

Defining spaces of exchange

Strunje, Petar

Doctoral thesis / Disertacija

2023

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **University of Zagreb, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences / Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet**

<https://doi.org/10.17234/diss.2022.9341>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:131:924816>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#) / [Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-17**



Sveučilište u Zagrebu
Filozofski fakultet
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences

Repository / Repozitorij:

[ODRAZ - open repository of the University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences](#)



I
- - -
U
- - -
A
- - -
V



University of Zagreb

Università IUAV di Venezia

Faculty of Humanities and
Social Sciences

Petar Strunje

DEFINING SPACES OF EXCHANGE: VENICE AND THE EASTERN ADRIATIC

INTERNATIONAL DUAL DOCTORATE

Supervisors:

Assoc. prof. Fulvio Lenzo, PhD
Assoc. prof. Jasenka Gudelj, PhD

Venice, 2022

ABSTRACT

The study of minorities, mobility, and cultural mediation in Early Modern Europe has attracted significant scholarly attention across disciplines in recent times. However, architectural history has dealt less with these phenomena. Aiming to fill this gap, this thesis responds to the overreaching question: How to straddle the cultural, religious, and linguistic divide when constructing architecture for a foreigner who is an apparent enemy? The answer is provided by focusing on a particular problem within a wide geographical area in the *longue durée*.

By relying on a large number of literary and visual sources, the dissertation investigates buildings made by the Republic of Venice to house and segregate Muslims, particularly Ottoman traders, from their implementation shortly after the War of Cyprus (1570–1573) to their abolishment with the dissolution of the Republic (1797). Segregation was not the only aspect. The term spaces of exchange can be understood in two ways. These buildings were spaces of commerce, but also spaces which were the result of cultural exchange. Various mediators and Ottoman merchants were consulted in the planning process, making these buildings a plural project. Traditional Adriatic architectural forms were enriched with elements of the Ottoman housing culture such as furniture, prayer spaces, hygienic and sanitation infrastructures. The mediators attempted to rhetorically position these solutions as Venetian caravanserais.

The study researches the entire Venetian system of hosting Muslims. It is separated into two macro chapters (Venice and the *Stato da Mar*), each with its case studies. The Venetian part looks into the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, not only in the Palazzo Pesaro, but also analyses the previous discussions and solutions. It takes into account the long tradition of *osterie*, the Ghetto, the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, national loggias, European fondacos in the Levant, Ottoman caravanserais, slave prisons in Livorno and Malta, and Ottoman fondacos in Ancona and Dubrovnik. The *Stato da Mar* part individuates the numerous solutions used on the Ottoman-Venetian border in Dalmatia: the *serraglio*, *stallia*, *loggia*, *tezza*, *stangada*, and *bazzana*. A distinction is established between the forms used in cities and large trade

ports, and those found in numerous small towns and along the trade routes in the hinterland, many of which are located, dated, and attributed for the first time. These solutions are positioned towards the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and all other surveyed solutions, establishing a typology and further contributing to solving the central dialectical problem of segregated spaces accommodated to a user with different housing needs.

Keywords: fondaco, early modern Split, cultural exchange, Ottoman Empire, Venice

SAŽETAK

Definiranje prostora razmjene u Veneciji i na istočnome Jadranu istražuje pojedinačne građevine i čitave infrastrukture koje je Mletačka Republika gradila za osobe, mahom trgovce, iz Osmanskog Carstva koji su dolazili na njene teritorije. Iako se radilo o raznim etničkim i religijskim skupinama, Mletačka je Republika pozornost usmjerila isključivo na muslimane. U razdoblju netom nakon Ciparskoga rata (1570.–1573.) odlučuje im izgraditi niz trgovačkih i smještajnih objekata u Veneciji i Dalmaciji, odvojeno od svih ostalih religijskih skupina. Radilo se o različitim arhitektonskim rješenjima, od *fondaca* (dosl. skladište; fontik) u gradovima, badžana (*bazzana*; dosl. carinarnica) i loggia (*tezza*, dosl. nadstrešnica) u predgrađima i na trgovačkim putevima. Sličnih su funkcija bili ograđena trgovišta zvana *stangade* (dosl. prečke), *serraglio* (dosl. ograđen prostor, tor, obor) i štalije (*stallia*, dosl. mjesto zaustavljanja). Unatoč heterogenim rješenjima, kod svih je primijećena stroga odvojenost od okoline, uz namjeru da se *Turke* (pojam korišten za sve muslimane) smjesti na njima prihvatljiv način. Stoga se i naslovni *prostori razmjene* mogu čitati dvojako: kao građeni prostori koji su služili trgovini, odnosno reguliranoj ekonomskoj razmjeni, te prostori koji su nastali kao posljedica pregovora, prilagodbe i kulturne razmjene između dva kulturna kruga.

Zbog ispravnije kontekstualizacije, u uvodu su prikazani opći modeli i arhitektonski tipovi koji su služili trgovini i smještaju stranaca poput *fondaca*, carinarnica, hostela, hospicija i tržnica, a uspostavljena je i veza s prostorima izolacije poput lazareta, bolnica, zatvora i geta. Ukratko su ocrtna i slična rješenja na Istočnome Sredozemlju poput *funduqa*, hana i karavan-saraja, s posebnim osvrtom na kulturu stanovanja u Islamskome Sredozemnome kulturnome krugu, kako bi se ustanovilo kakva su bila očekivanja osmanskih muslimanskih trgovaca kao korisnika. Tko su oni bili, gdje su i kako živjeli? Kako su mletačke institucije kao naručitelji vidjeli njihove stambene, kulturne i religijske potrebe? Kako su ih arhitekti i

inženjeri implementirali? Kako su izgledale građevine za njihov smještaj i koji su procesi utjecali na njihovo oblikovanje?

Polazeći od navedenih pitanja i činjenice da se odnos mletačkih institucija prema pristiglim muslimanima (kao i prema Židovima) razlikovao od odnosa prema kršćanima, uspostavljene su sljedeće hipoteze: 1) Specifičan odnos rezultirao je specifičnim arhitektonskim i prostornim rješenjima, sukladno religijsko-kulturnim potrebama korisnika i zahtjevima naručitelja. 2) Specifična rješenja nisu bila rezultat izravne komunikacije i preuzimanja oblika, nego prilagodbe lokalne graditeljske tradicije. Na hipoteze se odgovorilo komparativnom analizom i interpretacijom objekata kao sustava.

Disertacija je podijeljena na niz serija slučajeva u kojima se rekonstruira svaka pojedina građevina: od *Fondaco dei Turchi* i srodnih rješenja u Veneciji, splitske i hercegovačke trgovačke skale, do raznih rješenja u ostalim dalmatinskim priobalnim gradovima i njihovome zaleđu. Radi se o temi koja do sada nije bila istražena. Bilo je važno ujediniti brojna monografska istraživanja i bitno ih obogatiti novim saznanjima proizašlima iz arhivskog istraživanja kako bi se nadišli brojni regionalizmi i neusuglašeni glasovi između hrvatske i talijanske znanstvene produkcije. Ipak, disertacija polazi od nekoliko paralelnih razvoja na polju povijesti arhitekture i umjetnosti te povijesti, posebice urbane povijesti. Prvi je proučavanje manjina u predmodernoj Veneciji iz čega se razvio interes za trgovačku infrastrukturu, s obzirom da su najvidljivije manjine bile najprisutnije u ekonomskome životu. Drugi je recentni *mobility turn* koji mobilnost vidi kao temelj ljudske aktivnosti i interakcija, a infrastrukturu proučava kroz humanističku perspektivu. S obzirom da su oba pristupa izrazito prisutna u proučavanju ranonovovjekovne Venecije, a da povijesna prisutnost muslimana u europskom urbanom tkivu nije bila uočena, ova disertacija popunjava prazninu u dosadašnjoj literaturi. Kako niti jedna građevina nije sačuvana do današnjih dana, bilo ih je važno rekonstruirati oslanjanjem na vizualne i pisane primarne izvore raštrkane po zbirkama u Italiji, Hrvatskoj i Srbiji. Pritom su konzultirani izvori raznih provenijencija, nastali od strane naručitelja, investitora, izvođača, korisnika i

medijatora, pozicionirajući ovu arhitekturu kao pluralan projekt. Velik je broj manjih objekata u Dalmaciji prvi put rekognosciran, ubiciran, atribuiran i datiran. Izvedeni su i terenski pregledi, autopsija objekata ili relevantnih vizualnih izvora, nakon čega je uslijedila formalna povijesnoumjetnička i arhitektonska analiza, uz završnu primjenu ikonografije arhitekture. Naposljetku, komparativna je analiza korištena kao kontekstualizacijski i interpretativni alat.

Razlozi uspostave posebnog sustava opisani su u poglavlju *Chronology and geography* na temelju postojeće literature, polazeći od onih političke i ekonomske prirode, do društvenih i religioznih. Promjene u trgovačkim odnosima dovele su nakon Ciparskoga rata do naglog porasta broja osmanskih trgovaca u Veneciji i na njenim teritorijima, paralelno s opadanjem broja talijanskih trgovaca u Osmanskome Carstvu. Taj fenomen i specifičan sustav kojim je rezultirao sagledani su u dugom trajanju do pada Mletačke Republike kada su ukinuti (1797). Potreba za specifičnim sustavom objašnjena je konfesionalizacijom, pojmom koji objašnjava snažniji angažman države oko religijske homogenizacije pučanstva nakon reformacije i protureformacije. To je vrijeme uspostavljanja židovskoga Geta u Veneciji i reorganizacije i obnove *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* – palače na Canalu Grande u kojoj su bili obavezni odsjedati i poslovati svi trgovci s njemačkoga govornoga područja. Dodatno, kroz pregled već istraženih postupaka mletačke inkvizicije, rekonstruirani su opći razlozi zbog kojih je u tadašnjemu kontekstu bilo nužno odvojiti pridošle muslimane od domaćeg stanovništva.

S obzirom da je Mletačka Republika institucionalno bila podijeljena na Kopneni dio (*Stato da Terra*), te na Pomorske posjede (*Stato da Mar*), različita je uprava uvjetovala raspodjelu primarnih izvora. Sukladno je i disertacija podijeljena na dva primarna dijela (Veneciju i prekomorske posjede), svaki sa pripadajućim uvodom i studijama slučaja.

Prva je studija slučaja o osam prijedloga za uspostavu prvog *Fondaca dei Turchi* u Veneciji. Grčki mešetar Francesco Lettino predložio je Senatu 1574. godine da treba organizirati odvojen smještaj osmanskih muslimana pod njegovom upravom. Prijedlog je prihvaćen i krenulo se u potragu za lokacijom u privatnom vlasništvu koja bi bila regulirana od strane mletačke vlasti. Kao konzultant angažiran je dragoman (službeni prevoditelj za osmanski i druge levantinske jezike) Michiel Membré. Prijedloge su poslali Bartolomeo Vendramin, Andrea Malipiero, Marino Zane, Andrea Donà, Domenico Bossello, Antonio Priuli i Zaccaria Gabrieli. Svi predlagatelji ponudili su prostrane stambeno-poslovne građevine relativno izolirane od okoline, no ipak pristupačne s gradskih tržnica i prometnica. Uočene su i specifičnosti pojedinih projekata, nastale zbog religijsko-kulturnih potreba korisnika, a koje su takvima naznačili sami predlagatelji, dragoman Membré i mletačke institucije. Radilo se o kupaonicama, zahodima, pećima i posebnim izlozima za skupocjene uvozne tekstile. Takve specifičnosti išle su ruku pod ruku sa zahtjevima naručitelja za segregacijom. Građevina nije smjela biti u blizini crkve, ulazak i unutarnji poslovi bili bi regulirani, ključala bi se noću, a nitko nije smio vidjeti unutra ni van. Kao privremeno rješenje odabrana je i prilagođena gostionica *Angelo* u vlasništvu Bartolomea Vendramina. no zbog skandala u obližnjoj crkvi svetoga Mateja *fondaco* je premješten 1621. godine u palaču Pesaro u vlasništvu dužda Antonija Priulija na Canalu Grande, danas poznatiju upravo kao *Fondaco dei Turchi* koja čini drugu studiju slučaja.

Fondaco dei Turchi na toj se lokaciji nalazio nepuna dva stoljeća pa je sagledan tokom čitavog svog postojanja i rekonstruiran u nekoliko faza, od kojih su najnačajnije prva prilagodba građevine 1621. godine i rekonstrukcija 1751.–1768. koja je prvi put pripisana inženjeru Paolu Rossiju. U oba su slučaja centralna lica projekata bili ured za trgovinu (*Cinque savi alla mercanzia*) i dragomani, a izmjene su vršene na zahtjev korisnika. Tokom čitavog postojanja *fondaca*, inzistiralo se na ranije ustanovljenim segregacijskim modelima (koja su dijelom već postojala na židovskome getu) pa je građevina snažno reorijentirana prema dvama unutarnjim dvorištima, broj ulaza ograničen, a ostali vanjski otvori povišeni i pregrađeni. Ženama i djeci pristup je bio zabranjen, a građevina noću ključana. Ipak, priznato je da su muslimani (koje su odreda nazvali Turcima – *Turchi*) religijska, a ne etnička odrednica, pa je građevina podijeljena po pola na europski (za tzv. bosansku i

albansku naciju) i azijski dio (za tzv. anadolsku i carigradsku naciju). Istovremeno, značajna je pažnja posvećena sanitarnoj i ostaloj infrastrukturi po zahtjevu korisnika, a sredinom 18. stoljeća sagrađena je i džamija.

Značajan doprinos disertacije u sagledavanju je čitavog mletačkog sustava zbrinjavanja muslimana i njihove trgovine. Time *Fondaco dei Turchi* više nije iznimka već dio promišljene infrastrukture s brojnim primjerima na osmansko-mletačkoj granici – u tadašnjoj Dalmaciji.

U Šibeniku je od sredine 16. stoljeća muslimanima bio zabranjen ulazak u grad, a bili su smješteni na obližnjoj Mandalini i u predgrađu Plišac. U Zadru je od druge polovice 16. stoljeća reguliran ulazak muslimana u grad i predgrađa, a uređena im je strogo odvojena kuća u gradu i u današnjim Arbanasima. U isto vrijeme takva je građevina postojala i u Splitu, pred vratima od Pisture. Takve su građevine kasnije zabilježene u Trogiru, Kaštelima, Makarskoj i Obrovcu. Sastojale su se od ograđenog perimetra unutar kojeg su bile kuće i loggie, a svrha im je bila osigurati prostor za smještaj i trgovinu odvojeno od ostatka grada.

Za razliku od lokalnoga karaktera tih građevina, Mletačka je Republika na poticaj trgovca Daniela Rodrige 1577. godine u Splitu uspostavila najvažniju luku za trgovinu s Osmanskim Carstvom, poznatu kao *scala di Spalato*. Prostran građevinski kompleks od osam uzastopnih dvorišnih sklopova u luci građen je u sekvencama od 1588. do 1631. Svaki sklop odgovarao je jednoj ulozi unutar sustava prekogranične trgovine, od lazareta, preko priorova stana i ureda do carinarnice i fondaka. U ovom istraživanju naglasak je stavljen na dva posljednja odnosno najzapadnija sklopa, koji su služili prekograničnoj trgovini, smještaju pristiglih trgovaca i njihove robe. Arhitektonski uzori čitavoga sklopa kao i njegovih pojedinih dijelova pronađeni su u tadašnjim sjeverno-talijanskim lazaretima, a Split je pozicioniran kao ključna točka u razvoju tipologije mletačkih pomorskih lazareta.

Unutar takve prilagođene forme lazareta, koja pripada arhitekturi segregacije, pitanje vodoopskrbe prikazano je u izvorima kao glavni arhitektonski problem zbog kulturno-religijskih zahtjeva muslimana. Time je i splitski primjer pozicioniran između segregacije i ustupaka korisnicima.

Širenjem mletačkih posjeda u Prvom (1684–1699) i Drugom morejskom ratu (1714–1718), Split i ostali primorski centri našli su se dalje od granice. Stoga je trebalo urediti sustav karavanskih prenoćišta i trgovišta (*bazzana*) u manjim mjestima širom Dalmacije. To je posebice postalo važno uvođenjem sanitarnog kordona 1731. godine koji je izravan kontakt između osmanskih podanika i domaćeg stanovništva trebao svesti na nužni minimum. Ranije primijećene karakteristike prisutne i u ovdje, a razlike su uočene između trgovačkih badžana u gradovima i onih koje su isključivo korištene kao karavanska prenoćišta. Sukladno toj raspodjeli, njihovo tipološko podrijetlo pronađeno je u gradskim loggiama, odnosno vojarnama za konjicu. Istaknut je projekt badžane u Skradinu inženjera Frane Zavorea iz 1782. koji predstavlja zrelo rješenje koje kombinira i razvija ranije pristupe.

Posljednja se studija slučaja bavi kućom za smještaj trgovaca i osmanskog *emina* (carinika) u Herceg Novome gdje je Venecija ustanovila trgovačku luku po uzoru na Split nakon Drugog morejskog rata. Projekt inženjera Nicola Riga iz 1741. godine uspješno kombinira ograđenu loggiu sa stambenim prostorima, opremljenima higijenskim i sanitarnim prostorima zbog kojih je sagrađen i poseban vodovod.

U zaključnim su poglavljima sve građevine sagledane komparativno i ustanovljen je obuhvatan dijalektički pristup otvaranja i zatvaranja, dodvoravanja i segregacije. Naoko suprotne silnice pomirene su korištenjem pojma heterotopije. U ranonovovjekovnom društvu ustupci religijskim manjinama bili su mogući isključivo unutar segregiranih prostora van kojih pružene privilegije nisu vrijedile. Iako nikakva tipološka srodnost s osmanskom arhitektonskom tradicijom nije ustanovljena, primijećeno je postojanje određenih uvezenih, no prilagođenih elemenata islamske kulture stanovanja. To je objašnjeno prevođenjem i hibridizacijom pri čemu se presudnom pokazala uloga raznih

medijatora koji su lokalne graditeljske modele obogatili sadržajima prilagođenima iz osmanskoga kulturnoga kruga, time producirajući arhitekturu koja je bila mletački odgovor na muslimanske stambene probleme.

Ključne riječi: fondaco, Split u ranom novom vijeku, kulturna razmjena, Osmansko Carstvo, Venecija

RIASSUNTO

Defining spaces of exchange: Venice and the Eastern Adriatic (Definire gli spazi di scambio a Venezia e in Adriatico orientale) è la tesi che indaga singoli edifici e intere infrastrutture costruiti dalla Serenissima nei suoi territori per le genti provenienti dall'Impero Ottomano, per lo più mercanti. Sebbene si trattasse di vari gruppi etnici e religiosi, la Repubblica di Venezia rivolse la sua attenzione esclusivamente ai musulmani. Immediatamente dopo la guerra di Cipro (1570-1573), la Repubblica decise di costruire una serie di strutture commerciali e ricettive a Venezia e in Dalmazia (oggi in Croazia), separando i musulmani da tutti gli altri gruppi religiosi. Si tratta di diverse soluzioni architettoniche, dai fondachi nelle città alle bazzane (in Turco letteralm. dogana) e logge (anche chiamate *tezze* – tettoie) nelle periferie urbane e lungo le vie commerciali. I mercati semichiusi chiamati stangade, serragli e stallie ebbero funzioni simili. Nonostante le soluzioni fossero eterogenee, si osserva in tutti i casi una rigida separazione dall'ambiente circostante, combinata con l'intenzione di ospitare i Turchi (termine usato per tutti i musulmani) in un modo per loro accettabile. Pertanto, gli spazi di scambio possono essere letti in due chiavi: come spazi costruiti per il commercio, cioè per gli scambi economici, e come spazi creati a seguito di negoziazioni, adattamenti e scambi culturali.

Per una contestualizzazione più corretta, nell'introduzione si presentano modelli generali e tipologie architettoniche utilizzate per commercio e alloggio degli stranieri, come fondachi, dogane, osterie, locande e mercati. Si stabilisce anche un collegamento con spazi d'isolamento come lazzaretti, ospedali, prigionie e ghetti. Vengono delineate soluzioni analoghe nel Mediterraneo orientale, quali funduq, khan e caravanserragli, con particolare riferimento alla cultura dell'abitare nel Mediterraneo islamico, al fine di stabilire quali fossero le aspettative dei mercanti ottomani musulmani – i destinatari di questi spazi.

Chi erano, dove e come vivevano? Come le istituzioni veneziane (committenti) vedevano le loro esigenze abitative, culturali e religiose? In che modo queste esigenze venivano implementate da architetti e ingegneri? Che aspetto avevano gli edifici e quali processi influenzarono la loro progettazione?

Sulla base delle suddette domande, e dell'atteggiamento delle istituzioni veneziane verso i musulmani (nonché verso gli ebrei) che era ben diverso da quello verso i cristiani, sono formulate le seguenti ipotesi: 1) Il rapporto particolare ha portato a soluzioni architettoniche e spaziali particolari, in accordo sia con le esigenze religiose e culturali degli utenti che con le richieste del committente. 2) Le soluzioni particolari non erano il risultato della comunicazione diretta o dell'importazione di forme architettoniche, ma piuttosto il risultato dell'adattamento delle tradizioni locali. Alle ipotesi si risponde con un'analisi comparativa, interpretando gli edifici come un sistema infrastrutturale.

La dissertazione si articola in una serie di casi di studio nei quali viene ricostruito ogni singolo edificio: dal Fondaco dei Turchi e relative soluzioni a Venezia, le scale commerciali di Spalato e Castelnuovo di Montenegro, alle varie soluzioni nelle altre parti della Dalmazia. Finora, questo tema è stato scarsamente ricercato, mai come un sistema comprensivo. Dunque, era importante unire numerosi studi monografici e arricchirli di nuove conoscenze derivate dalla ricerca archivistica, allo scopo di superare i regionalismi e voci discordanti tra la produzione scientifica italiana e quella croata. Tuttavia, la dissertazione parte da diversi approcci recentemente sviluppati nel campo della storia, particolarmente quella urbana, e della storia dell'architettura. Il primo è lo studio delle minoranze a Venezia della prima epoca moderna, da cui si è sviluppato l'interesse per le infrastrutture commerciali, dato che le minoranze più visibili erano quelle più presenti nella vita economica. Il secondo è il recente *mobility turn*, che vede la mobilità come cardine di tutta l'attività e l'interazione umana, ed esamina le infrastrutture in chiave umanistica. Siccome entrambi gli approcci sono stati abbastanza usati da parte dei venezianisti, e allo stesso tempo la presenza storica dei musulmani nel tessuto urbano europeo è stata poco

studiata, questa dissertazione colma una lacuna nella letteratura scientifica. Poiché fino a oggi non è stato conservato un solo edificio, era importante ricostruirli sulla base di fonti primarie, sia visive che scritte, sparse per le collezioni in Italia, Croazia e Serbia. Sono state consultate fonti di varia provenienza, create da committenti, investitori, progettisti, appaltatori, utenti e mediatori, posizionando questa architettura come un progetto plurale. Sono stati inoltre eseguiti sopralluoghi, autopsie di edifici o fonti visive rilevanti, seguiti da un'analisi formale storico-artistica e architettonica, con l'applicazione finale dell'analisi iconografica. Infine, l'analisi comparativa è stata utilizzata come strumento contestualizzante e interpretativo.

I motivi che hanno portato all'istituire di un sistema particolare sono descritti nel capitolo *Cronologia e geografia* sulla base della letteratura esistente, partendo da quelli di natura politica ed economica, fino a quelli sociali e religiosi. I cambiamenti nei rapporti commerciali dopo la guerra di Cipro hanno portato a un improvviso aumento del numero di mercanti ottomani ai territori veneziani, contemporaneamente al declino del numero di mercanti italiani nell'Impero ottomano. Questo fenomeno e il sistema che ne sarebbe stato derivato sono osservati nel *longue durée* fino alla sua abolizione con la caduta della Serenissima (1797). La necessità di stabilire un sistema particolare si spiega nel contesto di confessionalizzazione, il termine che significa un coinvolgimento più forte dello Stato nell'omogeneizzazione religiosa della popolazione dopo la Riforma e la Controriforma. In questo periodo è stato istituito il Ghetto ebraico, ed è stato ricostruito il Fondaco dei Tedeschi in cui tutti i mercanti tedeschi erano obbligati a soggiornare. Inoltre, attraverso una panoramica dei processi dell'Inquisizione veneziana, sono ricostruiti i motivi generali per cui all'epoca era necessario separare i musulmani neoarrivati dalla popolazione locale.

Visto che la Repubblica di Venezia era istituzionalmente divisa in Stato da Terra e Stato da Mar, anche la dissertazione si articola in due parti principali (Venezia e i possedimenti d'oltremare), ciascuna con la propria introduzione e casi di studio. Il primo caso studio esamina otto proposte per il primo Fondaco dei Turchi a Venezia. Il broker greco Francesco Lettino propose al Senato nel 1574 di organizzare sotto la propria amministrazione alloggi separati per i musulmani ottomani. La proposta fu accolta e iniziò la ricerca di una sede privata che fosse regolata dalle autorità veneziane. Dragomanno (l'interprete ufficiale per ottomano e altre lingue levantine) Michiel Membré fu impiegato come consulente. Bartolomeo Vendramin, Andrea Malipiero, Marino Zane, Andrea Donà, Domenico Bossello, Antonio Priuli e Zaccaria Gabrieli inviarono varie proposte. Tutti i proponenti offrivano ampi complessi residenziali e commerciali, relativamente isolati dai dintorni, ma comunque accessibili dai mercati cittadini e dalle strade e canali. Sono inoltre osservate le specificità dei singoli progetti, sorte per esigenze religiose e culturali degli utenti, indicate come tali dai proponenti stessi – il dragomanno Membré e le istituzioni veneziane. Si trattava di bagni, servizi igienici, stufe e “mostre” cioè banchi speciali per i costosi tessuti levantini. Tali particolarità andavano di pari passo con i requisiti di segregazione proposti dal committente. L'edificio non poteva essere vicino alla chiesa, l'ingresso e gli affari interni sarebbero stati controllati, sarebbe stato chiuso di notte e nessuno avrebbe potuto vedere dentro o fuori. Come soluzione provvisoria fu scelta la riadattata osteria Angelo, proprietà di Bartolomeo Vendramin. Ma a causa di uno scandalo nella vicina chiesa di San Matteo, il fondaco fu trasferito nel 1621 nel palazzo Pesaro di proprietà del Doge Antonio Priuli sul Canal Grande, oggi noto come Fondaco dei Turchi, che costituisce il secondo caso studio.

Il Fondaco dei Turchi è rimasto in quel luogo per quasi due secoli. Quindi la tesi lo segue durante tutta la sua esistenza lì, con particolare attenzione prestata all'adattamento dell'edificio nel 1621 e la ricostruzione nel 1751–1768, assegnata per la prima volta all'ingegnere Paolo Rossi. In entrambi i casi i protagonisti del progetto erano l'ufficio commerciale della Serenissima (Cinque savi alla mercanzia) e i dragomanni, con le modifiche seguenti fatte su richiesta dei destinatari. Durante l'intera esistenza del Fondaco si insisteva sui modelli di segregazione prestabiliti (già in uso nel ghetto ebraico), per cui

l'edificio era fortemente riorientato verso i due cortili interni, il numero degli ingressi era limitato, e le finestre esterne erano sollevate e partizionate. L'accesso a donne e bambini era vietato e l'edificio veniva chiuso di notte, come il Ghetto. Tuttavia, si è stato riconosciuto che i Turchi (il nome usato per tutti musulmani) erano una determinante religiosa, non etnica, per cui l'edificio è stato diviso a metà nella parte europea (per la cosiddetta nazione bosniaca e albanese) e la parte asiatica (per la nazione anatolica e costantinopolitana). Allo stesso tempo, su richiesta dei destinatari, è stata prestata molta attenzione alle infrastrutture sanitarie e a metà del XVIII secolo è stata allestita anche una moschea – l'unica nella Repubblica.

Un contributo importante di questa dissertazione è che provvede un quadro d'insieme dell'intero sistema veneziano di alloggi per i musulmani, non solo delle sue singole parti. Così, il Fondaco dei Turchi non deve più essere considerato un'eccezione, ma parte di una infrastruttura ben pensata con numerosi esempi sul confine terrestre ottomano-veneziano in Dalmazia.

A Sebenico, dalla metà del XVI secolo, l'ingresso in città era proibito ai musulmani per i quali è stato costruito un serraglio, cioè un recinto chiuso con la *tezza* (loggia) nel sobborgo Borgo Orti (*Plišac*) e la vicina penisola Maddalena (*Mandalina*). A partire dalla seconda metà del XVI secolo, era regolata anche la loro presenza a Zara e nei suoi sobborghi, dove è stata predisposta una casa rigorosamente isolata in città e un'altra nel Borgo Erizzo (*Arbanasi*). Allo stesso tempo, un tale edificio esisteva a Spalato, davanti alla porta principale della città (*Pistura*). Tali edifici sono stati successivamente registrati a Trogir, Kaštela, Makarska e Obrovac. Consistevano di un recinto all'interno del quale si trovavano case e logge, e avevano lo scopo di fornire spazi separati dal resto della città per alloggio e commercio.

In contrasto con il carattere locale di quegli edifici, la Repubblica di Venezia, su iniziativa del mercante ebreo Daniel Rodriga, stabilì a Spalato nel 1577 il porto più importante per il commercio con l'Impero Ottomano, noto come scala di Spalato. L'ampio complesso edilizio di otto cortili consecutivi nel porto fu costruito in sequenze dal 1588 al 1631. Ogni cortile del complesso corrispondeva a un ruolo all'interno del sistema del commercio transfrontaliero, dall'lazzaretto, passando per l'appartamento e l'ufficio del priore, fino alla dogana e al fondaco. In questa ricerca, l'accento è posto sui due ultimi, più occidentali, cortili che servivano al commercio, l'alloggio dei commercianti in arrivo e le loro merci. Modelli architettonici dell'intero complesso come delle sue singole parti sono trovati nei lazzeretti dell'Italia settentrionale dell'epoca, e Spalato si posiziona come un punto chiave nello sviluppo della tipologia dei lazzeretti marittimi veneziani. All'interno di una forma adattata di lazzaretto, che appartiene all'architettura della segregazione, il problema dell'approvvigionamento idrico si presentava nelle fonti come il principale problema architettonico dovuto alle esigenze culturale-religiose dei musulmani. Pertanto, anche l'esempio di Split si colloca tra segregazione e concessioni agli destinatari.

Con l'espansione dei possedimenti veneziani nella prima (1684–1699) e seconda guerra di Morea (1714–1718), Spalato e gli altri centri costieri si sono trovati più lontani dal nuovo confine. Era necessario organizzare un sistema di alloggi per carovane e luoghi di scambio (*bazzana*) nei centri minori di entroterra dalmata. Ciò è diventato particolarmente importante con l'introduzione del cordone sanitario nel 1731, che avrebbe dovuto ridurre al minimo il contatto diretto tra i sudditi ottomani e la popolazione locale. Le caratteristiche precedentemente notate sono presenti anche in questi nuovi esempi e si osservano nelle differenze tra le bazzane commerciali suburbane e quelle che erano utilizzate esclusivamente come alloggi carovanieri. Secondo questa distribuzione, la loro origine tipologica si trova nelle logge urbane, cioè caserme di cavalleria. È inoltre evidenziato il progetto dell'ingegnere Frano Zavoro del 1782 per la bazzana di Scardona, che rappresenta una soluzione matura che unisce e sviluppa gli approcci precedenti.

L'ultimo caso di studio riguarda la casa dell'alloggio dei mercanti e l'emin (esattore doganale) ottomano a Castelnuovo di Montenegro, dove Venezia ha stabilito un porto franco sul modello di Spalato dopo la seconda guerra di Morea. Il progetto dell'ingegnere

Niccolò Rigo del 1741 collega una loggia parzialmente recintata con spazi abitativi, dotati di servizi igienico-sanitari per i quali è stato realizzato un apposito acquedotto.

Nei capitoli conclusivi, tutti gli edifici vengono analizzati in modo comparativo e viene stabilito un approccio dialettico di apertura e chiusura, concessione e segregazione. Linee apparentemente opposte vengono riconciliate utilizzando il concetto di eterotopia. In altre parole, nella società del tempo, le concessioni alle minoranze religiose erano possibili solo all'interno di spazi segregati. Sebbene non sia stata stabilita alcuna affinità tipologica con la tradizione architettonica ottomana, è stata notata l'esistenza di alcuni elementi di cultura dell'abitare islamica, ma cambiati notevolmente quando utilizzati nel contesto veneziano. Ciò si spiega con i concetti di traduzione e ibridazione, per cui come determinante si rivela il ruolo di vari mediatori che arricchiscono i modelli architettonici locali con contenuti adattati dall'ambito culturale ottomano, producendo così un'architettura che fu la risposta veneziana ai problemi abitativi musulmani.

Parole chiavi: fondaco, scala di Spalato, scambio culturale, Impero ottomano, Venezia

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASMo	Archivio di Stato di Modena (State Archives in Modena)
ASVe	Archivio di Stato di Venezia (State Archives in Venice)
BMC	Biblioteca del Museo Correr (Library of the Correr Museum, Venice)
BNM	Biblioteca nazionale Marciana (Marciana National Library, Venice)
DAPDP	(ASVe) Deputati e aggiunti alla provision del denaro pubblico
HAZU	Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb)
HR-DAŠI	Državni arhiv u Šibeniku (State Archives in Šibenik, Croatia)
HR-DAZD	Državni arhiv u Zadru (State Archives in Zadar, Croatia)
JAZU	Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb)
MMN	(ASVe, Secreta) Materie miste e notabili
PTM	(ASVe, Senato, Dispacci) Provveditori da terra e da mar e altre cariche
V Savi	(ASVe) Cinque Savi alla mercanzia
b.	busta (box/volume)
c.	carta (page)
cod.	codice (codex)
f.	foglio (leaf)
fasc.	fascicolo (fascicle)
fz.	filza (fascicle/bundle)
knj.	knjiga (book/volume)
kut.	kutija (box)
p.	pagina (page)
reg.	registro (register)
s.	serie (series)
sv.	svežanj (fascicle/bundle)

Note on the dates: The Venetian New Year began on 1 March. All January and February dates in the primary sources are part of the next year according to the modern Gregorian calendar. The original dating system was kept, and marked with *m. v. (more Veneto)*. Therefore, 1 January 1600 *m. v.* is 1 January 1601, according to our standard.

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2. 1 <i>Architectural details, plan, section, and façade of the Fondaco dei Tedeschi</i> (Cicognara, Diedo, Selva, <i>Le fabbriche e i monumenti cospicui di Venezia</i> , tav. 93–94)	34
Fig. 2. 2. Salomon Schweigger, <i>A caravansera in Bulgaria</i> (<i>Ein neue Reiss Beschreibung auss Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem</i> , p. 40)	42
Fig. 2. 3 K. Zukić, <i>A private khan in the village of Kasapovići, Bosnia</i> (Kreševljaković, <i>Hanovi i karavansaraji</i> , fig. 19).....	43
Fig. 2. 4 <i>Back side of the Palazzo degli Anziani</i> , Ancona (author Gerardo De Angelis, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Palazzo_fronte_porto.jpg accessed 25.6.2022).....	45
Fig. 2. 5 <i>Loggia dei mercanti</i> , Ancona (http://sirpac.cultura.marche.it/sirpacintraweb/storage/label/1411/384/00275169_MG_2569.jpg ; accessed 25.6.2022).....	46
Fig. 2. 6 <i>The Ragusan commercial presence</i> (author Giorgio Eusebio Petetti, https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/archive/7/75/20130923130833%21Espansione_di_Ragusa.png ; accessed 26.6.2022)	49
Fig. 2. 7 Ivan Tenšek, <i>Reconstruction of the façade of the palace of Sandalj Hranić</i> (Grujić, Zelić, “ <i>Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranica</i> ,” 78).....	50
Fig. 2. 8 Walter Raughmann, <i>Mercantile complex in Dubrovnik outside the city gate</i> , 1814. (HR-DAZD-377, <i>Miscellanea</i> , sv. 1, poz. D, l. 107).....	51
Fig. 2. 9 <i>Schematic rendering of bagno floor plan detail, upper-level overlay with ground floor partially visible, based on a late seventeenth-century plan</i> (Nadalo, “ <i>Negotiating Slavery</i> ,” 290)	57
FIG. 3. 1 Zaccaria Gabriel (?), <i>The Gabrieli warehouses and depots (at San Giovanni Crisostomo)</i> , 1579 (ASVe, <i>Secreta, Materie miste e notabili</i> , b. 55, fasc. II).....	75
Fig. 3. 2 <i>Location of the various proposals: 1) Bartolomeo Vendramin; 2) Bartolomeo Zane; 3) Zaccaria Gabriel; 4) Zaccaria Gabriel; 5) Antonio Priuli</i> (based on: Lodovico Ughi, <i>Iconografica rappresentazione della inclita città di Venezia</i> , 1729).....	79
Fig. 3. 3 Vincenzo Coronelli, <i>Palazzo, o Fondaco de’ Turchi</i> (<i>Singolarità di Venezia, I palazzi</i> , 1710, tav. 4.0.10.).....	93
Fig. 3. 4 Jacopo de Barbari, <i>View of Venice – detail</i> , 1500 (Schulz, <i>New palaces</i> , fig. 147).....	94
Fig. 3. 5 Juergen Schulz, <i>Elevation and partial section of the courtyard façade – conjectural reconstruction</i> (<i>New palaces</i> , fig. 135).....	94
Fig. 3. 6 Juergen Schulz, <i>Reconstructions of the floor plans of the Fondaco dei Turchi</i> (<i>New palaces</i>)	95
Fig. 3. 7 Cesare Torello called il Franco, <i>Pianta del Palazzo già Pesaro poi dei Marchesi e Duchi d’Este – ground-floor plan</i> , ca. 1600 (Archivio di Stato di Modena, <i>Mappario Estense</i> , n. 329).....	96
Fig. 3. 8 Cesare Torello, <i>Pianta del Palazzo già Pesaro poi dei Marchesi e Duchi d’Este – mezzanine plan</i> , ca. 1600.	97
Fig. 3. 9 Cesare Torello, <i>Pianta del Palazzo già Pesaro poi dei Marchesi e Duchi d’Este – first-floor plan</i> , ca. 1600.....	98
Fig. 3. 10 Petar Strunje, Ante Spahija, <i>Conjectural reconstruction of the Fondaco dei Turchi after 1621 – ground-floor plan</i>	99
Fig. 3. 11 <i>Mezzanine</i>	100
Fig. 3. 12 <i>First floor</i>	101
Fig. 3. 13 <i>Second floor</i>	102
Fig. 3. 14 Petar Strunje, Ante Spahija, <i>Elevation of the Fondaco dei Turchi after 1621 – conjectural reconstruction</i>	103
Fig. 3. 15 <i>View of the Fondaco de Turchi</i> (Domenico Lovisa, <i>Il Gran Teatro di Venezia</i> , ca. 1720, tav. XLVIII).	104
Fig. 3. 16 Francesco Guardi (att.), <i>Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , 1745–1750 (Swiss private collection).....	115
Fig. 3. 17 Francesco Albotto (att.), <i>View of the Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , 1752–1755 (Turin, Galleria Sabauda). 124	

Fig. 3. 18 Circle of Michele Marieschi, <i>Venice with a View of the Canal Grande and the Fontego dei Turchi</i> , after 1755 (private collection).....	124
Fig. 3. 19 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, <i>Fondaco dei Turchi – ground floor plan</i> , 1768 (ASVe, <i>Miscellanea mappe</i> , n. 571).....	125
Fig. 3. 20 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, <i>Fondaco dei Turchi – mezzanine plan</i> , 1768	126
Fig. 3. 21 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, <i>Fondaco dei Turchi – first-floor plan</i> , 1768.....	127
Fig. 3. 22 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, <i>Fondaco dei Turchi – second-floor plan</i> , 1768.....	128
Fig. 3. 23 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, <i>Fondaco dei Turchi – roof layout</i> , 1768.....	129
Fig. 3. 24 Federico Berchet, <i>Ground-floor and mezzanine plan of the Fondaco dei Turchi as present in 1858</i> (Sagredo, Berchet, <i>Il Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , tav. II).....	130
Fig. 3. 25 Federico Berchet, <i>First and second-floor plan of the Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , 1858 (Sagredo, Berchet, <i>Il Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , tav. III)	132
Fig. 3. 26 Federico Berchet, <i>Cross section of the canal-side tract</i> , 1861 (Schulz, <i>New palaces</i> , fig. 168)	133
Fig. 3. 27 Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, <i>The Imperial bath in Buda</i> , 1725 (<i>Entwurf einer historischen Architectur</i> , 1725, book 2, table 1)	137
Fig. 3. 28 Cristoforo Guerra and Tiziano (?), <i>A Turk when it rains</i> (Cesare Vecellio, <i>De gli habitanti antichi, e moderni di diverse parti del mondo libri due</i> , 1590, f. 383r).....	138
Fig. 3. 29 Francesco di Giorgio Martini, <i>Destro from the Trattati di architettura ingegneria e arte militare</i> , ms. II.I. 141, f. 14r. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze (Biow, <i>The Culture of Cleanliness</i> , 5)..	147
Fig. 3. 30 Sebastiano Serlio, <i>The Merchants' loggia in Lyon</i> , 1575 (Il settimo libro, p. 195).....	148
Fig. 3. 31 Sebastiano Serlio, <i>First and ground-floor plan of the Merchants' loggia in Lyon</i> , 1575.....	149
Fig. 3. 32 Dionisio Moretti, <i>View of the Grand Canal</i> , tav. 13 in: Antonio Quadri, <i>Il Canal grande di Venezia</i> , 1831 (The Getty Research Institute)	151
Fig. 3. 33 <i>Detail</i>	151
Fig. 3. 34 John Ruskin, <i>The Fondaco dei Turchi – watercolour original used for the engraved frontispiece of the Stones of Venice</i> , vol 2: <i>The Sea Stories</i> (1853), 1845 (private collection, UK).....	152
Fig. 3. 35 Federico Berchet, <i>Proposed reconstruction</i> (Sagredo, Berchet, <i>Il Fondaco dei Turchi</i> , tav. VIII) 153	
Fig. 3. 36 <i>The Fondaco dei Turchi, today the Museo di storia naturale di Venezia Giancarlo Ligabue</i> (author Didier Descouens, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Fondaco_dei_Turchi.jpg accessed 26.6.2022)	153
Fig. 4. 1 <i>Map of Venetian Dalmatia</i> (Hrvatska Enciklopedija, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, https://www.enciklopedija.hr/Ilustracije/Dalmacija_u_doba_mlecana.jpg , accessed 24.6.2022).....	163
Fig. 4. 2 <i>Map of Venetian Dalmatia with the positions of the bazzane</i> (author Petar Strunje)	164
Fig. 4. 3 The cadaster map of Šibenik, 1825 (maps.arcanum.com; number 540; note 459).....	170
Fig. 4. 4 <i>The poorhouse (orig. bazzana) of Šibenik (lower right)</i> , ca. 1880 (Šibenski.hr; note 459).....	170
Fig. 4. 5 Leo Wehrli, <i>The small loggia in Trogir (Mala loža)</i> , 1936 (Zürich, ETH Bibliothek_Dia_247-09449)	171
Fig. 4. 6 Maestro de Canapost, <i>Merchants unloading cargo at the loggia in Perpignan</i> , detail from: <i>Retable de la Trinité</i> , Musée Hyacinthe Rigaud, Perpignan, ca. 1489 (https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Perpignan,St_Jacques010,Rigaud3.jpg ; accessed 29.6.2022)	171
Fig. 4. 7 Giovanni Battista Lodoli, <i>Cargador of Zadar</i> , 1754 (Bilić, <i>Inženjeri</i> , p. 198).....	174
Fig. 4. 8 Napoleone Francesco Eraut, <i>Zara</i> (Cargador marked with an asterix * on the left), 1682 (BNM, Ms.It.IV.28, <i>Racolta delle piante d'alquante delle più considerabili et forti piazze dello Stato tanto di terra ferma quanto da mar della Serenissima Republica di Venetia</i> , c. 39r)	175
Fig. 4. 9 <i>Lazaretto of Zadar</i> , after 1782 (Museo Correr, Cl. XLIVb, n. 0638).....	178
Fig. 4. 10 Giorgio Calergi, <i>Spalato</i> , detail, 1675 (Duplančić, <i>Splitske zidine</i> , fig. 27)	181
Fig. 4. 11 Napoleone Francesco Eraut, <i>Spalato</i> , detail (Porta Pistora marked E, bazzana T, scala M), 1682 (BNM, Ms.It.IV.28, c. 48r).....	182
Fig. 4. 12 Stefano Buccò, <i>Spalato</i> , 1692 (Arhiv Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, <i>Istorijska zbirka, Zaostavština Jovana Tomića</i> , 8711/XII-45).....	183
Fig. 4. 13 <i>Detail with the scala di Spalato</i>	183
Fig. 4. 14 Antonio Moser de Filseck, <i>Reconstruction project of the bazzana of Split</i> , 1762 (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità</i> , b. 455).	185

Fig. 4. 15 Louis François Cassas, <i>Spalato with the scala</i> , 1802 (Joseph Lavallée; Louis François Cassas, <i>Voyage pittoresque et historique de l'Istrie et de la Dalmatie</i> , 1802, table 34)	189
Fig. 4. 16 Snježana Perojević, <i>Reconstructions of the scala di Spalato</i> , 2002 ("Izgradnja lazareta u Splitu," p. 130).....	189
Fig. 4. 17 Giovanni Battista Camozzini, <i>Plan of the scala di Spalato</i> , 1728 (Muzej hvarske baštine, <i>Fond Bučić</i> , 1. (18. st.) <i>Spisi mletačkog inženjera G. B. Camozzinija</i> , 43)	190
Fig. 4. 18 <i>The chronological and functional scheme</i> (Strunje, <i>Splitski lazaret</i> , fig. 14)	190
Fig. 4. 19 Giuseppe Juster, <i>View of Split from the West</i> , 1708 (Museo Correr, Cl. XLIVb, n. 0795).....	210
Fig. 4. 20 <i>Detail</i>	210
Fig. 4. 21 Giuseppe Santini, <i>View of Split – detail</i> , 1666. (Muzej grada Splita, <i>Zbirka crteža</i> , inv. br. 6316_6)	217
Fig. 4. 22 Putnički ured Split; studio Balkan-Mentor Beograd, <i>Split - detail</i> , 1926 (author's collection).....	218
Fig. 4. 23 <i>Topographic plan of the island of San Demetrio – the lazaretto of Corfù</i> , 1724 (ASVe, <i>Senato, Dispacci, PTM</i> , b. 582, fz. 865, dis. 1).....	219
Fig. 4. 24 Paolo Artico, <i>The lazaretto of Castel Nuovo (Herceg Novi)</i> , 1767 (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità</i> , b. 9, dis. 7/1)	219
Fig. 4. 25 <i>Birds-eye view of the lazaretto in Verona</i> , 1930 (Gatti, Negri, Ruffo, <i>L'utopia della rovina. Il lazaretto di Verona</i> , p. 26)	220
Fig. 4. 26 <i>Elements and plan of the lazaretto in Verona</i> (Langenskiöld, <i>Michele Sanmicheli: the architect of Verona</i> , 1938, p. 95).....	221
Fig. 4. 27 Ground plan of the lazaretto in Verona – detail, between 1551 and 1591 (Gatti, Negri, Ruffo, <i>L'utopia della rovina. Il lazaretto di Verona</i> , p. 34)	221
Fig. 4. 28 Adriano Cristofali, <i>Lazaretto of Verona and its surroundings</i> , 1754 (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità</i> , b. 8, dis. 2a).....	222
Fig. 4. 29 Alessandro Baratta, <i>Birds-eye view of the lazaretto alle Foce</i> , detail from <i>La Famosissima e Nobilissima Città di Genova</i> , 1637 (gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France).....	223
Fig. 4. 30 Joseph Furttenbach, <i>Lazaretto oder Brechhaus</i> , 1639 (Jetter, "Zur Typologie des Pesthauses," p. 295).....	223
Fig. 4. 31 Francesco Melchiori, <i>Map of the cordon sanitaire on the Ottoman-Venetian border in central Dalmatia</i> , 1731 (Kusin, ed., <i>Dalmatinska zagora nepoznata zemlja</i> , p. 216)	224
Fig. 4. 32 Francesco Melchiori, <i>Project for a bazzana in Klis</i> , 1732 (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità</i> , b. 417, dis. 2).....	228
Fig. 4. 33 Francesco Melchiori, <i>Bazzana of Klis</i> , 1732 (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità</i> , b. 417, dis. 3).....	229
Fig. 4. 34 <i>Klis on the Austrian cadaster map</i> , 1731 (maps.arcanum.com; accessed 20.3.2022).....	229
Fig. 4. 35 Faustino Brascuglia, <i>Plan of Sinj</i> , 1745 (<i>Atlante della Dalmazia</i> , BNM, It.VI.195, c. 23)	231
Fig. 4. 36 Francesco Melchiori, <i>Bazzana of Sinj</i> , 1732 (ASVe, <i>Senato, Deliberazioni, Sanità</i> , fz. 3).....	232
Fig. 4. 37 <i>Detail – falcon tornante (H)</i>	232
Fig. 4. 38 Camillo de Braglie, <i>Plan of Sinj – detail with the bazzana</i> , 1817 (Vulić, Vulić, <i>Zgrada na Štaliji u Sinju</i> , 2016, p. 22)	233
Fig. 4. 39 <i>The bazzana of Benkovac</i> (photo: Petar Strunje).....	235
Fig. 4. 40 Antonio Piovesana, <i>Bazzana in Benkovac</i> , 1766 (ASVe, <i>Senato, Dispacci, PTM</i> , b. 423, fz. 612).....	235
Fig. 4. 41 Antonio Piovesana, <i>Bazzana in Benkovac</i> , 1766 (ASVe, <i>Senato, Dispacci, PTM</i> , b. 427, fz. 617).....	236
Fig. 4. 42 Antonio Ferro, <i>Cavalry station at Dicmo</i> , 1795 (Bilić, <i>Inženjeri</i> , p. 178)	237
Fig. 4. 43 Giuseppe Ferro, <i>Cavalry station in Han (Sinj)</i> , 1775 (Bilić, <i>Inženjeri</i> , p. 179)	238
Fig. 4. 44 Antonio Ferro (?), <i>Soldiers' quarters (for the bazzana guard and caravan escort ?)</i> , second half of the 18th century (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni</i> , b. 11, dis. 20a).....	239
Fig. 4. 45 Antonio Ferro (?), <i>Soldiers' quarters (for the bazzana guard and caravan escort ?)</i> , second half of the 18th century (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni</i> , b. 11, dis. 20b).....	239
Fig. 4. 46 Antonio Ferro (?), <i>Bazzana for 40 horses</i> , second half of the 18th century (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni</i> , b. 11, dis. 20c)	240
Fig. 4. 47 Antonio Ferro (?), <i>Bazzana for 40 horses</i> , second half of the 18th century (ASVe, <i>Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni</i> , b. 11, dis. 20d)	240
Fig. 4. 48 Pietro Corir, <i>Imoschi</i> , 1774 (Franciscan monastery of Imotski).....	244

Fig. 4. 49 <i>Detail</i>	245
Fig. 4. 50 <i>Austrian cadaster, Imotski, 1835 – parcel 338</i> (maps.arcanum.com; accessed 21.4.2022).....	245
Fig. 4. 51 <i>Cattaro, (BNM, Ms.It.VII.200, Carte topografiche, piante di citta' e fortezze, disegni di battaglie della guerra di Candia (1645–1669).</i>	247
Fig. 4. 52 <i>Detail</i>	248
Fig. 4. 53 <i>Frane Zavoreo, Map of Skradin, 1787 (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanita, b. 24, dis. 23a)</i>	252
Fig. 4. 54 <i>Frane Zavoreo, Project for the bazzana of Skradin, 1787 (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanita, b. 24, dis. 23b)</i>	253
Fig. 4. 55 <i>Giuseppe Juster (?), Castelnuovo, 1709 (?) (Museo Civico Correr, CI XLIVb n0478)</i>	259
Fig. 4. 56 <i>Detail</i>	259
Fig. 4. 57 <i>Giovanni Battista Camozzini, Project for the lazaretto of Herceg Novi, 1730 (ASVe, Provveditori alle fortezze, ex b. 82, dis. 88)</i>	260
Fig. 4. 58 <i>Nicolò Rigo, Plan and profile of the building and enclosure of the Stangade in Castelnuovo, 1741 (ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 478, fz. 682, dis. 1)</i>	261
Fig. 4. 59 <i>Francesco Melchiori, Plan of Čitluk, 1695 (BNM, Ms.It.VII.94, Carte topografiche e piante di città e fortezze per la guerra di Morea (1684–1697).</i>	277
Fig. 4. 60 <i>Detail</i>	277
Fig. 4. 61 <i>Maškovića khan after its rebuilding and modification into a hotel in 2014</i> (photo: Davor Strenja, https://www.maskovicahan.hr/hr/o-nama/povijest ; accessed 24.6.2022).....	279
Fig. 4. 62 <i>Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, Functional disposition of the Maškovića khan in Vrana (“Yugoslavya’da Türk abideleri ve vakiflari,” fig. 63)</i>	279
Fig. 4. 63 <i>Geronimo Benaglio, Vrana Piazza del Turco, 1647 (BNM, Ms.It.VII.200, Carte topografiche, piante di città e fortezze, disegni di battaglie della guerra di Candia (1645–1669)</i>	280
Fig. 4. 64 <i>Detail</i>	280

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Chronology and geography.....	4
1.2. Historiography.....	10
1.3. Sources.....	19
1.4. Structure and methodology.....	22
2. SETTING THE STAGE.....	25
2.1. Spaces of exchange and their forms.....	25
2.1.1. The <i>fondaco</i> and the caravanserai.....	28
2.2. Housing the Muslim in Europe.....	44
2.2.1. Other <i>fondachi</i>	44
2.2.2. Slave prisons.....	53
2.3. Foreigners and the city – Muslims in Venice before the <i>Fondaco</i>	58
2.3.1. Sex, food, and apostasy: problems of cohabitation.....	63
3. INSTITUTING A SYSTEM: VENICE.....	66
3.1. Francesco di Dimitri Lettino and <i>un albergo particolare</i>	66
3.2. <i>Un fondaco per i Turchi</i> : Finding a place.....	70
3.3. <i>Il Fondaco dei Turchi</i> at Palazzo Pesaro.....	82
3.3.1. The reaction of the tenants.....	105
3.3.2. Defining a <i>Turco</i> : The question of the <i>Fondaco dei Persiani</i>	108
3.3.3. Pesaro management and mismanagement of the <i>Palazzo Pesaro</i>	111
3.3.4. The long reconstruction 1751–1768.....	116
3.3.5. Epilogue.....	150

4. STATO DA MAR	154
4.1. Coexistence in the <i>Stato da Mar</i>	154
4.2. Housing the Turk in the <i>Stato da Mar</i>	164
4.3. The <i>scala di Spalato</i>	188
4.3.1. Daniel Rodriga: <i>inventor della scala di Spalato</i>	191
4.3.2. The building process.....	196
4.3.3. The plague of 1607, subsequent modifications, and expansion	199
4.3.4. Construction of a lazaretto.....	203
4.3.5. Reconstruction of the complex.....	206
4.3.6. The typology of a <i>fondaco</i>	211
4.4. <i>Bazzana, stangade, bazzaro</i> : cordon sanitaire and forms of increased segregation in the 18 th century	224
4.4.1. Skradin.....	249
4.5. Herceg Novi: a new <i>scala di mercanzia</i> modeled after Split	254
5. CONCLUDING REMARKS	262
5.1. Prevalent solutions between Venice and the <i>Stato da Mar</i>	262
5.1.1. Segregating the <i>Turk</i>	264
5.1.2. Hosting the <i>Turk</i>	267
5.2. Architectural solutions and the question of models.....	271
5.2.1. Reproducing a housing culture.....	271
5.2.2. Visual communication and the question of forms	275
5.3. Translation as a mechanism of exchange	283
Appendices	287
Bibliography.....	353
Archival sources	384

1. INTRODUCTION

The Covid epidemic, the blocking of the Suez Canal, the War in Ukraine, and the rising fuel and transport prices made us acutely aware of our dependency on other people and far-away lands, on mobility, contact, and exchange. While the scope of this global interconnectivity is ever more encompassing in our time, it is not a novelty. Going back five centuries we will find traces of a system that we inherit to this day – the first World System. With the great discoveries and the merchants that followed, the Globe became politically and economically intricately connected for the first time.¹ The centrality of Venice in the Mediterranean segment of this network is already a trope. The thesis *Defining spaces of exchange: Venice and the Eastern Adriatic* taps into that connectivity, reconstructing the system of hosting Muslims in the *Serenissima* while discussing institutional patronage in Venice and its *Stato da Mar* (Maritime state); negotiation, mediation, and translation in architecture and housing culture.² Spaces of exchange in this work primarily relate to constructed spaces, architectures and infrastructures, which were used to facilitate commercial exchange. What ties this series of edifices together is that all of them were built for Muslim (primarily Ottoman) merchants to facilitate their business in Venice and her territories, uniting (and segregating) them under the same roof. Exchange does not only mean commercial, as these buildings were places of physical and cultural contact. It is universally accepted that early modern Venice was a multicultural ambient. However, multicultural does not mean universally accepting. What were the limits of Venetian multiculturalism and tolerance? Who was included, and who was not? Why and how? Through the exploration of architecture, this thesis aims to answer these questions, but it will not concentrate solely on the city of Venice and its famous *Fondaco dei Turchi*.

¹ See Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, vol. 1, *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

² The title is an intentional wordplay on Fernand Braudel, *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIIIe siècle*, vol. 2, *Les jeux de l'échange* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1979). As will be demonstrated throughout the thesis, the overwhelming concept was one of a “game of exchange”, but not only in the economic power plays of Braudel, but also between patrons, mediators, users, and architects-engineers; between institutions, and between two architectural and housing traditions. Continuing on the introductory sentence, it was an infrastructure of mobility.

Instead of claiming its exceptionality and extrapolating Venice from its context, it will rather inscribe it into a wider system and a broader architectural, cultural, geographical, and chronological frame. As will be demonstrated in the historiography, minority spaces in Venice are well researched, but two significant lacunae remain. Ottoman, specifically Muslim, spaces are left on the margins and systematic analysis is lacking. At the same time, no study expands these concepts beyond Venice to its *Stato da Mar*, thus uniting this single political entity. The material that will be researched is the *Fondaco dei Turchi* in Venice (1621–1797) in its long existence as the house of all Ottoman Muslim merchants. It is not the only Venetian example because, from 1574, when a separate lodging system was first discussed, several solutions were proposed, and one (*osteria Anzolo*) was even instituted on the Rialto. A significant contribution of this study will be the contextualisation of the Venetian *Fondaco* within numerous contemporary similar structures, from Dubrovnik and Ancona as foreign examples to the spacious complex of the *scala di Spalato* (free-port of Split; from 1577), the caravan stations in the hinterland (*bazzana*), and restricted trade enclosures and houses in the cities (*tezza*, *serraglio*, *stangade*) as domestic ones. As much as the sources and the literature will allow, each of these structures will be researched, reconstructed, interpreted, and contextualised (from broad socio-cultural strokes to architectural comparisons) to establish their specific characteristics, ideators, origins, and typology over a long period, spanning from the War of Cyprus (1570–1573) to the end of the Republic (1797).

Following the fact that the Venetian institutions' relation to the arriving Muslim merchants differed from their relation to domestic and other Christian ones, the hypotheses are the following:

- 1) This specific relation resulted in specific architectural and spatial solutions according to the religious-cultural needs of the users, and the demands of the patron. What were these needs and demands? How were they understood and implemented? How are they different from the prevalent Venetian tradition; from the domestic and commercial spaces, the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* (house of the German merchants), and the Ghetto as parallel examples?

2) Through a rigorous reliance on primary sources, it will be claimed that the specific solutions are not the result of direct (patron-user) communication and a reliance on imported models but a product of adjustment of the local building tradition. The concepts of mediation and accommodation will be found throughout the text, presenting the problem as a constant negotiation process.

1.1. Chronology and geography

The thesis will take a closer look at the period from after the Fourth Ottoman-Venetian War (War of Cyprus; 1570–1573) to the end of the Republic of Venice (1797). The starting point is easy to determine because it marks a shift in Venetian-Ottoman political and economic relations, which positioned Venice as the privileged trading partner of the Ottoman Empire which controlled the entirety of the Eastern Mediterranean, resulting in a substantial increase in Ottoman trade arriving in Venice and its territories. This required infrastructural solutions to direct trade and host Ottoman merchants in the Republic. Among these merchants, only Muslims were provided with separate buildings funded by the Republic. While the applied architectural solutions are at the forefront of this thesis, the well-researched and complex political and economic changes that led to the institution of the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and the *scala di Spalato* need explaining.

The 16th century has long been described as a period of crisis for Venice and Southern Europe.³ The Ottoman Empire was fast-expanding, conquering the entirety of the Levant and North Africa, the Balkans and the Aegean, and most of Hungary-Croatia, projecting military power from India to the German lands. Not only politically, it was also expanding commercially and economically – partially at the expense of Latin powers such as Venice and Genoa who held monopolies and colonies in the Eastern Mediterranean.⁴ Venetian foreign policy became increasingly defensive, and the period from 1479 to 1571 saw heavy investment in fortifications.⁵ However, it was not only the Ottomans. Around the turn of the century, the Portuguese started attacking ships and towns around the Indian Ocean, leading

³ For a survey of then-prevalent theories see: Alberto Tenenti, *Venezia e i corsari: 1580-1615* (Bari: Laterza, 1961); Miroslav Bertoša, “La crisi economica di Venezia nei secoli XVI e XVII alla luce della recente storiografia italiana,” *Atti* [Centro di ricerche storiche, Rovigno] 8, no. 1 (1978).

⁴ Cf. James Tracy, “Il commercio italiano in territorio ottomano,” in *Il Rinascimento italiano e l'Europa*, vol. 4, *Commercio e cultura mercantile*, ed. Franco Franceschi, Richard A. Goldthwaite, Reinhold C. Mueller (Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca; Costabissara: Colla, 2007).

⁵ Maria Fusaro, *Political Economies of Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean: The Decline of Venice and the Rise of England, 1450–1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 68.

to trade disruptions so the prices of Indian goods skyrocketed.⁶ In 1504 the Venetian trade fleet returned from Mamluk Alexandria completely empty for the first time.⁷ The Ottoman Empire (which incorporated Egypt and Syria in 1516–1517) increased tariffs for foreign merchants, protecting domicile commercial groups. This went hand-in-hand with the expansion of trade rights to almost any nation which wanted to trade there – such as France, England, and the Dutch Republic, fostering greater competition.⁸ In 1506 Venice established the *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia* (Board of Trade) to counter the changing commercial circumstances.⁹ Venetian participation decreased, and the nobility turned to their *Terraferma* estates giving the privileges of Levantine trade to Sephardim Jews.¹⁰ Generally, commerce still grew, but direct trade became less common so trade agents and other middlemen were commonly employed.¹¹ This, together with several other circumstances, led to the steady decrease of Venetian mercantile presence in the East as well as in the West, so the oligarchy decided that it was better to bring merchants to the city of Venice itself. Out of 10–12 Venetian merchant houses that existed in Constantinople in 1560, only five were active by 1612. This decrease led the *Cinque Savi* to conclude in 1610 that there were no more Venetian merchants in the West and a negligible number in the East.¹²

At the same time, the period was marked by constant diplomatic and economic negotiations between Venice and the Ottoman Empire. The *Serenissima* sought rapprochement, especially during the War of the League of Cambrai (1508–1516). Still, the Empire would have none of that as long as Venice controlled strategic points in the Eastern

⁶ Frederic Chapin Lane, *Venice: A Maritime Republic* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 290.

⁷ Fusaro, *Political Economies*, 67.

⁸ Trajan Stojanovic, “The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant,” *The Journal of Economic History* 20, n.o 2 (1960): 239–240. Molly Greene, “The Early Modern Mediterranean,” in *A Companion to Mediterranean History*, ed. Peregrine Horden and Sharon Kinoshita (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014), 94.

⁹ Maria Borgherini Scarabellin, *Il magistrato dei Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia dalla istituzione alla caduta della Repubblica: Studio storico su documenti d'archivio* (Venice: Regia Deputazione, 1925).

¹⁰ Benjamin Ravid, “The First Charter of the Jewish Merchants of Venice, 1589,” *AJS Review* 1 (1976).

¹¹ Fusaro, *Political Economies*, 67–68.

¹² Eric Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006), 24; Maartje van Gelder, *Trading Places: The Netherlandish Merchants in Early Modern Venice* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 35.

Mediterranean.¹³ This led to the Third (1537–1540) and the Fourth Ottoman-Venetian War (1570–1573), which strongly reduced the Venetian presence in the Levant. At the same time, the Ottomans conquered all of the Kingdom of Croatia's territories in the Dalmatian hinterland, surrounding the coastal towns (Venetian since 1409–1420) and disrupting their economy through near-constant raids. This instability gave rise to rampant piracy (in the Adriatic as elsewhere) – the rise of the Uskoks,¹⁴ the Knight Hospitaller (among other Crusading orders), and the Barbary pirates. As a consequence, trade routes shifted overland where possible.¹⁵

Finally, after the loss of Cyprus in 1573, the shift in Ottoman political-economic interests allowed Venice to be chosen as the preferred trade partner.¹⁶ Venice was diplomatically acceptable over the Papal States, the Habsburgs, the Florentine Medici, and their ally – the Republic of Ragusa (nominally an Ottoman vassal which dominated Balkan trade). From another angle, the Empire was the single largest market available for Italian goods, while Venice was needed for exporting the products of the growing Balkan economy.¹⁷ Trade flourished undisrupted in the long peace until the Cretan War (*Guerra di Candia*, 1645–1669),¹⁸ after which Dubrovnik managed to restore part of it. These trends continued notwithstanding the two Morean wars (1684–1699; 1714–1718), although in a diminished scope. These wars led to the expansion of Venetian Dalmatian territories into the hinterland to comprise the present Croatian-Bosnian border in the region. With the expansion of the

¹³ Palmira Johnson Brummett, *Ottoman seapower and Levantine diplomacy in the age of discovery* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994), 45ff.

¹⁴ Lazzaro Soranzo wrote that the port of Split was established to provide safety against the Uskoks. *L'Ottomanno* (Ferrara: Vittorio Baldini, 1599), p. 92.

¹⁵ Cf. Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Epoque de Philippe II* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1949).

¹⁶ Fusaro, *Political Economies*, 69–70.

¹⁷ Vera Costantini, “Fin dentro il paese turchesco: stabilimento della scala di Spalato e potenziamento delle reti mercantili e diplomatiche veneziane nell'entroterra bosniaco,” *Studi veneziani* 67 (2014): 267–270.

¹⁸ The official *casus belli* for the Ottoman side was slave trade through Crete. In 1645 the Maltese knights, with ships full of slaves, stopped there which was reason enough for the sultan to attack. The underlying reason for the War must have been geopolitical because of the strategic position of Crete within the *Ottoman sea*, as was for Cyprus. Venice never truly recovered from this war. Gaetano Cozzi, “Dalla riscoperta della pace all'inevitabile sogno di dominio,” in *Storia di Venezia: dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, vol. 7, *La Venezia barocca*, ed. Gino Benzoni, Gaetano Cozzi (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1997), 26.

border, the means of controlling it stabilised and expanded with it, which will be further explained in the last case studies.

These encompassing commercial changes made the Adriatic perfectly positioned for cross-continental trade. In this new constellation of commercial geography, the Ottoman Empire's internal routes would provide protection from Persia to the Adriatic coast, where goods would be embarked to reach the Italian coast. The phenomenon was not new, but the inter-continental scope was.

The convenient geographical features of the Eastern Adriatic also played their part, and the region is littered with port towns. It abounds in small islands, enclosed bays, and good ports while the winds and currents project a ship north with minimum effort. This North-South commercial route, the *Rotta di Levante*, was the reason for Venice's constant ambition to control the Dalmatian coastal towns. However, the core of their medieval affluence was the East-West route, in which they were points of contact between Balkan and Italian markets. Furthermore, from 1420 they were included in the Venetian Maritime state and its internal market while being geographically and (for the most part) linguistically part of the Slavic Balkans – easing commerce and communication. As the maritime traffic on the *Rotta di Levante* became overly expensive and unsafe, most of the Oriental trade, now Ottoman-dominated, shifted on roads leading to the Adriatic border towns of Split and Dubrovnik, which thus became the direct points of East-West connection. Although all Dalmatian towns were part of this network to a certain point, beneficial political relations made Dubrovnik the preferred commercial port of Balkan trade before 1577. That year, the Sephardim trader Daniele Rodrigo (1523–1603) understood the shifting political and economic circumstances and saw that Split was better positioned to direct this trade. Located exactly in the middle of the Adriatic and its Eastern coast, this Roman town (just 4 km from the ancient provincial centre of Salona) could tap into the ancient routes that led to the hinterland through the easily traversable Klis gap between the mountains. Furthermore, the bays of Split and Salona make up the largest natural port on the Adriatic.

More recently, the term *crisis* is being re-examined. Italian export-based textile production still grew steadily, not in a small deal thanks to the growing demand in the Ottoman

Empire.¹⁹ The relative worth of trade grew with it; just the routes and the traders changed. The increasing presence of Greek, Jewish, Armenian, and Muslim traders in the Adriatic meant that Florence, as an alternative example to Venice, no longer shipped its goods to Constantinople via Pisa but instead relied on a series of foreign traders and agents to ship it over the Ancona-Ragusa axis to the markets of the Ottoman Empire. This axis flourished for a short period in the first half and middle of the 16th century, resulting in infrastructural solutions that would resound decades later in the *Serenissima*.²⁰ Venice in the 1570s established a parallel shipping axis that would flourish even more – the Venice-Spalato one. It was faster and cheaper to go through Split, where merchandise only had to pass one border (the Ottoman-Venetian one), comparable to three when going through Dubrovnik (Duchy of Tuscany, Papal States, Republic of Ragusa, Ottoman Empire).²¹ This competition, together with the privateering of the Tuscan Crusading Order of Saint Stephen, led the sultan to revoke commercial privileges to Florentine traders in 1589 – marking the end of any significant Florentine Eastern presence and the relative decline of the Ancona-Ragusa axis. Even earlier, economically short-sighted Papal commercial, anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim policies from the 1550s signalled a steady decline. Finally, due to political hostilities, Ottoman subjects were banned from going to Ancona by the sultan in 1564.²² Starting from the capitulations of 1540 (renewed in 1573), Ottoman merchants were guaranteed protection and the same tax regime as Venetian citizens.²³ The Split-Venice axis will steadily surpass and replace the Dubrovnik-Ancona one, with another inter-continental node added south of Dubrovnik in Herceg Novi after Ottoman-Venetian negotiations in 1699.

¹⁹ Richard A. Goldthwaite, *The Economy of Renaissance Florence* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), 265; 278; 295.

²⁰ On the *fondachi* of Dubrovnik and Ancona see chapter: *Housing the Muslim in Europe*.

²¹ Cf. Sergio Anselmi, *Venezia, Ragusa, Ancona tra cinque e seicento: un momento della storia mercantile del medio adriatico*, (Ancona: Deputazione di storia patria delle Marche, 1969); Renzo Paci, *La "scala" di Spalato e il commercio veneziano nei Balcani fra cinque e seicento* (Venice: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1971); Costantini, "Fin dentro il paese turchesco."

²² Cemal Kafadar, "A Death in Venice (1575): Anatolian Muslim Merchants trading in the Serenissima," *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 10 (1986): 197–198. The 1564 ban was repeated after the War of Cyprus. Petar Strunje, *Splitski lazaret i trgovačka skala* (Zagreb: FF Press, 2022).

²³ Goldthwaite, *The Economy of Renaissance Florence*, 189–192.

Another key concept of the 16th and 17th centuries that needs to be mentioned is Confessionalisation. It was coined by Ernst Troeltsch to describe the political, cultural, and religious interplay between Protestant, Reformed, and Catholic societies that saw the re-evaluation of religious identity on political terms.²⁴ States, instead of churches, introduced behaviour codes to regulate and police religious, social, and economic life, while many charitable functions came under central authority.²⁵ This re-constellation of political and ecclesiastical authority also had far-reaching consequences on Venetian relations with the Muslim world, where ethnolinguistic and religious identities came to dominate the discourse of difference.²⁶ In Venice, as elsewhere, cross-religious contact needed to be more clearly defined, and separate spaces for non-Catholic (or even lapsed Catholic) groups were a visible way of delineating socio-religious boundaries.²⁷

²⁴ Ernst Troeltsch, "Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt," *Historische Zeitschrift* 97 (1906). Also see John M. Headley, Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed., *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2004).

²⁵ In Venice, this coincides with the government's establishment and patronage of numerous pious institutes for the poor, the sick, the penitent, orphans, prostitutes, converts, widows... See: Bernard Aikema, Dulcia Meijers, *Nel regno dei poveri: arte e storia dei grandi ospedali veneziani in età moderna, 1474–1797* (Venice: Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, 1989).

²⁶ Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011).

²⁷ Stephen Ortega, *Negotiating Transcultural Relations in the Early Modern Mediterranean: Ottoman-Venetian Encounters* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 42.

1.2. Historiography

The literature on Venetian-Ottoman connections is vast because of the great scholarly interest that Venice and its relation with the East have always enjoyed. It developed particularly since the 1970s when the study of minorities, multiculturalism, cross-cultural contact, and mobility surged. There are two historiographical approaches to researching Ottoman-Venetian relations, one emphasising war, and the other peace. The first has been traditionally prevalent,²⁸ and spilt over into art and architectural history, where it is still present. It is reflected in the study of fortifications,²⁹ and the representation of the *Turk* (meaning both Muslim and Ottoman) in Christian visual imagination.³⁰ While fortifications have their objective *raison d'être*, the study of the representation of Muslims speaks more about the patron (an elite group) and their propagandistic efforts than about the Muslims or their position within European societies. The reception and efficiency of that propaganda remain an open question while emphasising it paints a picture of factionalism and constant tension in preparation for war. Keeping in mind that conflict and war are a state of exception, recent historiography has shifted its attention to what happened in the long periods between short wars: cooperation, communication, and coexistence.³¹ Religious,

²⁸ This is particularly true in national historiographies: Grga Novak, *Prošlost Dalmacije*, vol. 1–2 (Zagreb: Izdanje hrvatskog izdavačkog bibliografskog zavoda, 1944); Gligor Stanojević, *Jugoslavenske zemlje u mletačko-turskim ratovima XVI-XVIII vijeka* (Beograd: Istorijski institut, 1970); Kenneth M. Setton, *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1991). For one of these Grand Histories, although more weighed, see John Toland, Gilles Veinstein, Henry Laurens, *Europe and the Islamic World: A History* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013) [2009].

²⁹ Ennio Concina, Elisabetta Molteni, *La Fabrica Della Fortezza: L'Architettura Militare di Venezia*, (Verona: Banca Popolare di Verona; Banco S. Geminiano e S. Prospero, 2001); Andrej Žmegač, *Bastioni jadranske Hrvatske* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga; Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2009).

³⁰ The literature produced in the last two or so decades is overwhelming. See at least: David R. Blanks, Michael Frassetto, eds., *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999); Karen-edis Barzman, *The Limits of Identity: Early Modern Venice, Dalmatia, and the Representation of Difference*, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017); Laura Stagno, Borja Franco Llopis eds., *Lepanto and Beyond: Images of Religious Alterity from Genoa and the Christian Mediterranean* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2021). On placing the Ottoman and identity borders see: Palmira Brummet, *Mapping the Ottomans: Sovereignty, Territory, and Identity in the Early Modern Mediterranean* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

³¹ See the 4 volume *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). An early attempt that carefully weighs between war and peace is: Carlo Pirovano, ed., *Venezia e i Turchi: scontri e confronti di due civiltà* (Milano: Electa 1985), especially the article: Ugo Tucci, "Tra

political, ethnolinguistic, or other identities – whether communal or personal, are more seen as a process, constantly negotiated, repositioned, and changeable.³² This is the approach applied in this study. It will tackle architecture commissioned by the Venetian institutions to foster and regulate mobility, contact, and commerce with neither a Venetian nor a Christian – with somebody who has different expectations of architectural space and the domestic experience. It aims to fill the gap in the field of architectural history, as no such study exists, although numerous case studies and articles provide sufficient and relevant insight for this thesis.

This research draws from two connected traditions in architectural and urban history. The study of minority groups in the Italian urban space has grown significantly since the '70s, together with the research on ghettos, national confraternities, churches, hospices, and related spaces.³³ A decade later, it was the turn of the study of commercial infrastructure. This connection is not arbitrary. It stems from the fact that Italy's most visible minority groups were merchants and artisans, who often settled in Venice.³⁴ The Sephardim Jews are

Venezia e mondo turco: i mercanti,” 38–55. For an encompassing case study of Crete see Molly Greene, *A shared world: Christians and Muslims in the early modern Mediterranean* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). In terms of art and architecture see Deborah Howard, “Venice and Islam in the Middle Ages: Some Observations on the Question of Architectural Influence,” *Architectural History* 34 (1991); Deborah Howard, *Venice & the East: the Impact of the Islamic World on Venetian Architecture 1100–1500* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); Rosamond E. Mack, *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002); Anna Contadini, Claire Norton, eds., *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013).

³² Natalie Rothman, *Brokering Empire; The Dragoman Renaissance: Diplomatic Interpreters and the Routes of Orientalism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021). Ortega, *Negotiating Transcultural Relations*. Both Rothman (through trans-imperial subjects), and Ortega (through negotiation) show the 16th- and 17th-century evolution of identity and its difference from a juridical-commercial discourse to an ethnolinguistic and religious one in Venetian institutional and public space. Both argue that the built environment has the capacity to affect socio-political interaction. The *Fondaco dei Turchi* and the involved actors constantly repeat in their discussions. For a diametrical perspective see Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*. For a systematic survey of religious identity, its control, and change that convincingly integrates the *Stato da Mar* see Giuseppina Minchella, *Frontiere aperte: Musulmani, ebrei e cristiani nella Repubblica di Venezia (XVII secolo)*, (Rome: Viella, 2014).

³³ Hans-Georg Beck, Manoussos I. Manoussacas, Agostino Pertusi, eds., *Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV-XVI): Aspetti e problemi. Atti del II Convegno internazionale di storia della civiltà veneziana (Venezia, 3-6 ottobre 1973)*, 2 vols. (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1977). For a study that includes both immigrants and merchants see: Simonetta Cavaciocchi, ed., *Le migrazioni in Europa: Secc. XIII-XVIII. Atti della venticinquesima settimana di studi, 3-8 maggio 1993* (Florence: Fondazione istituto internazionale di storia economica F. Datini, 1994); Brünhilde Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia, 1300–1510* (Rome: Il Veltrò, 1997).

³⁴ Luca Molà, *La comunità dei Lucchesi a Venezia. Immigrazione e industria della seta nel tardo Medioevo* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, 1994); Luca Molà, “Fondaci, mercanti, artigiani: le comunità dei

a good example, who were organised in the Levantine and Ponentine schools and who will be mentioned concerning the *scala di Spalato* to which they are intricately tied.³⁵

In more recent developments, this thesis is connected with the *mobility shift* and the infrastructures that facilitate movement.³⁶ While infrastructure is increasingly being seen from a humanist viewpoint, its *politics and poetics* are mostly explored by modernist anthropologists.³⁷

One of the first systematic attempts to research the presence of ethnic Turks in Venice and the chronology of their *fondachi* was Şerafettin Turan's 1968 article *Venedik'te Türk ticaret merkezi (Fondaco dei Turchi)*.³⁸ The value of Turan's work is in his consultation of Ottoman documents in the Venetian *Archivio di Stato*, where he found commercial correspondences between merchants, Venetian and Ottoman institutions. Written in Turkish, the article remained largely unknown outside Turkish-speaking academia. The

Tedeschi e dei Turchi a Venezia,” in *Le Venezie e l'Europa: testimoni di una civiltà sociale*, ed. Giuseppe Barbieri (Cittadella: Biblos 1998); Donatella Calabi, “Magazzini, fondaci, dogane,” in *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 1, *Il Mare*, eds. Alberto Tenenti, Ugo Tucci (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991), 806–807; Donatella Calabi, *Il mercato e la città: Piazze, strade, architetture d'Europa in età moderna* (Venice; Marsilio editori, 1993) – [translated: *The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003]. In this work (p. 200) Calabi was the first to notice specific housing solutions in the *Fondaco*, such as furniture and baths. Also see Donatella Calabi; Paola Lanaro, eds., *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri (XIV – XVIII secolo)*, (Rome; Bari: Laterza, 1998); Maria Georgopoulou, *Venice's Mediterranean Colonies: Architecture and Urbanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Ersie C. Burke, *The Greeks of Venice, 1498–1600: Immigration, Settlement, and Intergration* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2016); Giuseppe Capriotti, Francesca Coltrinari, Jasenka Gudelj, eds., *Visualizing Past in a Foreign Country: Schiavoni/Illyrian Confraternities and Colleges in Early Modern Italy in comparative perspective* [special issue], *Il capitale culturale: Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage, Supplementi* 7 (2018).

³⁵ Ravid, “The First Charter”; Gaetano Cozzi ed., *Gli Ebrei a Venezia: secoli XIV–XVIII* (Milan: Edizioni di comunità, 1987); Donatella Calabi, Ludovica Galeazzo, Martina Massaro eds., *Venezia, gli Ebrei, e l'Europa 1516–2016* (Venice: Marsilio, 2016).

³⁶ Tim Cresswell, *On the Move: Mobility in the Western World* (London: Taylor & Francis, 2006); Rosa Salzberg, “Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange in the Lodging Houses of Early Modern Venice,” *Urban History* 46, n.o 3 (2019); Luca Zenobi, “Mobility and Urban Space in Early Modern Europe: An Introduction,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 25 (2021). Zenobi's is the introductory chapter of the journal's special issue *Cities in motion* that also deserves a mention. A stimulating study is: Maria Ines Alverti, Ronnie Mulryne, Anna Maria Testaverde, eds., *Ceremonial Entries in Early Modern Europe: The Iconography of Power* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015).

³⁷ Brian Larkin, “The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013). This interest started with Marc Augé, *Non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1992); James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997). For an inquisitive reading of the Ragusa road – the route connecting Istanbul and Dubrovnik, see Jesse C. Howell, “The Ragusa Road: Mobility and Encounter in the Ottoman Balkans (1430–1700),” (PhD diss., Harvard University, 2017).

³⁸ Şerafettin Turan “Venedik'te Türk Ticaret Merkezi,” *Belleten* 23 (1968).

first study to tackle the question of Venice's complex relations with the Ottomans was the *Venezia e i Turchi* (1975) by Paolo Preto, still widely used.³⁹ Using a large base of literary and archival sources, Preto aimed to reconstruct the presence and the image of the Ottoman Muslim in Venice, publishing numerous information about the foundation of the *Fondaco dei Turchi*. Referencing Turan and Preto, Cemal Kafadar caused a minor revolution in the field when he proved that Muslim Ottoman traders were essential actors in inter-continental trade, instead of an earlier presumed *disinterest* of the *warlike* Empire and the near-monopoly of Jews, Armenians, and Greeks.⁴⁰

In his 1997 study of the *fondachi*, Ennio Concina has tried to incorporate the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and similar Venetian institutions into a more comprehensive network of primarily Levantine examples while exploring long traditions and reciprocity between architectural cultures.⁴¹ Concina was also responsible for uniting the Venetian *Fondaco* with its architectural counterparts in the *Stato da Mar*: the *bazzana* of Klis (*Clissa*) and the *scala di Spalato* in the 2006 Palmanova exhibition *Venezia e Istanbul: incontri, confronti e scambi*.⁴² Although presenting them as summary catalogue entries, Concina's is the only work suggesting the existence of a network of similar buildings.

³⁹ Paolo Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi* (Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1975). Reprinted in 2013 by Viella. For some information in English see: Paolo Preto, "Venice and the Ottoman Empire: from war to turcophilia," *La Mediterranee au 18. siecle. Actes du Colloque international tenu a Aix-en-Provence les 4-6 septembre 1985* (Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 1987).

⁴⁰ Kafadar, "A Death in Venice". A short while later and focusing on diplomatic envoys, Maria Pia Pedani has also shifted the focus to Ottoman experiences in Venice: *In nome del Gran Signore: inviati ottomani a Venezia dalla caduta di Costantinopoli alla guerra di Candia* (Venice: Deputazione Editrice, 1994). On earlier theories see: Stoianovic, "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox merchant."

⁴¹ Ennio Concina, *Fondaci: Architettura arte, e mercatura tra Levante, Venezia e Alemagna* (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1997), particularly pp. 220–246. Using almost exclusively Italian sources, Concina continues the work of Gabriel Mandel, *I caravanserragli turchi* (Bergamo: Lucchetti Editore, 1988). The seminal work on these structures is Olivia Remie Constable, *Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World: Lodging, Trade, and Travel in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

⁴² Ennio Concina ed., *Venezia e Istanbul: incontri, confronti e scambi* (Udine: Forum, 2006), exhibition catalogue Palmanova, 2006. – particularly unit 6 *Nuova mercatura*. See also: Stefano Carboni, ed., *Venice and the Islamic World, 828–1797*, (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2007). Exhibition catalogue: Institute du Monde Arabe, Paris, 2006–2007; Metropolitan Museum, New York, 2007; Palazzo Ducale, Venice 2007; Giampiero Bellingeri, Nazan Ölçer, *Venezia e Istanbul in epoca ottomana / Osmanlı Doneminde Venedik ve İstanbul* (Milan: Electa, 2009). Exhibition catalogue (Sakıp Sabancı Museum, İstanbul 2009–2010). Recently, two biographical exhibitions on Francesco Morosini (the only doge who won a war against the Ottomans) have somewhat shifted the Italian discourse from peaceful connections to conflict: Bruno Burratti, ed., *Francesco Morosini (1619–1694): L'uomo, il doge, il condottiero* (Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato italiano; Libreria dello Stato, 2019). Conference proceedings and

The first monograph on the 13th-century Palazzo Pesaro (better known as the *Fondaco dei Turchi*) was published by Agostino Sagredo and Federico Berchet in 1860 to promote the *original* appearance and reconstructive restoration.⁴³ Although they often misread the primary material while providing minimal information and a highly negative opinion on the post-1621 use of the building as the *Fondaco*, the authors witnessed it before its subsequent partial destruction and complete reconstruction. More recently, Juergen Schulz provided a systematic chronological survey of sources (visual and written) in his work on 12th- and 13th-century residential palaces in Venice (Ca' del Papa, Ca' Barozzi, Fondaco dei Turchi, Ca' Fasetti, Ca' Loredan).⁴⁴ Belgin Turan Özkaya has tried to position the *Fondaco dei Turchi* as a place of extreme segregation influenced by fear, orientalism, desire, and fetish, analysing the 1621 decree on the remodelling of Palazzo Pesaro into the *Fondaco* from the (partial) translation published by Chambers and Pullan in 2001.⁴⁵

Several historiographical problems need to be addressed. While Preto and Concina narrate the discussions and proposals predating the formation of the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, they are of an introductory nature, not analysed separately. The 18th-century history of the building is largely unexplored, the only published information being the summary chronological registers meticulously made by Schulz. More importantly, all researchers present a relatively static methodological model in which the centrality of the patron is emphasised, failing to recognise the complex interplay between patrons, architects-engineers, owners-investors, users, and mediators. Lastly, the relation between the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and its

exhibition catalogue, Museo Correr, Venice: *Francesco Morosini: L'ultimo eroe della Serenissima tra storia e mito*, 2019. Elisabetta Molteni, *Francesco Morosini in guerra a Candia e in Morea. Guida alla mostra e catalogo degli oggetti esposti*, (Venice: Ente editoriale per il Corpo della Guardia di Finanza, 2019). Exhibition catalogue (Guardia di Finanza – Palazzo Corner Mocenigo, San Polo, Venice, 2019).

⁴³ Agostino Sagredo, Federico Berchet, *Il Fondaco dei Turchi in Venezia: Studi storici ed artistici* (Milano: Giuseppe Civelli, 1860).

⁴⁴ Juergen Schulz, *The New Palaces of Medieval Venice* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004). Particularly appendix 3. From the same author also see: "Early Plans of the Fondaco dei Turchi," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 42 (1997).

⁴⁵ Belgin Turan Özkaya, *Theaters of Fear and Delight: Ottomans in the Serenissima, Thamyris/Intersecting: Place, Sex and Race*, vol. 10, *After Orientalism: Critical Entanglements, Productive Looks*, ed. Inge E. Boer (Amsterdam; New York: Editions Rodopi, 2003); David Chambers, Brian Pullan, eds., *Venice: A Documentary History: 1450–1630*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 350–352. For a more measured recent study that uses all previously published sources and literature see Mathieu Grenet, "Institution de la coexistence et pratiques de la différence: le fondaco dei turchi de Venise (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle)," *Revue d'Histoire maritime* 17/1 (2013).

Stato da Mar counterparts suggested by Concina in 2006 was never followed through. This leaves a historiographical vacuum beyond Venice, but it is not absolute. Some research, mainly by local scholars, has been done.

In recent years, interest has been shown in the *Stato da Mar* which is slowly being incorporated into the international architectural history discourse.⁴⁶ The socio-economic circumstances in the province of Dalmatia that led to the establishment of the structures of interest are already well-established in the literature of the *Annales School*, starting from Braudel himself and developed primarily by Tomislav Raukar in the 1960s and '70s.⁴⁷ The historian and Ottoman scholar Seid Traljić has explored the connectivity of the littoral and the wider hinterland and will be cited throughout the second part of the thesis,⁴⁸ as well as various historical surveys of Dalmatia and its cities, the majority of them written by Grga Novak.⁴⁹ Darka Bilić has recently shown how state commissions functioned in the Venetian province of Dalmatia and Albania during the 18th century.⁵⁰ Many of our examples were

⁴⁶ Charles Dempsey, ed., *Quattrocento Adriatico: Fifteenth century Art of the Adriatic Rim* (Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); Concina, Molteni, *La fabbrica della fortezza*; Angelo de Benvenuti, *Fortificazioni venete in Dalmazia* (Venice: Collana di ricerche storiche, 2006); Jasenka Gudelj, "Lo Stato da Mar: l'architettura. Il Cinquecento in Istria e in Dalmazia," in *Storia dell'architettura nel Veneto: il Cinquecento*, ed. Donata Battilotti et al. (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 2015); Helena Seražin, "Lo stato da Mar," in *Storia dell'architettura nel Veneto: Il Settecento*, ed. Elisabeth Kieven, Susanna Pasquali (Venice: Marsilio Editori; Regione del Veneto, 2012); Alina Payne ed., *Dalmatia and the Mediterranean: Portable Archaeology and the Poetics of Influence* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014).

⁴⁷ Fernand Braudel refers heavily to the Eastern Adriatic, especially Dubrovnik in his seminal *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Epoque de Philippe II*. After Braudel, it was Tomislav Raukar who included the Early Modern Adriatic in the Mediterranean system: "Venecija i ekonomski razvoj Dalmacije u XV i XVI stoljeću," *Radovi [Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu]* 10 (1977). Also see Anselmi, *Venezia, Ragusa, Ancona tra cinque e seicento*.

⁴⁸ "Trgovina Bosne i Hercegovine s lukama Dalmacije i Dubrovnika u XVII i XVIII stoljeću," *Pomorski zbornik: povodom 20-godišnjice Dana mornarice i pomorstva Jugoslavije: 1942–1962*, vol. 1, eds. Grga Novak, Vjekoslav Maštrović (Zadar: Institut za historijske i ekonomske nauke, 1962); "Zadar i turska pozadina od XV. do potkraj XIX. stoljeća," *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11–12 (1965). For a relevant, more recent case study see Tea Mayhew, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule: Contado di Zara 1645–1718* (Rome: Viella, 2008) – of related interest is the trade in Muslim slaves on pp. 260–266.

⁴⁹ Notwithstanding their character as secondary literature, in the absence of previous studies Novak extensively used primary sources for the writing of these surveys. *Prošlost Dalmacije*, vol. 1–2 (Zagreb: Izdanje hrvatskog izdavačkog bibliografskog zavoda, 1944); *Povijest Splita*, vol. 2 (Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1957); "Presjek kroz povijest grada Zadra," *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11–12 (1965); "Šibenik u razdoblju mletačke vladavine 1412.–1797. godine," in *Šibenik. Spomen zbornik o 900. obljetnici*, ed. Slavko Grubišić (Šibenik: Muzej Grada Šibenika, 1976).

⁵⁰ *Inženjeri u službi Mletačke Republike: Inženjeri i civilna arhitektura u 18. stoljeću u mletačkoj Dalmaciji i Albaniji* (Split: Književni krug, 2013).

discovered, attributed, and dated in her study, albeit in a different context. Most of the secondary material will be provided from numerous microhistorical studies.

As the *scala di Spalato* was the single largest building in the *Stato da Mar* and the joint of Venetian–Ottoman commerce, it has raised significant scholarly interest.⁵¹ Once again, Novak has demonstrated the centrality of Split in this Ottoman-Venetian network, yet lamenting its passive and subordinate position to Venice in the spirit of Italian-Yugoslav tensions of the 1920s.⁵² After the War, Cvito Fisković – the director of the Dalmatian Monuments Protection Office (*Konzervatorski zavod*) in Split, wrote the first art-historical study that elaborated on the spatial disposition of the complex and proposed a first chronology.⁵³ Fisković relied on historical data provided by Novak and early 19th-century sources from the Monuments Protection Office and the Archives in Split, so his findings were limited.⁵⁴ These deficiencies were somewhat corrected with findings of new, primarily visual sources by Duško Kečkemet and Arsen Duplančić.⁵⁵ Parallely, two articles were posthumously published by the engineer Viktor Morpurgo who brought forward numerous information about Daniele Rodriga, the Jewish community of Split, and the first stages of the *scala di Spalato* – a product of a long-time effort in the Venetian

⁵¹ It will appear in most surveys of early modern Venetian history and commerce. As the literature is vast, only a concise list is presented here.

⁵² Grga Novak, *Split u svjetskom prometu* (Split: Hrvatska štamparija, 1921), 85–110. For a recent study of 18th-century Split as a commercial center between East and West see Nataša Bajić-Žarko, *Split kao trgovačko i tranzitno središte na razmeđu istoka i zapada u 18. stoljeću* (Split: Književni krug, 2004).

⁵³ Cvito Fisković, “Splitski lazaret,” in *Četiri priloga historiji grada Splita XVII i XVIII stoljeća* (Split: Muzej grada Splita, 1953).

⁵⁴ With the exception of firmly establishing the datation, attribution, price, and subsequent fate of Daniele Rodriga’s first building effort; a find he made while researching artistic crafts in early modern Split. Cvito Fisković, “Umjetnički obrt u Splitu 15.–16. stoljeća,” in *Zbornik Marka Marulića 1450.–1950.*, ed. Josip Badalić (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1950), 143. Unfortunately, the document from the State Archives in Zadar that Fisković quotes has never since been retrieved.

⁵⁵ Duško Kečkemet, „Prilog opisu i povijesti splitskog lazareta“, u: Pomorski zbornik 13 (1975), “Splitski lazaret,” in 400 ljeta splitskog lazareta, ed. Mladen Smoljanović (Split: Zavod za zaštitu rada, 1992); On the lazaretto and the *bazzana* see “Zaštita od epidemija u Splitu,” in *Sanitarni kordon nekad i danas, Zbornik radova Simpozija održanog u povodu 250. obljetnice Sanitarnog kordona*, ed. Janko Vodopija (Zagreb: Zbor liječnika Hrvatske, 1978). Arsen Duplančić, “Popisi državnih zgrada u Splitu iz godina 1789. i 1804.” *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture* 13 (1987); “Prilog poznavanju luke i pomorstva Splita u 18. i 19. stoljeću,” *Adrias* 2 (1988); “Neobjavljeni nacrti i opisi splitskog lazareta,” *Adrias* 4–5 (1994); “Prinos dokumentaciji urbanističkog razvitka Splita od 17. do 19. stoljeća,” *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 20–21 (1994–1995).

Archivio di Stato.⁵⁶ The first monograph on the *scala di Spalato* from the point of view of economic history was published by Renzo Paci in 1971, whose study is also the most extensive work on the social history of contemporary Split up to date.⁵⁷ Unlike Paci, Donatella Calabi did not quote Croatian authors but did provide a glimpse into the central importance of Daniele Rodriga for the Venetian Sephardim community and into the architecture of the *scala* within similar commercial structures in the *Serenissima*.⁵⁸ Calabi was the first to note that the *scala di Spalato* complex contained more than simply the lazaretto, but subsequent authors will not pursue this up until now.⁵⁹ More recently, the architectural historian Snježana Perojević has reconstructed the *scala di Spalato* (fig. 4.16), correcting the earlier chronology.⁶⁰ In doing so, she relied heavily on the master's thesis of Alessandra Sartori made at IUAV, which in turn exclusively consulted the archival fonds of the Senate and the final relations of the counts (*Collegio, Relazioni finali*).⁶¹ While Perojević's and Sartori's reading is increasingly accurate, reliance on such sources is severely limiting because the Senate was only the last controlling office that approves the previously made decisions in short redactions, not being the direct patron. Furthermore, the final relations were made after holding office and before being selected for the next one, used as political tools to further one's career.⁶² Petar Strunje, in his 2022 monograph on the subject, has turned to direct sources of the patrons (*Cinque Savi alla mercanzia*), and the offices in charge of construction (*Provveditore di Dalmazia ed Albania*; count of Split) to (minimally) correct the chronology, and for the first time establish the attribution, explain the construction process, the functional division (lazaretto – customs office – *fondaco*), the

⁵⁶ Viktor Morpurgo, "Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje splitske skele u XVI stoljeću," *Starine* 52 (1962); "Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje splitske skele u XVI stoljeću (nastavak)," *Starine* 53 (1966).

⁵⁷ Paci, *La scala di Spalato*, 1971.

⁵⁸ Donatella Calabi, *Venice and its Jews: 500 Years Since the Founding of the Ghetto*, transl. Leonore Rosenberg (Milan: Officina Libraria, 2017), 38 [first edition: *Venezia e il ghetto: cinquecento anni del recinto degli Ebrei*, Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 2016]; "Città e territorio nel dominio da mar," *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 6, *Dal Rinascimento al Barocco*, ed. Gaetano Cozzi, Paolo Prodi (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1994).

⁵⁹ Donatella Calabi, "Le basi ultramarine," *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 2, *Il Mare*, ed. Alberto Tenenti; Ugo Tucci (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991), 867, 872.

⁶⁰ Snježana Perojević, "Izgradnja lazareta u Splitu," *Prostor* 24, no. 2 (2002).

⁶¹ Alessandra Sartori, *Spalato rinascimentale: la fortezza e la città a dal sec. XV al sec. XVIII* (Master's thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1986–1987).

⁶² On the critique of the sources see Petar Strunje, "Blagajnički spisi mletačke Općine Split kao izvor za građevinsku povijest," *Vjesnik dalmatinskih arhiva* 2 (2021).

possible models, all within a social, political, and economic frame.⁶³ While only exploring a single aspect of that study, this thesis is a continuation of that effort.

Besides micro and economic-historical works that will be cited in the text, the *bazzane* are severely understudied, considered *minor architecture*. Mentioned studies by Traljić and Bilić marginally mention several of them, as does Mirela Slukan Altić in her study of the Dalmatian cordon sanitaire.⁶⁴ Arsen Duplančić is the only scholar that dealt with the *bazzana* of Split within architectural history but expanded his study to several other Dalmatian examples.⁶⁵

Herceg Novi was included in Novak's economic-historical surveys and has been monographically researched as a free port by Gligor Stanojević.⁶⁶ Besides Darka Bilić, who discovered the drawing of the *emin*'s and merchants' house marginally mentioning it within the opus of engineer Nicolò Rigo,⁶⁷ there is no other study on it, and occurrences in local historiography are sporadic.

⁶³ Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*.

⁶⁴ Mirela Slukan Altić, "Povijest sanitarnih kordona i njihova uloga u razvoju dalmatinskih gradova," *Ekonomika i ekohistorija* 2, n.o 2 (2006).

⁶⁵ "Splitska bazana i njena uloga u zaštiti zdravlja." *Acta historiae medicinae, stomatologiae, pharmaciae, medicinae veterinariae* 28 (1988).

⁶⁶ Gligor Stanojević, "Novska skela u XVIII vijeku," *Spomenik SANU* 127 (1986).

⁶⁷ Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 243. Bilić did not claim Rigo's authorship of the project attributed here, just of the drawing. The *emin* is the Ottoman customs officer and unofficial consul.

1.3. Sources

Considering the somewhat disparate conclusions and approaches in historiography and its many lacunae, it was necessary to turn to primary sources from several collections in Italy and Croatia. The administrative framework of the Venetian state determines the position of the source material. The Republic was administratively divided into the *Stato da Mar* and the *Stato da Terra* (also known as *Domini di Terraferma*, which includes the *Dogado* – the old Duchy of Venice).

For Venice and its *Fondaco dei Turchi*, most of the sources from the late 16th and the first quarter of the 17th century were already consulted by Şerafettin Turan, and significantly more by Paolo Preto and Ennio Concina,⁶⁸ while probably the single-most-important document – the 33 rules for the modification of *Palazzo Pesaro* and management of the *Fondaco dei Turchi* (appendix 15), has been partially translated and published by David Chambers and Brian Pullan.⁶⁹ A short but systematic English survey of all known documents (visual and written) was made by Juergen Schulz.⁷⁰ Schulz's subject matter were the 12th- and 13th-century palaces, so he did not extend his analysis to these later sources, which he presented as short registers in appendices. Still, his meticulous work will be cited throughout the case study on the *Fondaco*. As the architecture of the *Fondaco dei Turchi* was not the prime subject of the mentioned studies, it was necessary to re-consult the documents cited, meanwhile finding new ones. To that aim, the *Senato*, *Terra* and the *Collegio* as the highest government organs and the *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia* as the direct patron and regulatory office were consulted. A significant part of the documentation from the late 16th and early 17th centuries is found in the small fond *Secreta, Materie miste e notabili*. Numerous copies exist throughout the Archives, so the originals were located and used wherever possible. Many documents dealing with the *Fondaco dei Turchi* have been

⁶⁸ Turan “Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi”; Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*; Ennio Concina, *Fondaci*.

⁶⁹ Chambers, Pullan, eds., *Venice: A Documentary History*, 350–352. I rather turned to the original, considering partial omissions and mistranslations (for example, they translate *mezadi* as offices, instead of the more neutral term mezzanine rooms).

⁷⁰ Schulz, *New Palaces*, appendix 3.

separated from their context and subsequently united in the Library of the *Museo Correr* by the 19th-century proprietor Antonio Busetto called Petich for an ownership litigation. These contain a previously un-consulted source – the *Giornale del Fondaco dei Turchi*,⁷¹ the internal book of management comprised by the Pesaro proprietors in the 18th century that notes all significant events, decisions, changes, and expenses of the building. The two most important visual sources – plans made by Cesare Torello around 1600 (fig. 3.7–3.9) and Bernardino Maccaruzzi in 1768 (fig. 3.19–3.23) are found extrapolated into map collections of the State Archives in Modena and Venice.⁷²

For the *Stato da Mar*, power was relegated to civic institutions on the local level and governors (*provveditori*) on the regional one. The border province of Dalmatia and Albania was administered by the *Provveditore generale di Dalmazia ed Albania* under whom were old communal authorities and their (Venetian-appointed) lesser *provveditori*, counts, captains, rectors, and city councils with rights predating Venetian rule. This means that the *Stato da Mar* material is scattered between various offices, with the most detailed sources found on the local and regional levels, while (mostly summary) decisions and confirmations can be found in the collections of the Senate such as *Senato, Mar*, and the *Provveditori da terra e da mar ed altre cariche*.⁷³ Formal opinions and more detailed sources can at times be located with the relevant offices such as the Board of Trade (*Cinque Savi alla mercanzia*) and the Board of Health (*Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità*). For the local level, these sources will be expanded by using the final relations of the counts and rectors (*Collegio, Relazioni finali*), a large part of which has been published since the 19th century in the series *Commissiones et relationes venetae* by the Yugoslav (now Croatian) Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb. Many visual sources, especially maps, found their way to the Correr Museum and the Marciana library. The State Archives in Zadar, Croatia (*Državni arhiv u Zadru*) contains the archives of regional and local Venetian administrators. Except for microhistorical analyses, these sources were seldom

⁷¹ BMC, PDC 740, item II. Schulz, *New Palaces*, consulted the first part of the collection, particularly the documents that predate the institution of the *Fondaco*.

⁷² Both were found by Schulz, “Early Plans”; *New palaces*.

⁷³ For the 18th century, many of the documents and drawings are pointed out by Darka Bilić, *Inženjeri* which presented a stimulative starting point. For the *scala di Spalato*, partial Croatian translations are published in Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez”, and “Daniel Rodriguez (nastavak)”. When so, it will be indicated.

consulted. For this thesis, an extensive survey has been made of the collections of the *Provveditore generale* (1617–1797) to ascertain the principal preoccupations of this central office, the region-wide and Zadar-related decisions, a series of locations, datations, and attributions. After establishing the main points of reference from this collection, it was often impossible to find any trace in the Venetian *Archivio di Stato*; the projects and subsequent management being done in the province. Therefore, detailed information was found in the archives of the local communes, primarily those of Split in the State Archives in Zadar, and Šibenik kept in the State Archives in Šibenik. Subsequently, the Dalmatian cadastre of 1789 held in Zadar will be heavily relied upon to reconstruct the buildings in question (those that survived until the late days of the Republic). Finally, a series of contemporary treatises, ranging from architectural to political and ethnographical, and travel books, both European and Ottoman, will be used throughout the text to provide a larger picture and comparative material.

1.4. Structure and methodology

The body matter of the thesis is composed of two main parts: Venice and the *Stato da Mar*, each with its introductory chapter explaining the relevant socio-political background. While all individual buildings were part of the same mercantile hospitality system, this separation stems from socio-geographical and administrative differences between the centre and the province. This complex administrative apparatus had different routes of institutional patronage, so the source material required a cross-reading between central, regional, and local institutions. Furthermore, these sources will not only present a view from above (by the patron) but will also be influenced by the function, the user, and the socio-geographical requirements of the location (view from below). In all case studies, the top-down vertical approach will be studied by analysing those sources that position the architectural commission from the needs of the patron – which is the prevalent norm in architectural history. As in these cases the patron was not the user, certain specific arguments in the commission process prove that a bottom-up process affected form. Two types of sources testify to this: discussions with intermediaries (dragomans⁷⁴ in most cases) and the supplications of the users (Muslim traders). This vertical approach based on sources will be supplemented by a horizontal outlook achieved from comparatively analysing the buildings as a network. Wherever possible, the visual sources will be analysed and cross-read with the accompanying written reports to avoid extrapolating them from their intended context.⁷⁵ This last approach, together with comparative analysis and the reliance on contemporary treatises, brings architectural iconography to the forefront, which will be used as a final, interpretative method.

⁷⁴ The dragoman was the official interpreter for Ottoman Turkish, but often wielded other languages used in (Eastern) diplomacy and commerce such as Greek, Arabic, Persian, and one of the South Slavic idioms. The dragoman was also a broker – he was to be present during transactions between Muslim and European traders. Cf. *Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire* (2009), s.v. “dragoman (tercüman)”; *Dictionnaire de la Méditerranée* (2016), s.v. “drogman”.

⁷⁵ In addition this was necessary to reconstruct the buildings, as not a single example survives to this day except the *bazzana* of Benkovac.

This approach will be used in each case study in which all known buildings will at least be summarily surveyed. The first case study is on the eight proposed locations for the *Fondaco dei Turchi* in Venice, the discussions that preceded them, and the temporary solution in the Vendramin-owned *osteria Anzolo* on the Rialto during the period 1574–1621. The relatively large number of proposed projects and the single realisation allow for comparative analysis to see how a Muslim space in Venice has been envisioned and who participated in its formation.

The second case study deals with the *Fondaco dei Turchi* at Palazzo Pesaro on the Canal Grande during the long period of its existence (first discussed in 1608, instituted in 1621, abolished in 1797, closed in 1838). Through its long history, all the negotiations and changes, the *Fondaco* study shows the stabilisation of the system in Venice, the main arguments and the constant preoccupations of the patrons, the intermediaries, and the users. The second part of the thesis starts with a survey of subjective problems the Venetian administrators encountered in Dalmatia and Albania, and the set of legislative and spatial instruments of cross-border contact and mobility control in this border province to show how it relates to Venice. Respecting the chronology provided by sources as much as possible, this first case study will proceed from city to city, building to building, to provide some first glimpses into the local variants, positioned between the centre and the province, the local and the foreign, the patron and the user.

The second case study of this part will be the *scala di Spalato* – the main Ottoman-Venetian trade port and zone of contact where large infrastructural investments were made from 1588 to 1670. In terms of infrastructure, the Split commercial system comprised the port, roads, warehouses, government administration, customs and sanitation offices, military infrastructure and bastions, the *fondaco*, and the *lazzaretti*. They were reflected in negotiations and investments on the Ottoman side of the border, demonstrating a degree of reciprocity. This reciprocity (and sometimes a lack thereof) will also be analysed on the building complex of the *scala di Spalato* proper – especially its *fondaco* part, while the question of its typology will position these spaces in the dialectical question of opening and closing at the heart of this thesis. Besides function, the Spalato case is often mentioned in sources together with the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, connecting them without a doubt.

The following case study is the consequence of the previous one – a network of *bazzane* made in the 18th century that led to Split and other coastal cities, serving as caravan stations and isolated trading houses on the way. Due to their simple forms and widespread use, they will be analysed in groups, finishing with the *bazzana* of Skradin (*Scardona*), which will be dealt with separately. The questions on the origin, evolution, and typology of these structures will provide some answers to the limits of exchange between Ottoman and Adriatic architectural traditions to the same problem of cross-border trade and hospitality.

The final *Stato da Mar* case study deals with Herceg Novi (*Castelnuovo*), where a new, southern node parallel to the one in Split was constructed in the first half of the 18th century. Among these realisations, an enclosure and a house for the Ottoman customs officer (*emin*) and merchants was built in 1741, which functioned as a *fondaco*. This example will serve as a finishing discussion on overlapping questions that pertain to specific architectural solutions when housing Muslims in Venetian lands.

Finally, all case studies will be comparatively analysed with similar European and Ottoman solutions to show what was specific (and what was not) about the Venetian system and how were the *spaces for the Turk* envisioned in Venetian circles.

2. SETTING THE STAGE

2.1. Spaces of exchange and their forms

The *fondaco* and the *bazzana* of the Venetian tradition were just several of the many architectural types used in cross-border commerce. All of them were a reality of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Era. These were the lazaretto, the customs house (*dogana*), the loggia, the *fondaco*, covered specialised markets, warehouses, hostelries, and similar.

The lazaretto (roughly translated as a quarantine house or a plague hospital) is a place of double function: isolation of the suspected and care for the sick. The hospital element is not of interest to this study, but quarantine is. Quarantine was first implemented in Dubrovnik in 1377 for those incoming from suspected areas, while the first lazaretto was made in 1423 on the island of *Santa Maria di Nazareth* in the Venetian lagoon, better known as the *Lazzaretto Vecchio*.⁷⁶ Regarding trade, it had the function of preventing the spread of epidemics through the implementation of quarantine. If a person's place of origin was not suspected, they were usually not obliged to stay in quarantine. However, as the Ottoman Empire did not have such a system, those coming from there were always suspected and quarantined for at least a week. Much has been said about the lazaretto form, but no typology has been established – with good reason. Multiple solutions were employed, which were always strictly tied to the function and the prevalent medicinal standpoint. When speaking about a new project (such as Milano, Verona, or Split), the cloister solution was preferred, as was with hospitals and hospices. This is reminiscent of the first lazaretto in the monastery of *Santa Maria di Nazareth* and the fact that plague hospitals were in

⁷⁶ Hence the name: *lazzaretto* comes from the toponym Nazareth, and 15th- and 16th-century sources will call any lazaretto under that name. Over time, the term became contaminated with Saint Lazarus the beggar, the patron-saint of lepers. On the *lazzaretti* see Orazio Pugliese, ed., *Venezia e la peste 1348–1797* (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1979). Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 1979); Daniel Panzac, *Quarantaines et lazarets: L'Europe et la peste d'Orient (XVIIe-XXe siècles)*, (Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1986); Nelli-Elena Vanzan Marchini, ed., *Rotte Mediterranee e baluardi di sanità: Venezia e i lazaretti mediterranei* (Milan: Skira, 2004). Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 2004); Jane L. Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals: Public Health for the City in Early Modern Venice* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012).

times of immediate need often established in monasteries so the friars could provide care. This form included external isolation and the orientation of separate rooms around a central courtyard, often with a portico. This allowed the reception of a multitude of people, easy management through numbered rooms and a visible, controllable courtyard. The architectural form allowed for easy implementation of plague-related solutions such as ventilation, fumigation, movement and goods control. Lazarettos were a reality of cross-border trade but will not be included in this study. Quarantine, and the plague for that matter, did not discriminate on the basis of religion. Therefore, lazarettos were places of total isolation for everybody crossing a border and cannot be considered spaces of exchange.

The customs house (*dogana*) is a place where, as today, goods are controlled and taxed before entering another market. In the Early Modern Era, they came in all shapes and sizes, depending on the location and the value of trade passing through them. It could have been a house (Lazise – Lago di Garda, Livorno), a large courtyard structure (Dubrovnik, Split, Florence), a set of warehouses and rooms (*Dogana da Mar*, Venice), or the well-known and elaborate 18th-century *Barrières* of Paris. To ease goods unloading and control, large open spaces were preferred, be it a courtyard, a portico, or a loggia. The term is often confused with a *fondaco*, as demonstrated by Giovanni Boccaccio and Leonardo Fibonacci.⁷⁷ This testifies that the *dogana* was often used also as a *fondaco* – a place of merchant housing, commercial control, and storage.

As *fondacos* before them, loggias functioned as enclaves and had consuls or *baili* but were places of privileged communities and not restricted spaces – echoing in their accessible form. The loggia is a form of Germanic origin that became widespread in the Mediterranean during the 14th century. Although used in parallel, the *fondaco* started losing its hospitality aspect to the loggia, which increasingly became the facility of choice when providing space for lodging, storage, and trade for Christian foreigners doing business in

⁷⁷ “[...] un fondaco il quale in molti luoghi è chiamato dogana [...]” Giovanni Boccaccio, *Il Decamerone* (Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1557), p. 387 [first edition 1351–1353]. Leonardo Fibonacci learned arithmetic in one of the Pisan *fondacos* in Algeria (Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 129). Another example is the Venetian *fondaco* in Tunis which had a *dogana* inside.

other Christian lands.⁷⁸ Loggia belongs to a completely different architectural concept than the *fondaco*, conveying openness with its ground floor porticos and rooms above or in continuation. Otherwise, smaller loggias were often found in front of city gates so foreigners could conduct business there without entering the city – for which special permissions were required and duties paid. This latter subtype is most connected to the Germanic origin of the loggia as an “open shaded space”.⁷⁹

Covered specialised markets were spaces for conducting commerce of particular interest and control, such as cloth. It is not surprising that in Padua, the market is in and around the *Palazzo della Ragione* – the place of justice and city administration. Nonetheless, cities had, as they continue to have, different markets (open or closed but always regulated) for the sale of each good-groups such as vegetable markets, fruit markets, meat markets, fish markets, and similar.

A note to remember is that most of the buildings explored in this thesis are also on the sea, positioned like a ring around the *Golfo di Venezia* to control entry to it, just as the fortified towns that hosted them. Therefore, they were the knee of land-sea connection, a stepping stone (and a barrier) to the broader world in both directions. Parts of this constellation of mercantile spaces were the *fondaco* and the *bazzana*.

⁷⁸ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 156–157, 189. Cf. Geo Pistarino, “Les symboles de Gênes dans les établissements d’outre-mer,” in *Coloniser au Moyen Âge. Méthodes d’expansion et techniques de domination en Méditerranée du 11e au 16e siècle*, eds. Michel Balard, Alain Ducellier (Paris: Armand Colin, 1995), 302. In Spain for example, the loggia (*lonja*) was used by Christians, while the *alfondiga* by Muslims. For civic, administrative loggias see Kim Susan Sexton, “A History of Renaissance Civic Loggias in Italy from the Loggia dei Lanzi to Sansovino’s Loggetta” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1997). For Southern-Italian examples intricately tied to civic institutions and identities see Fulvio Lenzo, *Memoria e identità civica: L’architettura dei seggi nel Regno di Napoli, XIII–XVIII secolo* (Rome: Campisano Editore, 2014).

⁷⁹ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, note 157.

2.1.1. The *fondaco* and the *caravanserai*

A *fondaco* is a specific building type dedicated to lodging and storing, already noted in the parable of the Good Samaritan in the Gospel of Luke (10:30-35) under the Ancient-Greek name *pandokeion* (“receiving all”).⁸⁰ While the *pandokeion* was simply a hostelry, by the High Middle Ages in Egypt and Syria it evolved into a system of foreigner and commercial control (among other uses). From there, it spread throughout the wider Mediterranean area, testified under the Middle-Greek name *foundax*, Latin *fonticum*, Italian *fondaco* (*fontico*, *fontego*), Castillian *alfondiga*, Catalan *fontech*, all stemming from the Arabian *funduq*.⁸¹ It entered European usage from the national *fondacos* of the European Christian merchants in the Levant (most notably in Alexandria) where each external Christian nation was obliged to stay – enjoying the privilege of self-organisation, but being somewhat separated from the Muslim-dominated markets and societies. A foreigner could enjoy the company of their compatriots and fellow merchants, the internal dispensation of justice on minor issues, religious observance, their traditional cuisine (including the usually forbidden wine and pork), and hygienic habits. On the other side, they would be kept locked at night and during Friday prayers,⁸² and were discouraged from travelling further inland. A local dragoman (*terjuman*) was to escort them when outside the *fondaco* – providing protection, translation, and brokering services.⁸³

A *funduq* is virtually impossible to differentiate from a *khan* (its Persian equivalent used in the Ottoman Empire), but the latter substituted the former by the Early Modern Era – even when housing foreign Christians.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 11. Saint Jerome translated the term into Latin as *stabulum* – stable.

⁸¹ On the system, its evolution and the etymology see: Constable, *Housing the stranger*. She established the terminological distinction of using the term *funduq* for Arabian establishments, and *fondaco* for Christian ones.

⁸² Although also pertaining to foreigner control, this was nonetheless done for any commercial building (*bazaar*, *wakala*, *khan*, *inn*) in Muslim lands. Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 8.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 268.

⁸⁴ This difference is lost to us, but the contemporaries were aware of it. *Ibid.*, 59–60. Cf. Eleanor Sims, “Markets and Caravanserais,” in *Architecture of the Islamic World: Its History and Social Meaning, with a Complete Survey of Key Monuments*, ed. George Michell (London: Thames and Hudson, 1984), 97–111. A *caravanserai* is an encompassing term that lost its historical meaning, but sometimes in literature signifies

The *funduq* – *fondaco* form evolved significantly over time and space, so conclusions can only be generalised.⁸⁵ Some, usually private hostelries, had a domestic character. The large, state-commissioned ones were large structures with one gate and small windows on the outside while open to the central courtyard. Ideally, there was just one upper floor, but varied solutions can be found. They consisted of many rooms and warehouses often on all floors and had their internal administration (*fundicarius* – manager; notary), while services provided differed between urban and rural *funduqs*. Rooms could be private or communal; the latter often had raised platforms for sleeping and in any case would have heating.⁸⁶ In contemporary sources, questions of ventilation and sanitation were emphasised. The buildings served many guests, so filth tended to accumulate. The regime of cleaning the structure and emptying the septic tanks beneath the latrines was discussed in detail by several Islamic jurists.⁸⁷ Ventilation in the hot climate concerned the courtyard, the disposition of windows, chimneys, and rooftop terraces. As with any commercial structure in the Muslim World, and indeed any medieval city or private house, they would be locked at night.

Urban *funduqs* – especially those for European traders, are relevant for this research. As demonstrated by Olivia Constable, the constellation *fondaco* – oven – bath – church was a package generally requested and granted to the various European groups when they petitioned for a *fondaco* in medieval Muslim lands.⁸⁸ Otherwise, the presence of such facilities is a reality of Levantine urban life, and no decent neighbourhood could function without them. An urban *fondaco* usually did not have such facilities inside but in the vicinity. These were also provided to Christian merchants who could frequent a bathhouse on a prearranged day of the week. An oven was always provided separately so that the Christians would not contaminate it for *halal* food preparation with pork and other

posts along trade routes, contrarily to the *khan* which is located in urban centers. In this study we will use the terms interchangeably accordingly to the prevalent use.

⁸⁵ It is nearly impossible to typologically unify structures built between the 8th and the 18th century and between India and Spain. Luckily, typical for Islamic architecture is a small number of basic forms that are highly adaptable to new functions with only subtle changes in structure.

⁸⁶ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 93–98.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 98; 119.

products.⁸⁹ The same was arranged for water sources if the building did not have a well previously. Chapels (and a priest) were provided inside.⁹⁰ Sometimes, instead of a *fondaco*, the traders were provided with a residential enclosure, a street, or one or several houses. Needless to say, the obligation to lodge in the *fondaco* was often avoided in the multi-ethnic and multi-confessional Levant, so some European Christians owned property, married, and lived there permanently (this was allowed), or stayed with friends and partners (business or otherwise). The *funduq* – *fondaco* is a medieval system, and the commercial changes of the Early Modern Age saw their eventual decline and replacement with the *khan* (in legal terms), but their overall numbers decreased. Venetian *fondacos* in the Levant were still operating at the end of the 16th century but soon fell into disuse, only rarely replaced with a *khan*. European *khans* were increasingly becoming places of commerce and not residence but some were still kept as commercial and consular spaces for the French, Dutch, and English in Syria well into the 19th century.⁹¹ However, the decision to segregate the Europeans depended on each case in the Ottoman Empire. In a relieved manner, the system was kept in the old markets of the Mamluk Sultanate in Syria and North Africa. There was no such restriction in the newly Muslim lands such as Constantinople and the Balkans, and merchants could stay where they pleased. However, certain solutions were preferred over others. The *khan* or a European quarter provided all the benefits in one place. Such was the case of Galata (*Pera*). Originally a Genoese colony situated across the Golden Horn, it was designated by the Ottoman Sultan Mehmet the Conqueror (1444–1446; 1451–1481) as a place for European colonies and diplomats. Soon it grew into a proper city, with many European ethnicities, their diplomatic services, schools, churches, and monasteries, sharing it with the locals and their establishments. So it was not a segregated – European space, although the government preferred them away from the centre of power. When almost all ambassadors moved to the nearby suburbs (*Vigne di Pera*), the merchants could follow their representatives but chose to remain in the commercial hotspot of Galata.⁹² The Ottoman Empire did not have a dedicated diplomatic

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 275.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 100.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 359–361.

⁹² Cf. Dursteler, *Venetians in Constantinople*.

presence in foreign cities, instead preferring foreigners to come to them while sending representatives only when strictly needed. On such occasions, they were honoured guests of the *Serenissima* and were not subject to restrictions. Due to their occasional presence, the Ottoman merchants did not group around them for representation.⁹³

2.1.1.1. *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*

In the European South and the Byzantine Empire, the *fondaco* evolved in the 13th century into the state-controlled warehouse and commercial space for regulated merchandise, such as cereals and other foodstuffs, salt, silk, or similar, their price control and supply.⁹⁴ Venice was the exception where – with the institution of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* in the 1220s on Levantine organisational principles, the *fondaco* also became an enclave of foreign merchants.⁹⁵ As demonstrated by Olivia Constable, the main role of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* was to keep the more competitive German merchants from the Venetian internal market and the Venetian-dominated markets in the Levant.⁹⁶ Artisans, pilgrims, and other visitors were not restricted to the *Fondaco*, demonstrating that ethnic segregation was not the aim. For these, special hostelryes *per oltramontani* existed; the nearby *Al San Giorgio*, also called *Casa Tedesca*, was popular.⁹⁷

The *Fondaco* was under the management of the *Visdomini*, elected among the Venetian nobility. It had a *fundicarium* who was in charge of internal management and keeping

⁹³ Cf. Maria Pia Pedani, *In nome del Gran Signore*.

⁹⁴ Concina, *Fondaci*, 120–122; Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 64–66; 311.

⁹⁵ Concina, *Fondaci*, 139; Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 308; 314; 321; 326. Constable called it “an unusual example of cross-cultural replication”, and Concina concluded it is a “transfer of typology”. After the *Serenissima* conquered Dalmatia, the Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund forbade his subjects in 1417 to trade in Venice. Milan and Genoa tried to take advantage by organising their own *fondacos* for the Germans which would be privileged spaces without curfews and tax duties but these efforts were short lived because the ban was lifted in 1431. Cf. Philippe Dollinger, “Projets d’un ‘Fondaco dei Tedeschi’ à Gênes et à Milan au XVe siècle,” *Byzantinische Forschungen* 12 (1987).

⁹⁶ *Housing the stranger*, 317.

⁹⁷ Massimo Costantini, “Le strutture dell’ospitalità,” in *Storia di Venezia: dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, vol. 5, *Il Rinascimento: Società ed economia*, eds. Alberto Tenenti, Ugo Tucci (Rome: Istituto dell’Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), 893; Uwe Israel, “Fondaci: città nelle città sulle sponde del Mediterraneo,” in *Il Rinascimento italiano e l’Europa*, vol. 6, *Luoghi, spazi, architetture*, eds. Donatella Calabi, Elena Svalduz, (Treviso: Angelo Colla, 2010), 109.

ledgers on guests, their goods, and sales, with the help of the notary. The packers (*imballatori*) and porters (*fachini*) managed merchandise manipulation. Each merchant was awarded a personal broker (*sensale*) who could speak German and Italian. All were employees of the Republic.⁹⁸ During the night, the building was kept locked from the outside.

The present structure⁹⁹ (fig. 2.1) is the result of the 1505–1509 reconstruction, made after the original building burnt down. According to Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574), the three-floor rectangular building with a spacious central atrium was the recreation of a *Greek forum*.¹⁰⁰ The Canal Grande façade had a five-bay loggia for unloading wares and two towers protruding from the roof. Crenulation surrounded the building, reminiscent of *Veneto-Byzantine* palaces. Ventilation and sunlight were major concerns. The large courtyard (with a cistern) was surrounded by a portico on all floors. Pairs of large windows with flues between them dominated the façade. In total, the building had 68 rooms for merchants, a tavern, a refectory, a kitchen, and ground-floor warehouses around the courtyard with shops on the street. One of the rooms was used as a chapel, where an altar was built in the mid-14th century.¹⁰¹ In general, rationalist architectural qualities dominate the project, and the ornament is heavily reduced (note the pilasters, their cubical capitals, the masonry).¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 323. In the Levant these employees were Europeans who would generally receive a salary from the local government.

⁹⁹ It must be noted that two significant reconstructions were made that significantly changed the interior. Architect Ferdinando Forlati modified the building 1929–1939 for the central Venetian office of the Italian post. The building was purchased by Benetton in 2008 and made into a shopping mall (inaugurated 2016) according to the project of the Dutch architect Rem Koolhaas.

¹⁰⁰ Vasari attributed the building to Fra Giovanni Giocondo, which was taken up by Vincenzo Fontana, *Fra Giovanni Giocondo architetto (1433 c.–1515)*, (Vicenza: N. Pozza, 1988), 77. However, this attribution lacks any confirmation even from comparative analysis, and archival documents attribute the project to Hieronymo Todesco (appendices 1–2), realised under Giorgio Spavento and Antonio Scarpagnino, with the participation of many other parties. Cf. Simon P. Oakes, “‘Hieronymo Thodesco’ and the Fondaco dei Tedeschi: A Reappraisal of the Documents and Sources Relating to a German Architect in Early Sixteenth-Century Venice,” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 72, n.o 4 (2009). On the problem of attribution see Elisabetta Molteni, “Venezia, Fondaco dei Tedeschi. Le ricostruzioni di un edificio nel cuore della città,” in: *Il fondaco dei Tedeschi, Venezia, OMA. Il restauro e il riuso di un monumento veneziano*, eds. Francesco Dal Co, Elisabetta Molteni (Milano: Electa, 2016), especially pp. 36–43.

¹⁰¹ Henry Simonsfeld, *Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi in Venedig und die Deutsch-Venetianischen Handelsbeziehungen*, Vol. 2 (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1887), 11. This was not only convenient, but became necessary after the Reformation.

¹⁰² This rationalist approach was stressed in the documentation (appendices 1–2). The façades were subsequently decorated in frescoes by Giorgione and Tiziano.

Having hosted diverse groups of people who used German as the commercial *lingua franca* (Northern and Southern Germans, the Dutch, Hungarians, Poles, Bohemians, etc.), internal subgroupings and conflicts happened, especially at the table. There were several complaints about seating arrangements and the food itself, so the refectory was reshuffled a few times. From 1429, two cooks were employed, one for the Southerners and the other for the Northerners. These two groups also organised separate confraternities.¹⁰³

Venice was the only European city that demonstrated such a degree of central control and which could harness the potential of its island location – south of Brenner pass and on the northernmost tip of the Adriatic, to contain all the traders from the Holy Roman Empire and the lands around it under one roof.¹⁰⁴ However, as the goal was commercial control, the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* over time took a much more elite and somewhat religious character, where wealthier Protestant merchants and their agents sojourned.¹⁰⁵ Unlike the future *Fondaco dei Turchi* and similar structures for Muslims, the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* centralised the complete Venetian-German commercial infrastructure, with many public and private offices, workshops, archivists, accountants, and communal spaces such as the two large dining halls. Otherwise, the merchants elected consuls for legal representation. This representation, together with the central location of the *Fondaco*, gave the German merchants high visibility within Venice.¹⁰⁶

Far less formal and regulated was the domestic ambient of hostelries and inns (*albergo*, *osteria*). In Venice, they were grouped around the Rialto market and the Piazza San Marco. The innkeeper had to procure a special permit to operate such an establishment, they would specialise in hosting certain groups, and their guests had to be registered.¹⁰⁷ However, housing the Muslims will provide a much more restrictive variant of that model, influenced by different requirements.

¹⁰³ Israel, “Fondaci,” 109–110.

¹⁰⁴ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 325.

¹⁰⁵ Simonsfeld, *Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, vol. 2, 10.

¹⁰⁶ Sybille Backmann, “Abitare e lavorare nel Fondaco dei Tedeschi di Venezia: L’arredo delle camera (1508–1650),” in *Spazi veneziani: Topografie culturali di una città*, ed. Sabine Meine (Rome, Venice: Viella, Centro Tedesco di studi veneziani, 2014), 61, 63.

¹⁰⁷ Rosa Salzberg, “Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange”; Costantini, “Le strutture dell’ospitalità”.




Fig. 2. 1 Architectural details, plan, section, and façade of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* (Leopoldo Cicognara, Antonio Diedo, Giannantonio Selva, *Le fabbriche e i monumenti cospicui di Venezia*, vol. 1, Venice: G. Antonelli, 1858, tav. 93–94)

2.1.1.2. The house and the caravanserai in Ottoman lands

Even if we accept the simplistic notion that the classical Ottoman khan (15th–18th century) is a two-floor structure with the traditional disposition of cell, portico (*revak*), and central court already found on the *funduq* it developed from,¹⁰⁸ we will see that no surveyed Venetian structure corresponds to it, although it would have been a most functional approach. Furthermore, their simple structure and modular construction provided a flexible model not exclusive to Islamic architecture, which generally uses a limited repertoire of easily adjustable forms. Therefore it is difficult to differentiate a khan from a *medrese* (religious school), a hospital, a hospice, a dervish lodge, or a military encampment (*ribat*).¹⁰⁹ A critique can also be made on the typological classification of the Ottoman architectural canon. These ideal representations mainly deal with the classical khans of the Ottoman *külliye* (state-funded great complexes) on the *menzil* system (transportation infrastructure). These great complexes included mosques, khans, markets, hospitals, asylums, schools, inns, hospices, baths, and warehouses, in *menzil* towns and cities, forming the backbone of the Ottoman transportation system. They arose on the Empire's main roads, fostering first and foremost faster military responses, then commercial mobility and social wellbeing.¹¹⁰ In those complexes, the khan generally took two forms: the mentioned classical form or that of a large longitudinal space under a single vault or with an open roof resting on pillars – thus in two or three naves (fig. 2.2). Except for the fireplace and the raised platforms used for sleeping, no other facilities existed within, as it was provided in the rest of the *külliye*. The khan is only a part of the wider urban quarter, not a segregated space, although locked during the night. The locking was a general practice of all commercial and hospitality-related spaces more rigorously observed than in Catholic Europe. However, the khan was still much more accessible and architecturally

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Ceyhan Güran, *Türk Hanlarının Gelişimi ve İstanbul Hanları Mimarisi* (Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 1978), 193–194.

¹⁰⁹ Robert Hillenbrand, *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function, and Meaning* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 331–376 is similarly cautious.

¹¹⁰ Fatih Müderrisoğlu, “Menzil Roads and Menzil Complexes in the Ottoman Empire,” in *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*, vol. 4, *Culture and Arts*, ed. Kemal Çiçek, (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2000).

open than either the Islamic private house or the examples found in this thesis. Indeed, such infrastructure, while found around the Empire, was the exception to the usual merchant experience. Mostly they stayed in private khans, which were more often than not domestic houses repurposed as inns, and in which the stay was paid, unlike in the *menzil* (fig. 2.3). These private khans testify to the Ottoman housing culture to which the merchants appertained and from which their expectations of a domestic environment can be surmised. Therefore, we will reconstruct the Ottoman private ambient so that at the end of the thesis, we can surmise how it corresponds to the spaces that hosted the Ottomans in the Republic. While significant regional differences will not be neglected, the Muslim private house (at least in the Middle East, India, Persia, and the Mediterranean) is largely uniform in terms of organisational aspects and facilities provided, due to its form stemming from religious tradition and the derived legal practice. Unlike in the *funduq-khan*, both the elements of segregation and the hygienic facilities at the centre of the discussion can undoubtedly be found in the Ottoman home. Starting from the general, the first aspect that differentiates a Muslim home from a Christian one is the insistence on privacy. A domestic environment is to be completely separated from the constraints of communal life while respecting the religiously based social order of which the (patriarchal) family is the building block. The first, rigorous separation is between the house and the street, the second is between the parts of the house for the guests and the family, and the last is between male and female spaces. Privacy was to be observed on three levels: visual, acoustic, and olfactory. These levels can be observed in theory and practice.

Visual privacy is a predominant design objective of a Muslim home. Obstructed windows are prevalent in private and semi-private spaces across Islam. On the practical side, small high windows and limited doors best suit the hot climate (in Arab lands) and provide safety from theft. However, they are also fully within the *hijab* religious requirements, stemming directly from the Quran.¹¹¹ Islamic teaching is clear when reminding Muslims not to violate

¹¹¹ Basim Selim Hakim, *Arabic-Islamic Cities: Building and Planning Principles* (London; New York: Routledge, 2010), 33 [first edition: 1986]; Hisham Mortada, *Traditional Islamic Principles of Built Environment* (London: Routledge, 2003), 80–82; 95–96. Contrary to its modern usage, the *hijab* does not refer solely to the headscarf but to modest attire and demeanour. It also obliges men, who should dress modestly, not show their private parts (from the navel to the knee), and avert their gaze from women and

visual privacy by peeking into other people's homes. Seeing the neighbour is also to be avoided so one ideally should not see outside from the house.¹¹² That rigorous internal orientation explains the prevalence of courtyards (the main building blocks of Islamic architecture), urban gardens, balconies with high parapets, gendered spaces, restrictions on door position and building height, and wooden lattice screens (*mashrabiya*). According to Islamic jurisprudence, the window exists solely to provide illumination and ventilation, never sight. If it violated the privacy of neighbouring residences, litigations ensued and the height and size would need to be modified.¹¹³ The house (except in the poorest homes) was accordingly divided between the guest section toward the street, the semi-private family and male section, and the completely private family and female spaces.

Concerning acoustic privacy, clamour from markets and noise from shops or stables should not upset domestic life. Owners of outside noise pollutants were routinely obliged to construct a solid-foundation double wall or a vault to absorb the noise. In rare cases, when a house is a place of work, those spaces are dutifully separated. If acoustically offensive sources could not be remedied, they had to be removed. Corridors, courtyards, and other circulation spaces are used to further control sound transmission between separate units.¹¹⁴

Olfactory privacy is connected to the many hygienic rules of Islam. All private houses must have a sewage disposal system, be it a cesspool or a connection to the sewer (Turkish *algun*). Furthermore, rainfall, kitchen, and washing water are not to be mixed into the sewage but reused in the gardens or channelled through communal drains to a body of

other men. In general terms, the *hijab* regulation ensures the privacy of the family, especially its women, their bodies, and spaces.

¹¹² Hakim, *Arabic-Islamic Cities*, 36, remembers a verdict that if a person standing on a bed can look outside to the neighbor's house then the window must be heightened.

¹¹³ Mortada, *Traditional Islamic Principles of Built Environment*, 96–106. This is not to say that this was completely uniform across the Islamic world. In the Balkans where *hijab* regulations were somewhat less observed, cities less densely populated, and the climate colder, the upper floors often opened with large windows and balconies while the ground floor often had none. However, this did not present a break with tradition. Other houses were more distant, high walls protected the large court even in cities, while thick curtains were posted on the inside, and casement shutters and screens on the outside of windows. Maurice Cerasi, "The Formation of Ottoman House Types: A Comparative Study in Interaction with Neighboring Cultures," *Muqarnas* 15 (1998). For Cerasi this is the result of "Adriatic" influences from the 18th century onward, but it can just as easily be argued that it is not an evolutionary principle, as the Balkan houses are even more open than their Adriatic counterparts.

¹¹⁴ Zulkeplee Othmann, Rosemary Aird, Laurie Buy, "Privacy, modesty, hospitality, and the design of Muslim homes: A literature review," *Frontiers of Architectural Research* 4 (2015): 17. Hakim, *Arabic-Islamic Cities*, 33.

water, keeping it unpolluted. Accordingly, the building, maintaining, and cleaning of cesspools and sewage systems are also clearly regulated. In *funduqs*, for example, it was a legislated rule that the owner regularly cleans the cesspools.¹¹⁵ Discharging waste onto the street or any public space from where it could produce a sensory offence was met with physical and monetary punishment.¹¹⁶

As a general rule, every Islamic household (past and present) has a toilet, which should be designed to respect all three requisites of privacy. Therefore, it was most often detached from the main body of the house. The existence of a toilet means that a washing room (Turkish *abdesthane*) or similar facilities must exist. As the five daily prayers are also done at home, the washing room provided facilities for maintaining ritual cleanliness which was necessary before prayer and after certain actions.¹¹⁷ This also means that the house should be kept clean, not only as a prayer space but also because of the general standards Islam puts on hygiene, adding a certain sanctity to the private home.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, the complete washing (Arabic *ghusl*, Turkish *güsül*)¹¹⁹ is an intimate act more conveniently done at home than a hamam and requires a separate space (*güsülhane*) from the *abdesthane*.

Frugality, modesty, and humility were recommended for the private space within more expansive sumptuary laws preventing social stratification based on the Prophet's teachings.¹²⁰ While strongly observed on the exterior, in the interior it meant that most rooms were multifunctional,¹²¹ and most of the furniture was formed out of raised benches used for sitting, resting, and sleeping (comp. fig. 2.2).¹²²

It is possible to trace each of these requisites to the Ottoman domestic ambient in Anatolia as well as in the Balkans. Reha Günay published a large body of work on the Ottoman vernacular, providing a detailed catalogue of Ottoman housing with particular attention to

¹¹⁵ Hakim, *Arabic-Islamic Cities*, 51–54.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 49.

¹¹⁷ It was necessary to wash the relative areas after relieving oneself, after sleep or any other loss of consciousness. For details see chapter 3.3.4.2.

¹¹⁸ Othmann et al., "Privacy, modesty, hospitality," 18. One of the consequences is that shoes are not allowed inside.

¹¹⁹ Obligatory after intercourse and completion of the menstrual cycle. Recommended after sickness, a trip, and on Fridays before going to the mosque.

¹²⁰ Mortada, *Traditional Islamic Principles of Built Environment*, 120–122.

¹²¹ As they were in Europe.

¹²² They are found throughout the Islamic world. In Bosnian they are called *sećija*, from Turkish *seki*. A variant is the *diwan*, or in European terms the *Ottoman*, present in European housing from the 18th century.

the small town of Safranbolu in northwestern Anatolia.¹²³ Multipurpose private rooms and multipurpose easily movable objects were the norm. Such is the *güsülhane* – the washing closet. As the *güsül* or full ablution is primarily done in the complete privacy of the home, a washing closet can be found in almost every room. It contained a water basin (covered with a lid) and a shelved closet above. Before washing, the shelves and their contents would be removed, giving the appearance of a stand-up shower. To provide total privacy, the closet doors could be closed. The used water, not considered filthy but unfit for further human use, went through a drain to the garden. Similarly, used kitchen water would flow into the garden or a separate rainwater channel.¹²⁴ Human waste, on the other hand, is considered filthy, physically and spiritually. Therefore, its discharge is an important question of theology and urban and architectural planning. As was usual, two main systems were used. *Algun* is a closed sewage system discharged into the sea or a stream further from populated areas. Cesspits were usually made in drystone so they would be drained deep into the ground to avoid the need for cleaning them.¹²⁵ The toilet as a separate room is present in almost all Ottoman Muslim homes. Its presence means that water needs to be provided close by, unlike in the contemporary West. Water is the sole prerequisite of cleanliness in the Islamic world and providing access to it is the duty of the administrators. The populace would get their water from public fountains, but many households had private wells, and some were connected to aqueducts. While partial ablution (*abdest*) can be sufficiently done using an ewer and basin, most households were furnished with a washroom-toilet, each in an adjacent unit. This is necessary because once anything is discharged from the body, ablution (*abdest*) needs to be renewed (at least for the hands and the intimate areas).¹²⁶ Respecting visual, olfactory, and acoustic privacy, the washroom-toilet was situated in an annexe of the main structure, either in the garden or projecting from the upper floors and encased in wooden panelling (fig. 2.3.). The washroom is usually a wooden sink on a countertop, 40–50 cm wide. A wooden gutter leads the water discharge directly into the

¹²³ Reha Günay, *Tradition of the Turkish House and Safranbolu Houses*, trans. Çelen Birkan (Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1998).

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 244.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 243.

soil. The toilet is always separated from the washroom and is a simple hole in the ground with raised footholds on the sides (*alla turca*). A water bowl or an ewer can be found there for intimate washing.¹²⁷ Rarely, but present in every city, some households had their small private hamams (Turkish *hamamcık*), sometimes with the hypocaust system and the division between baths.¹²⁸ Muslim households in Bosnia and Herzegovina closely follow the same model.¹²⁹ In the past, the main distinction between Christian and Muslim domestic ambient was the insistence on the sanitation element and the relatively larger privacy of the Muslim house, provided by screens and parapets. Each married couple (or an unmarried individual) needed to have a *banjica* (from *bagno*, *güsülhane*) which was a small room (here rarely a closet) situated next to a stove that heated it. It was never connected to the toilet, which was either in the spacious courtyards or in an annexe of the house, a sort of well-ventilated porch with a direct waste disposal system. As in Anatolia, next to it was the *abdestluk* – a room with a wash basin for daily hygienic needs.¹³⁰ The main piece of furniture was the *sećija* – the built-in multipurpose wooden bench. On it, or the floor, the *dušek* (mattress) would be put. Otherwise, special closets for the mattress and the bedding were used to store them when not in use (*dušekluk*). In contrast, every European house had a bed, even the poorest one. It was large, expensive, and difficult to move, designating the room where it is found as the bedroom.¹³¹

¹²⁷ Ibid., 243–244.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 245.

¹²⁹ The significant presence of three major religions and several denominations (Muslim, Christian, Jewish) makes for probably the most multi-religious province of the Ottoman Empire. In terms of housing culture, one could differentiate between houses of different religionists, as can still be observed today to a lesser degree.

¹³⁰ Muhamed Kadić, *Starinska seoska kuća u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1967), 88–90. Cf. Alija Bejtić, *Spomenici osmanlijske arhitekture u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1953); Amir Pašić, “Prilog proučavanju islamskog stambenog graditeljstva u Jugoslaviji na primjeru Mostara, koliko je stara stambena arhitektura Mostara autohtona pojava” (PhD diss., University of Zagreb, 1989).

¹³¹ In poor households the bed would be shared by all members of the household. It was made of a frame filled with hay (pallet) on top of which a mattress made of wool or feathers would be put. Raffaella Sarti, *Živjeti u kući: stanovanje, prehrana i odijevanje u novovjekovnoj Europi (1500.–1800.)*, trans. Ana Badurina (Zagreb: Ibis grafika, 2006), 138–140 [first edition: *Vita di casa: abitare, mangiare, vestire nell'Europa moderna*, Rome: Laterza, 1999]; Peter Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior: 1400–1600* (New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1991), 111–167. In the examples brought by Thornton, the beds are so tall that one would need a step, a stool, or a chest to climb on it.

Everything mentioned was noted by the Dalmatian traveller Luigi Bassano da Zara (b. ca. 1510) during his extensive travels in the Ottoman Empire. He dedicated two chapters (27, 29) of the popular “On the particular ways and customs of Turkish life” to the olfactory civic regulation, saying that the cities smell nicer, the streets are cleaner, and the people healthier than in Italy because the Turks prohibit cemeteries in towns and the introduction of animals, so the related industry is kept in villages and even then heavily regulated. Otherwise, a captain (municipal sanitation officer) enforced order so that everybody cleaned in front of their houses, did not keep animals or throw garbage around.¹³² He was not impressed with the typical home and the caravanserai, stating that the houses are *very ugly* and poorly made. He noted that the high windows could not be opened or seen through, and were made so “because the Turks jealously keep their women.” The lack of furniture amazed him, seeing that the people sat, ate, and slept on the floor. On the caravanserai, Bassano claimed there were no private hospices (*hosteria*) whatsoever in the Levant, but he found the caravanserai (“hospitali dove hanno delle stanze dette Charvosera”). He disliked them because staying there implied sharing a room (with only a fireplace inside) with other people, without food and bed provided, and being locked during the night. However, he noted the lodging was free or cheap, safe, and some buildings were lavishly and well-made. Lastly, he mentioned there was no religious or ethnic exclusion in these places which are open to all but generally avoided by Christians (appendix 3).¹³³

This short survey of prevalent solutions in the Ottoman World was necessary to form the basis of what a merchant would expect from a commercial and domestic environment, what would be acceptable to them, and subsequently, what needed to be provided if Muslims were to be united under the same roof. These provisions could not be sufficiently provided in a regular European house, as will be argued further, so the traditional local forms needed to be modified to bring them closer to Islamic housing expectations and experiences. Olivia Remie Constable positions the lack of adequate facilities as one of the reasons Muslims

¹³² Luigi Bassano da Zara, *I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de' Turchi* (Rome: Antonio Blado Asolano, 1545), ff. 34v–35r; 36v–37r. Bassano’s short treatise was included in the popular and the many-times republished Francesco Sansovino, *Dell’historia universale dell’origine et imperio de Turchi libri tre* (Venice, 1564) so it reached a wide audience.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, ff. 44v–45v.

rarely visited Europe.¹³⁴ In the subsequent chapters, we will see how the users' needs were addressed by the users themselves, the patrons, and the various mediators, and how the architectural realisations reflect them.




Fig. 2. 2. Salomon Schweigger, *A caravanserai in Bulgaria* (*Ein neue Reiss Beschreibung auss Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem*, Nürnberg, 1608, p. 40)

¹³⁴ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 8.



19. Han u Kasapovićima

Fig. 2. 3 K. Zukić, *A private khan in the village of Kasapovići, Bosnia* (Kreševljaković, *Hanovi i karavansaraji*, fig. 19)

2.2. Housing the Muslim in Europe

2.2.1. Other *fondachi*

Several Adriatic ports would establish *fondachi* to host visiting Muslims, but not before the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 and the advent of Ottoman diplomatic and commercial activity in the eastern Mediterranean. The numbers of Ottoman Muslim traders, while never surpassing those of the Jews, would significantly rise in the 16th century. Before that period, their presence was almost negligible. Olivia Constable argued that the European virtual monopoly of commercial shipping in the Mediterranean, the privileges of European traders in Muslim countries, the lack of appropriate lodging, and the prevalent public opinion in the monocultural European South discouraged Muslim travel west.¹³⁵

The Ottoman Empire spread to the Adriatic in the late 15th century by conquering the Bosnian, Albanian, and Croatian domains. Before the consolidation of its trade policy after the Fourth Ottoman-Venetian War (1570–1573), Ancona and Dubrovnik (together with Florence at the other end) formed the preferred commercial axis for Ottoman trade. In 1514, the Greek merchant Demetrio Caloiro requested trade privileges for the merchants of Arta, Ioannina, and Valona (Vlorë) from the Council of Ancona. This was accepted and a few months later expanded to include all subjects of the sultan.¹³⁶

In 1505 intent was shown to house all Muslim merchants in the *Fondaco* known as the *Palazzo della Farina* – the grain depot in the same building as the *Palazzo del Comune* or *degli Anziani* (fig. 2.4).¹³⁷ In 1522, the grain depots (*fondaco della farina*) on the lower levels of the sea-side of the *Palazzo degli Anziani* (the municipal seat) were repurposed into

¹³⁵ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 328.

¹³⁶ Niccolò Fattori, “The Greeks of Ancona (1510–1595): Migration and Community in the Early Modern Mediterranean” (PhD diss., University of London, 2017), 79; Cf. Jean Delumeau, “Un ponte tra occidente e oriente: Ancona nel Cinquecento,” *Quaderni Storici* 5 (1970): 33.

¹³⁷ Francesco de Bosis et al., *Ancona descritta nella storia e nei monumenti* (Ancona: Gustavo Cherubini, 1870), 182–183.

the “palace of Turkish and other Mohammedan merchants”.¹³⁸ Any private person found hosting them was to be fined a considerable sum of 100 ducats. The choice of the location and the prohibitions testify to both the importance of such trade and the need for control of the Muslim presence in the city. The souring of relations between the Empire and the Papacy that escalated in the formation of the Holy League together with the formal inauguration of the *scala di Spalato* in 1592 will severely affect overall traffic and the Muslim presence in Ancona, leading to its downfall.¹³⁹ However, Orthodox Greeks from the Ottoman Empire will continue to have a significant presence in the city.



Fig. 2. 4 Back side of the Palazzo degli Anziani, Ancona (author Gerardo De Angelis, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Palazzo_frente_porto.jpg accessed 25.6.2022)

¹³⁸ “[...] palacio dei mercanti Turchi et altri Maometani.” Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism: 15th-18th century*, vol. 3, *The perspective of the world*, trans. Siân Reynolds (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), 480. Braudel claimed, without reference, that this was done in 1514. Fattori, “The Greeks of Ancona,” 79–80 corrects the chronology. Unknown to both, the two decisions (Dec. 23 and 30) were published in Vikentij Makušev, *Monumenta historica Slavorum meridionalium vicinorumque populorum e tabulariis et bibliothecis Italicis deprompta* (Warsaw: Srpsko naučno društvo, 1874), 188–189. Interestingly, other merchants could stay at the *Loggia dei mercanti* in the port (fig. 2.5) and were not subjected to such restrictions.

¹³⁹ Renzo Paci, “La rivalità commerciale tra Ancona e Spalato (1590–1645),” *Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le Marche* 82 (1977).




Fig. 2. 5 Loggia dei mercanti, Ancona

(http://sirpac.cultura.marche.it/sirpacinraweb/storage/label/1411/384/00275169_MG_2569.jpg; accessed 25.6.2022.)

On the other side of the Adriatic lies the Republic of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), with its historical double status of a staunchly Catholic Ottoman vassal: strongly aligned with the Papacy and Spain while enjoying the significant protection and privileges of the Empire which surrounded it – in return for yearly tribute and mediation. The reality of Ragusan society is that it was and still is surrounded by Orthodox and Muslim-populated lands. As a consequence, the Republic had a notable Orthodox and Muslim presence. This made it even more restrictive compared to Venice, Split, or Ancona. Never were the Orthodox (merchants, pilgrims, migrants, seasonal workers, or residents) allowed a place of worship or any kind of representation. The visiting Muslims, who were most often Balkans Slavs speaking the same language as the majority of the Ragusan populace, were restricted to using two different solutions. If they did not intend to visit the city proper and pass quarantine in the lazaretto, they could do business with the local Christians in the *Tabor* (Croatian for encampment; called *Bazzaro* in Italian sources) located just outside of the Southern city gate of Ploče, at the end of the *Carigradski drum* – the road to Constantinople (fig. 2.6; 2.8). It was a spacious walled perimeter with a fountain and a pond, depots, warehouses, stables, and rooms. Commerce and other contact were conducted through a grille.¹⁴⁰ Those who wished to enter the city had to go through quarantine in the lazaretto. After that, they were constrained to the *fondaco* – being the only foreigners obliged to stay under guard at a specified location.¹⁴¹ The first known *fondaco* existed at an undisclosed location before 1502,¹⁴² from where it was moved in 1543 to the 15th-century palace of the Duke of Herzegovina Sandalj Hranić Kosača (1370–1435), located behind the old cathedral, next to the port and the Rector’s Palace (fig. 2.7).¹⁴³ We again find a centrally

¹⁴⁰ Lukša Beritić, “Ubikacija nestalih građevinskih spomenika u Dubrovniku II,” *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 12 (1960): 61–67; Ante Milošević, ed., *Lazareti u Dubrovniku* (Dubrovnik: Zavod za obnovu Dubrovnika, 2018).

¹⁴¹ Ilija Mitić, “Imigracijska politika dubrovačke republike s posebnim obzirom na ustanovu svjetovnog azila,” *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 17 (1979): 132. For other merchants, the Republic organised a hospice in the *Sponza* (the customs house) in the mid-14th century, which served to supplement private accommodation. Jorjo Tadić, *Promet putnika u starom Dubrovniku* (Dubrovnik: Izdanje Turističkog saveza u Dubrovniku, 1939), 22.

¹⁴² Radonja Miobratović was elected as its guard that year. Tadić, *Promet putnika u starom Dubrovniku*, 26. It is possible it was somewhere in the Prijeko quarter because the *emin* was housed on the crossing of Žudioska and Prijeko streets. Conveniently, that part became the Jewish ghetto in 1546.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 28. It seems in these earlier times the palace was used to host just the Ottoman officials and guests of the Republic. The palace was destroyed in the earthquake of 1667.

located place – next to the seat of power. Furthermore, the palace was probably the most lavish residential building owned by the Republic. It was decreed in 1571 for it to be *furnished with everything needed*. A grille was to be installed on the window towards the cathedral.¹⁴⁴ Ten years later, the aqueduct was extended from the Rector’s palace *for the comfort of the Turks*.¹⁴⁵ The *Turks* were moved shortly before 1638 when the house was again being leased.¹⁴⁶ This was probably because the part of the *lazzaretti* complex (1590–1642) was designated to house the prior and the merchants after finishing quarantine (fig. 2.8).¹⁴⁷ As we will see in the case study on Split, the merchants in Dubrovnik proceeded closer to the city after quarantine. On the coast, just outside the Ploče gate, a triangular structure with courtyards, warehouses, and rooms was built for them. The Ottoman *emin* (the customs officer) was housed in a wing of the lazaretto courtyard closest to the city which was then detached from the remaining structure.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁴ Nada Grujić, Danko Zelić, “Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranića u Dubrovniku”, in: *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku*, 48 (2010): 130. DAD, Consilium minus, sv. 50, f. 115v, Sept. 22, 1571. “Captum fuit de ordinando dominis officialibus laboreriorum comunis ut faciant adaptare et resarcire domum ubi Turce habitant omnibus rebus necessariis et quod ponere faciam unam cratem ferream uni fenestrae quae respicit ecclesiam Sanctae Mariae.”

¹⁴⁵ Grujić, Zelić, “Palača vojvove Sandalja Hranića,” 131. DAD, Consilium Rogatorum, sv. 66, f. 133v, Sept. 9, 1581. “Prima pars est de commitendo magnifico domino rectori et suo consilio ut faciant conducere aquam ex pallatio in domum Cherezegovinam pro comoditate Turcarum et ut faciant expensam necessariam. Per XXXI, contra IIII. (Secunda pars est de non commitendo cancell.)”

The Jewish ghetto also had its own aqueduct access through a fountain. Cf. Vesna Miović, *The Jewish Ghetto in the Dubrovnik Republic (1546–1808)*, (Dubrovnik, Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zavod za povijesne znanosti, 2005).

¹⁴⁶ Nada Grujić, Danko Zelić, “Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranića,” 98.

¹⁴⁷ On the mercantile complex see: Vladimir Bazala, “Pomorski lazareti u starom Dubrovniku,” in *Dubrovačko pomorstvo: U spomen sto godina Nautičke škole u Dubrovniku*, eds. Jozo Luetić et al. (Dubrovnik: Odbor za proslavu sto godina Nautičke škole u Dubrovniku, 1952); Beritić, “Ubikacija nestalih građevinskih spomenika II,” 61–67; Milošević, *Lazareti u Dubrovniku*.

¹⁴⁸ According to fig. 2.8 found by the author in HR-DAZD-377 (State Archives in Zadar, *Miscellanea*), sv. 1, poz. D, l. 107. The triangular structure seems an improvised solution, unfit for the role. Bazala, “Pomorski lazareti,” 305 argued that the *lazzaretti* complex was never finished and that two additional courtyard sections toward the city were originally planned. Having in mind the location, the realised plan, and the long construction period, this can be accepted as highly possible. Seeing the position of the *emin* and the merchants, it is possible that the unrealised segments would house them.




Fig. 2. 6 *The Ragusan commercial presence* (author Giorgio Eusebio Petetti, https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/archive/7/75/20130923130833%21Espansione_di_Ragusa.png ; accessed 26.6.2022)




Fig. 2. 7 Ivan Tenšek, *Reconstruction of the façade of the palace of Sandalj Hranić* (Grujić, Zelić, “Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranića, 78)




Fig. 2. 8 Walter Raughmann, Mercantile complex in Dubrovnik outside the city gate, 1814. (HR-DAZD-377, Miscellanea, sv. 1, poz. D, l. 107)

Earlier, unconnected variants of the *fondaco* also deserve mention. The Byzantine *mitation* was used to host Syrian Muslim merchants since the 11th century. On the Iberian peninsula since the 13th century and until the ban on Islam (Castille 1500; Navarre 1515; Aragon 1523), Muslims were forced to live in segregated quarters known as the *morerie*, parallel to the Jewish *juderie*. *Fondachs* for Muslim merchants were located within these segregated communities. Both in the *mitaton* and the *moreria fondachs*, one could find Muslim religious spaces – mosques.¹⁴⁹ This concession will be repeated in the reconstruction of the Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi* in 1751.

This ends the short survey of separate lodging provided to Muslim merchants in Europe. However, cultural modifications useful for this discussion can be observed in a completely different building type – the slave prisons of Livorno and Malta.

¹⁴⁹ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 147; 190; 329. We could also find mosques, in a less organised manner, in the South of Italy and the Crusader states in the same period. Concina, *Fondaci*, 59, notes a case from Constantinople during the reign of Emperor Isaac II Angelos (1185–1195), when a Muslim merchant built a mosque “at the *fondaco*”.

2.2.2. Slave prisons

Because of its position at the centre of the Mediterranean and a specific political system, Malta cannot be a direct comparison to the European mainland, but it deserves mention. The Knights of Saint John heavily engaged in piracy, and Malta was a hub of slave trade.¹⁵⁰ For galley slaves and other state-owned people, slaves' prisons (*Bagni degli schiavi*) were their fate. Their movement and other rights were loosely regulated, but they enjoyed religious self-organisation, and mosques were established in the three prisons on the island in Valletta, Vittoriosa, and Senglea.¹⁵¹ The (now demolished) Valletta slaves' prison was established in the 1580s next to the walls above the still existing Old fish market. The three-floor courtyard complex with a hospital, tavern, mosque, dormitories, and two chapels is attributed to the architect Girolamo Cassar (c. 1520–c. 1592).¹⁵² After 1615, the prison was supplied with running water from the Wignacourt Aqueduct.¹⁵³

When speaking about (regulating) religious plurality, Livorno is an unavoidable case. Wanting to repopulate the town, Ferdinando I (1549–1609), the Grand Duke of Tuscany, issued a decree in 1591 that guaranteed protection to all immigrants of “any nation, Eastern Levantines and Westerners, Spanish, Portuguese, Greeks, Germans, Italians, Jews, Turks, and Moors, Armenians, Persians, and others.”¹⁵⁴ Soon, the city was populated with Jews, Orthodox Greeks, Miaphysite Armenians, Protestants, and others. However, the protection offered did not extend to equal rights, as all non-Catholic groups were restricted – especially the Protestants. While it was not built to house migrants but slaves – the *Bagno dei forzati* was formed starting from 1598, probably according to the project of architects

¹⁵⁰ Anne Brogini, “L’esclavage au quotidien à Malte au XVI^e siècle,” *Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, 65 (2002).

¹⁵¹ Godfrey Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000–1812* (Malta: Publishers Enterprises Group, 2002), 439–484.

¹⁵² Leonard Mahoney, *5000 Years of Architecture in Malta* (Malta: Valletta Publications, 1996), 313; David Borg-Muscat, “Prison life in Malta in the 18th century – Valletta's Gran Prigione,” *Storja* (2001); Wettinger, *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo*, 85–126.

¹⁵³ Themistocles Zammit, “The Water Supply of the Maltese Islands,” *Archivium Melitense* 7, n. 1 (1922): 8.

¹⁵⁴ Stephanie Nadalo, “Constructing Pluralism in Seventeenth Century Livorno: Managing Religious Minorities in a Mediterranean Free Port (1537–1737)” (PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2013) 3. See also: Stephanie Nadalo, “Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier: Livorno's Turkish Bagno (1547–1747),” *Mediaevalia* 32 (2011); Lucia Frattarelli Fischer, “Il bagno delle galere in 'terra cristiana',” *Nuovi Studi Livornesi* 8 (2000).

Claudio Cogorano (d. 1618) and Alessandro Pieroni (1550–1607).¹⁵⁵ A prison in all regards,¹⁵⁶ it served as the quarters for galley slaves in the port, next to the *Palazzo del Governatore* and the central customs house (fig. 2.9). Not exclusively, but most of these slaves were Muslims captured by the Knights of the Military Order of Saint Stephen, numbering several thousand at times.¹⁵⁷

It was a very large three-floor building oriented to the courtyard, with dormitories (containing *tavoli* – raised boards for sleeping), a penitentiary, a tavern, offices, workshops, shops, a central cistern for drinking, and a well for washing. Long corridors connected the floors with the two hospitals around the second courtyard – one for Christians, the other for Muslims. The building was closed to the outside, and guards patrolled the perimeter on top of the walls. At each corner, the guards had a bell – to signal any escape attempt. The church comprised an entire wing, dominating the complex. It was run by the Archconfraternity of the *Purificazione di Maria Vergine e dei Catecumeni*, demonstrating a (limited) pious goal of Christianisation.¹⁵⁸ Otherwise, four smaller spaces were organised as mosques, whose *coggia* (*hodja*) was allowed to lead services, wear a turban, and was exempt from physical labour.¹⁵⁹ Friar Luca da Caltanissetta visited the main mosque and described the spaces and the ritual cleansing preceding entry:

¹⁵⁵ Dario Matteoni, *Livorno* (Rome; Bari: Laterza, 1985): 39; Frattarelli Fischer, “Il bagno delle galere,” 80.

¹⁵⁶ Even the name suggests the same. *Banyol* means prison in Ottoman Turkish. *Bagno* is a mistranslation established by Giorgio Vasari il Giovane (the nephew of his more famous namesake) in the 1596 treatise *La città ideale: Piante di chiese (palazzi e ville) di Toscana e d’Italia*, ed. Virginia Stefanelli (Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1970). On the slave prisons see pp. 182–183. The *forzati* refers to Europeans enslaved due to debt bondage or criminal offenses.

¹⁵⁷ Federico chose to represent himself on the monument in the port (*I Quattro Mori*) as a Knight of Saint Stephen, triumphing over four Moorish slaves in chains. See: Giorgio Mandalis, *I mori e il granduca: storia di un monumento sconveniente* (Livorno: Belforte, 2009).

¹⁵⁸ Giuseppe Piombanti, *Guida storica ed artistica della città e dei dintorni di Livorno* (Livorno: Gio. Marini, 1903), 339–340.

¹⁵⁹ Nadalo, “Negotiating Slavery,” 300. The same was tolerated among the slaves in Marseille, Naples, and Civitavecchia, where no similar architectural solutions could be found. In Naples especially, as in other lands of the Spanish crown, the presence of free Muslim traders was several times suppressed, most strongly in 1635. Cf. Salvatore Bono, *Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia moderna. Galeotti, vu’ cumprà, domestici* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1999); Giuliana Boccadamo, *Napoli e l’Islam: Storie di musulmani, schiavi e rinnegati in età moderna* (Naples: D’Auria, 2010); Gennaro Varriale, “Tra il Mediterraneo e il fonte battesimale: Musulmani a Napoli nel XVI secolo,” *Revista de historia moderna*, 31 (2013).

A so-called *bagno* is also seen here, which is a place of the men of the galleys of the Grand Duke, where the Capuchins assist in administering the Holy Sacraments to these poor souls, with their beautiful and clean chapels that arouse devotion. On this occasion, the aforementioned Capuchin friars have shown me the Muslim *moscova* [sic! mosque] which is a small house [room], into which the Muslims do not enter if not barefoot and clean of any filth. In it, there is a pulpit with two stairways, the Quran and their other law books. On one side there is a gilded cape, on another a trumpet and other small things which they adore. There they practice their Mohammedan law. This mosque is allowed because even the Muslims permit Christians in their *bagni* to organise secret churches.¹⁶⁰

An Arab visitor – the Emir of Lebanon Fakhr al-Din II (ca. 1572–1635) visited the *Bagno* in 1613 as a guest of the Grand Duke during his four-year exile. Note his description of the sleeping arrangements and the unusually descriptive observation on defecation:

In Leghorn, there is a prison for captives [asara]. It consists of four long, vaulted buildings with a high open space in the middle. In the center, there is a post to which the captive is tied and beaten if he errs. There are rooms on the upper level for the guards with entrances different from those for the captives. There are small windows in the floor through which the cells can be seen so that when the captives move, the guards are alerted. The gate to the cells is locked from the side of the guards so that the captives can neither open nor shut it. There are captains and wardens [wardiyanat from the Italian guardiano?] who give out passes to the captives to go and attend to the needs and possessions of the governor, and in the evening, collect them. There are wooden layers inside the cells. They said that in the cells there are more than three thousand Muslims as well as Christian criminals. They have six galleys, and when they want to sail out but are short [of men], they use some of the captives. All those inside the cells defecate in barrels that have covers. The captives lift the barrels and empty them outside the wall.¹⁶¹

¹⁶⁰ “Quivi vidde anche il bagno, così domandato, qual è un luogo della gente della galere del granduque, ove assistono i capuccini per amministrare i Santi Sacramenti a quei poverelli, con le sue cappelle bellissime e pulitissime quali eccitano a devotione. I suddetti Padri capuccini con tal occasione mi fecero vedere la Moscova dei Turchi quale è una piccola casa, nella quale i Turchi non entrano se non a piedi scalzi e ben limpi d’ogni sporchezza, in cui vi è una cathedra con due scale, il libro del suo Alcorano ed altri libri della sua legge, in una parte vi sta indorata una cappa, in un’altra un trobante et altre coselle quali sono da loro adorati e quivi facciono i loro esercittii della loro maumettana legge. Questa muscova gli si permette perchè anche i turchi permettono a Christiani nei loro bagno il fare le loro segrete chiese.” *Relatione del Viaggio e Missione fatto per me Fra Luca da Caltanisetta*. Cited in Bono, *Schiavi musulmani nell’Italia*, 243; Nadalo, “Negotiating slavery,” 301.

¹⁶¹ Nabil Matar, *Europe through Arab Eyes, 1578–1727* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), 176.

As Stephanie Nadalo has shown, the Medici architect replicates a model of the North African *bagni* proposed by Giorgio Vasari il Giovane (1562–1625) in 1596, together with the Slave prisons of Valetta (also cited by Vasari). Both examples were structures centred on the courtyard, with various services provided. Vasari never witnessed such structures but modelled his plans on a *capriccio* – idealising his reference models as neutral, classicised spaces of work productivity that provide for the slaves.¹⁶² Contrary to Vasari’s centralised *capriccio*, the North African *bagni* were multiple housing units separated by religion, gender, and class. However, the initial management of the *bagno* was explicitly modelled after similar solutions in Istanbul and was envisioned in consultation with Christians formerly enslaved in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁶³ Unlike the *forzati*, who were Christians, the slaves (clearly racially distinct) could walk around Livorno and work for an independent salary during the day when the *bagno* would be kept open.¹⁶⁴ The system was abolished in 1747,¹⁶⁵ and the building destroyed in World War II bombings.

What slave prisons show is that cohabitation was allowed among the *men of chains* (*uomini della catena*) insofar as it did not spread to wider society. Inside such heavily segregated communities, concessions could be made to the Religious Other concerning a degree of economic enfranchisement, minimal freedom of movement, religious and cultural habits, such as mosques, religious organisation, and water. Unlike a *fondaco*, where merchants could come or not depending on if they wanted to visit a city, these spaces were prisons. Slaves could not leave when they wanted. The mentioned concessions were (also) justified with diplomatic reciprocity, as mentioned by da Caltanissetta. After all, there were far greater numbers of Christian slaves in Muslim lands, and they benefited from relative religious tolerance, forms of self-organisation, and somewhat decent living conditions depending on their status.¹⁶⁶ In the *fondaco*, concessions in housing culture were made to lure the merchants in and keep them from the city, while in the *bagno* they were a product of reciprocity. Reasons aside, the slave prisons show that architecture for the Muslim

¹⁶² Nadalo, “Negotiating slavery,” 287–289.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 292–293. This would soon change. Alessandro Risaliti, the Commissioner of the Galleys warned that the *bagno* is a new thing in Christianity, very different from the Turkish custom.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 296.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 305.

¹⁶⁶ Nadalo, “Negotiating slavery,” 305.

includes religious spaces and specific sanitation solutions, including water for ritual washing and – believing Fakhr al-Din – latrines.

- A. Entrance (ground floor)
- B. Courtyard
- C. Communal Dormitory “San Giuseppe” (upper level)
- D. Communal Dormitory “San Francesco” (upper level)
- E. Communal Dormitory “della Concezione” (upper level)
- F. Principal Church (upper level)
- G. Turkish Mosque (upper level)
- H. Principal Mosque, “Moschea Maggiore” (upper level)
- I. Tavern (ground floor)
- J. Slave Shops, “Botteghe delli Schiavi” (ground floor)




Fig. 2. 9 Schematic rendering of bagno floor plan detail, upper-level overlay with ground floor partially visible, based on a late seventeenth-century plan (Nadalo, “Negotiating Slavery,” 290)

2.3. Foreigners and the city – Muslims in Venice before the *Fondaco*

The Venetian system of foreigner control functioned on a case-to-case basis. Immigration was allowed to all Christians, and the immigrants tended to group and organise in certain neighbourhoods, around confraternities and churches. Immigration from the East surged during the 15th century when Ottoman expansion pushed large numbers of Albanians, Slavs, and Greeks toward the city. This was followed by the institution of the *Scuola di Santa Maria degli Albanesi* (1442) and the *Scuola dalmata dei Santi Giorgio e Trifone* (1451). In 1516 the Ghetto was established for the Jews. The Orthodox Greeks organised their confraternity in 1498 and requested a church in 1514 (there was a Greek chapel in *San Biagio* from 1470), while an Armenian *domus* with the church of *Santa Croce* is attested from the 13th century.¹⁶⁷ The *Ragusei*, *Lucchesi*, *Milanesi*, *Begamarschi*, *Veronesi*, *Vicentini*, *Padovani*, and all others should not be particularly mentioned, while the Germans and their *Fondaco* have already been discussed.

All non-Venetians (whether from the Republic or foreigners) were subjected to mobility control through registration, stay permits, and lodging in regulated public or private *osterie*, *albergherie*, *taverne*, *locande*, *case di comunità*, under the control of the office of the *Giustizia Nuova*. The *Giustizia Nuova* was both the wine supplier and the wine taxing office for these places. The *public osterie* were not State-owned but were private establishments with special privileges regarding hosting newcomers in Venice, prices, and wine permits. Their number was continually between 20 and 24. All *osterie* – as the prominent establishments, had regulations concerning their form. Only one door was allowed, and windows and balconies were to be such that no person could enter or exit through them. In 1510 the *Collegio* decreed that the minimum stay for foreigners in an *osteria* was 30 days (if special permits were not procured), after which they were free to

¹⁶⁷ See Ersie C. Burke, *The Greeks of Venice*.

lodge in a place of their choosing.¹⁶⁸ The *albergo* was a private accommodation recognised by the State. Licences needed to be procured for lodging particular foreign *nations*. The guests had to stay there for a minimum of four months before moving to other establishments. The *case di comunità* were free-of-charge places for hosting individuals from the Venetian *Terraferma* on official assignments in the capitol. *Taverne* both hosted people and functioned as restaurants and bars. Prostitution in the *taverne* and the *alberherie* was widespread despite efforts to regulate it. *Locande* were establishments for sleeping only, but this legal term was colloquially used to describe other hospitality-related establishments, as were the others.¹⁶⁹

The comparison with the ghetto will be elaborated on later. For now, it suffices to say that the Jews generally had a separate system of hostelries within the Jewish quarter or ghetto.¹⁷⁰ In Venice, hosting foreign Jews was controlled by the *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia* (as merchants of interest) and the *Ufficiali al cattaver* (in charge of the Ghetto). The regime was such that the Jews had to stay within the Ghetto unless they were Levantine traders (*Ebrei da mar*) who could choose their lodging after staying for three days in the Ghetto hostelry. However, most of them would continue their sojourn there, preferring the community and networks of the *Ghetto Vecchio*. All non-resident Jews could stay in Venice for a maximum of 15 days only once every year.¹⁷¹

While numerous studies quoted in the chapter on the historiography dealt with foreigners in the city, they have been concentrating on other Christian groups and the Jews. Only rarely do these works mention Muslims, and when they do – they are on the margins, used to prove an encompassing argument concerning the Jews and other minority groups, market spaces, shipping, and similar.¹⁷² Sufficient information can, however, be found in

¹⁶⁸ A copy of this decision was attached to the discussions on the first location for the *Fondaco dei Turchi* in: ASVe, Secreta, Materie miste e notabili, b. 55, fasc. II, Mar. 2, 1510.

¹⁶⁹ Rosa Salzberg, "Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange," Lina Urban, *Locande a Venezia* (Venice: Centro Internazionale della Grafica, 1989); *Venezia e il "foresto": situazioni avventure, meraviglie, quando anche i re alloggiavano in locande: hosterie, locande e alberghi dal XIII al XIX secolo* (Venice: Centro internazionale della grafica, 1990).

¹⁷⁰ Constable, *Housing the stranger*, 331.

¹⁷¹ Costantini, "Le strutture dell'ospitalità," 903.

¹⁷² Such as: Benjamin Ravid, "The Religious, Economic and Social Background and Context of the Establishment of the Ghetti of Venice," in *Gli Ebrei e Venezia*, ed. Gaetano Cozzi (Milan: Edizioni

historiographical works on Venice and its relations with the East.¹⁷³ Already Paolo Preto established that the *Turkish* (Ottoman Muslim) presence in Venice, although significant, could be compared to that of the Jews and the Germans.¹⁷⁴ Although the first international commercial accords were from 1419,¹⁷⁵ he found the first significant number of Ottoman Muslim merchants in private guest houses and brothels in the parish of Santi Giovanni e Paolo in 1516.¹⁷⁶ The first important decisions concerning trade brokering (and Turkish-Italian translation) were from 1541 when it was decided that a dragoman must be present in all transactions with the *Turks*,¹⁷⁷ while significant duties exemptions were guaranteed to all Ottoman subjects.¹⁷⁸ This caused the trade to expand further, which statistically led to more incidents. Due to several thefts and malpractices, the Grand Vizier Damat Rüstem Pasha (1500–1561) wrote in 1546 to the Doge Francesco Dona (1468–1553) that protection must be guaranteed to the many Ottoman merchants, as is done in his sultan’s lands.¹⁷⁹ Another important chapter in this pre-*Fondaco* era is from the beginning of the Fourth Ottoman-Venetian War (1570–1573). During the night of 13 September 1569, a great fire occurred in the Arsenal that destroyed ships and facilities while stopping production. This is believed to have encouraged the Ottoman Empire to invade Cyprus nine months later.¹⁸⁰ The Jews and the *Turks* were accused.¹⁸¹ When the War began, the *bailo* (ambassador) in Constantinople, Marcantonio Barbaro (1518–1595), was arrested with all other Venetians there. The Senate responded with the same measure, confining all non-Christian Ottoman

Comunità, 1987); Donatella Calabi, *The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 200; Molà, “Fondaci, mercanti, artigiani”.

¹⁷³ Turan “Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi”; Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*; Kafadar, “A Death in Venice”; Pedani, *In nome del Gran Signore*. Rare instances when people moved to Venice from the Levant in earlier periods can be found in Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali*.

¹⁷⁴ Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 127. For Preto, the term *Turco* means Ottoman Muslim, not just ethnic Turk.

¹⁷⁵ Imhaus, *Le minoranze orientali*, 559–560; Kafadar, “A Death in Venice,” 192.

¹⁷⁶ Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 127.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 128.

¹⁷⁸ Giuseppe Stefani, *L’assicurazione a Venezia: dalle origini alla fine della Serenissima*, vol. 1 (Trieste: Assicurazioni Generali di Trieste e Venezia, 1956), 305–307.

¹⁷⁹ Turan, “Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi,” 275–276.

¹⁸⁰ George Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. 3, *The Frankish Period, 1432–1571* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948), 883.

¹⁸¹ Andrea Zannini, *Venezia città aperta: Gli stranieri e la Serenissima XIV-XVIII sec.* (Venice: Marcianum Press, 2009), not paginated.

merchants: 75 Muslims and 97 Jews, to the *Bailo's* Cannaregio palace.¹⁸² The Grand Vizier Sokollu Mehmet Pasha (1506–1579) proposed to exchange the prisoners one for one, which means that the Ottoman numbers in Venice were similar to the Venetian ones in Constantinople. In the end, the prisoners were not exchanged, but the Ottoman subjects were soon liberated from their house arrest to resume their business as long as they did not leave the city.¹⁸³ Their number continued to rise, and in 1581 the Senate wrote that it was *countless*, so another dragoman was assigned to mediate with the locals.¹⁸⁴ When the *Fondaco dei Turchi* stabilised in the Palazzo Pesaro in 1621, the number of *Turkish* brokers grew to 33 out of a total of 190 of them.¹⁸⁵ The papal nuncio Giambattista Castagna (1521–1590; became pope Urban VII 12 days before his death) wrote that the *Turks* themselves asked for a “building of their own comparable to the Ghetto” in August 1573.¹⁸⁶ This account is of low credibility due to several reasons. Firstly, there is no evidence of any such request. Future (negative) reactions of the Muslim merchants to the establishment of the *Fondaco dei Turci* present it as unlikely. Furthermore, Castagna’s source is unknown. As he did not have direct access to Venetian institutions, the source was either a rumour, or a third-hand account heard from someone who did have access. While this makes it unlikely, such a request was not impossible considering the anti-Ottoman climate in Venice at the

¹⁸² Giovanni Battista Galliccioli, *Delle Memorie Venete Antiche Profane Ed Ecclesiastiche*, vol. 1 (Venice: Domenico Fracasso, 1795), 101–102. I was not able to locate the palace. The choice of the place, while conveniently large, was likely a political statement. The general location is confirmed by a contemporary source: Rocco Benedetti, *Ragguaglio delle allegrezze, solennità e feste fatte in Venetia per la felice vittoria di Lepanto* (Venice: Gratoso Perchaccino, 1571), not paginated. Benedetti writes that the *Turks* closed themselves in the palace after their defeat at Lepanto out of fear of being stoned to death. Cited in Grenet, “Institution de la coexistence,” 283.

¹⁸³ Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 128–129.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 129–130. Their numbers continued to increase. Next year, Bosnians Hassan and Risuan (probably Rizvan) requested a *schiaivonesco*, or South Slavic-speaking broker, although 4 of the 20 Turkish brokers already knew that language alongside Turkish. Kafadar, “A Death in Venice,” 203.

¹⁸⁵ Kafadar, “A Death in Venice,” 203. Cf. Giorgio Vercellin, “Mercanti Turchi e Sensali a Venezia,” *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 4 (1980).

¹⁸⁶ “[...] per commodità delle mercantie un luogo proprio come hanno li Giudei il loro ghetto.” Adriana Buffardi, ed., *Nunziature di Venezia*, vol. 11, *18 giugno 1573–22 dicembre 1576*, (Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l’età moderna e contemporanea, 1972), 283–295. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 130; Concina, *Fondaci*, 221; Stephen Ortega, “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries: Ottoman Networks and Spaces in Early Modern Venice,” *Mediterranean Studies* 18 (2009): 71. I have not found any corroborating evidence. Fusaro, *Political Economies of Empire*, 215 claims that documents (ASVe, Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia, b. 187 2. serie, fasc. 1–2, 1574, June 4, 1588; Dec. 5, 1618; and also ASVe, Compilazione Leggi, b. 210, Mar. 28, 1620) point to the *Turks* requesting a *fondaco* on numerous occasions but in fact they do not, instead showing their negative reaction to its implementation.

time. After the European victory at Lepanto on 7 October 1571, the merchants were attacked and retreated to their residences.¹⁸⁷ On 19 March 1574, Hassan and Mustafa – representatives of Sokollu Mehmet Pasha, complained of a verbal and physical attack that happened the previous night. During the entirety of their stay, they claimed to have been subjected to all kinds of verbal assaults when in public.¹⁸⁸ The Venetian government had bilateral agreements and obligations to protect them as diplomatic envoys and Ottoman subjects, so they reprinted the guarantees of safety and prohibitions on verbally and physically attacking Ottoman subjects (as they will on numerous occasions in the future). Preto brings prevalent popular stereotypes of the *Turks*, which can easily be imagined and do not need to be repeated.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, while unlikely, a small group might have requested a solution similar to the Ghetto.¹⁹⁰

¹⁸⁷ Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 129; Pedani, *In nome del Gran Signore*, 203–209; Kafadar, “A Death in Venice,” 199–201.

¹⁸⁸ On the basis of this and similar attacks Ortega finds a *Turkish* request for a *fondaco* likely: “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries,” 72–73.

¹⁸⁹ Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 116–120; 144–145.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Ortega, “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries,” 71–73.

2.3.1. Sex, food, and apostasy: problems of cohabitation

The Inquisition was involved several times in the lodging houses that hosted Muslims in Venice. In 1571 a Christianised Bulgarian servant called Zorzi (Giorgio) attempted to escape Venice with three other boys, return home, and revert to Islam. He was aided by Muslims staying at the lodging house ran by the Greek broker Francesco di Dimitri Lettino – who would become the custodian of the first *Fondaco dei Turchi*. Lettino was arrested two years later by the Inquisition on charges of aiding the boy in apostasy, together with his wife Giulia.¹⁹¹ Food and physical outlook formed the basis of Zorzi's apostasy. It was ascertained that his head was shaved, that he was dressed in Turkish clothing, and that he ate meat on Fridays and Saturdays.¹⁹² In his defence, he continued to drink wine. During his first days there, the boy was hidden from Francesco by Giulia – the lady of the house who was questioned next. Her testimony reverts the argument to food which could be a vessel of apostasy. The Inquisition asked Giulia whether she prepared meat on Fridays and Saturdays, whether the family ate it, and whether they ate with their guests. Giulia negated each instance, except one Friday when Zorzi gave her four-year-old daughter a pumpkin roll (made with grease), but Giulia saw it and gave it to the cat.¹⁹³ In the end, Lettino warned of his proven loyalties to the Republic and Christendom and was only fined 200 ducats after a Demetri from Spalato vouched for him.¹⁹⁴ Lettino was indeed a broker (*sensalo*) and thus prohibited from hosting people, but this rule was often ignored.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ Ersie Burke, "Francesco di Demetri Litino, the Inquisition and the Fondaco dei Turchi," *Thesaurismata* 36 (2006): 79. The article establishes a biography according to which Lettino also worked as an interpreter and broker for Greek and *schiavonesco* (out of all the South Slavic idioms, he probably spoke early modern Dalmatian, or Chakavian Croatian that he learned from his wives: Margareta from Klis (d. 1555), and Giulia, both Dalmatians and merchants in their own right. This idiom was the contemporary literary standard in that region). The Inquisition established that he used this language when conversing with his guests – most of them Balkan Muslims. Lettino claimed not to know Turkish.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 88. The Patriarch was in charge of controlling the kitchens of private inns on these days.

¹⁹³ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 33

¹⁹⁴ Burke, "Francesco di Demetri Litino," 89.

¹⁹⁵ See Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, esp. chapter 2.

Another Inquisition case witnessed a licensed lodger – Paolina Briani. During the 1580s, Briani was interviewed several times regarding the alleged promiscuous practices taking place in her house, which was being rented to Ottoman Greeks and Muslims. Two main points of contention arose: interreligious (sexual) contact and religious observance as seen from eating habits. Paolina was accused of procuring Christian prostitutes for her guests and even of having sexual relations with them, resulting in a daughter. Equally scandalous, her locale was allegedly a scene of forced religious conversion when an Armenian Christian servant was forced to dress like a Muslim and observe their customs, including eating meat on prohibited days – which her other guests did unscrupulously.¹⁹⁶ Finally, Briani was exonerated because the men in her house cooked for themselves and did so *better than women*, with no mention of prostitution.¹⁹⁷ These fears were perpetuated in a 1622 case when an unnamed Muslim-born woman who turned Christian for 12 years took refuge in the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, wanting to return to her original faith.¹⁹⁸

Such episodes, more than demonstrating the cosmopolitan ambient of the city, show the limits of Venetian cosmopolitanism as delineated by the ruling elite. Who could and could not be included in urban life and to what degree? As we have seen, the Orthodox Greeks did not provoke the same level of scandal as the Muslims or the Jews did. This was true even for prostitutes, whose establishments were allegedly frequented by the Turks. Prostitution might have been frowned upon, but it was legal, and the main problem here was sexual intimacy with the *Other* and apostasy that could arise from such proximity.¹⁹⁹ The same was valid for food which was used to assert Catholic identity and boundaries with non-Christians.²⁰⁰ If these boundaries of identity could not be relied upon, it was better if they were physical. Leonardo Donà (doge: 1606–1612) commented in 1596 that “the

¹⁹⁶ Rosa Salzberg, “Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange,” 399–400; Ortega, *Negotiating Transcultural Relations*, 25–26; 33

¹⁹⁷ Salzberg, *Transcultural Relations*, 416.

¹⁹⁸ Pedani, *In Nome del Gran Signore*, 83.

¹⁹⁹ Minchella, *Frontiere aperte*, 67–70.

²⁰⁰ See Eleanor Barnett, “Food and religious Identities in the Venetian Inquisition: ca. 1560–ca. 1640,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 74 (2021).

mess of the houses in which Turks live with Christians should be changed.”²⁰¹ As Stephen Ortega concluded on the matter: “Fear of this type of contact created the need for physical boundaries that could both be identified and maintained.”²⁰²

²⁰¹ “[...] disordine delle habitationi de Turchi mescolati a christiani, ben degno di essere rimediato.” Federico Seneca, *Il doge Leonardo Donà: La sua vita e la sua preparazione politica prima del dogado* (Padua: Antenore, 1959), 205.

²⁰² Stephen Ortega, *Negotiating Transcultural Relations*, 44.

3. INSTITUTING A SYSTEM: VENICE

3.1. Francesco di Dimitri Lettino and *un albergo particolare*

In the changing times after the Fourth Ottoman Venetian War, the already-known Francesco Lettino sent a supplication to the Senate on 28 October 1574 asking for the right to institute a *ridutto* (to be understood as *fondaco*),²⁰³ namely a particular hostelry (*un albergo particolare*), for the incoming *Turks* “as they have provided to the *Christian nation* in the Levant”, and as other nations have in Venice (appendix 4).²⁰⁴ He said that the institution of a formal *albergo* under his management would benefit all while claiming that the roaming *Turks* are an offence to the Name of God and bring dishonour to Christian Venice because they steal, corrupt, even kidnap the youth, and sleep with Christian women. On the other side, he stated that the *Turks* are complaining about being robbed and even attacked by their hosts. In return for performing this difficult task free of charge to the public coffers, he asked for himself and his many descendants the monopoly to operate this building where all *Turks* were to stay immediately upon their arrival and until the moment of their departure. The Senate instructed the office of the *Sopraprovveditori alla Giustizia Nuova (Sette Savi)* to look into the matter, and they sent their approval on the *habitation of all the Turks* half a year later.²⁰⁵ They confirmed what Lettino stated, adding that they

²⁰³ *Il ridotto*, or *ridotto*, is literally a place where people gather – today used as an alternative term for the foyer. Historically the term has been used as a synonym for the Italian *fondachi* and similar mercantile spaces of gathering in the Orient according to the Dictionary of the Istituto Treccani: *Vocabolario Treccani on line*, <https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/ridotto2/> (accessed 30.11.2021).

²⁰⁴ ASVe, Cinque Savi alla mercanzia (henceforth V Savi), 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, unpaginated, Oct. 28, 1574; also at: BMC, PDc 740, item II, Giornale del Fondaco dei Turchi, p. 1. The copy at the *Cinque Savi* was consulted by Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 130; Concina, *Fondaci*, 222–223; Ravid, “The Religious, Economic and Social Background,” 234. Stephen Ortega, “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries: Ottoman Networks and Spaces in Early Modern Venice,” *Mediterranean Studies* 18 (2009), pp. 66-89; Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 198.

²⁰⁵ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, May 17, 1575. The *Sopraprovveditori alla Giustizia Nuova e vin dalla spina (Sette Savi alla Giustizia Nuova)* was the office in charge of controlling and assisting that of the *Provveditori alla Giustizia Nuova* who were in charge of giving and taking permits for wine sale in the *osterie*, taxing wine sale, and regulating wine use to prevent drunkenness and safeguard public morality. As wine sale was prohibited in all hospitality related places except in the *osterie*, they were in charge of

looked into him and that he is indeed loyal and the perfect person for the job “for the experience he has of the Turks, of their nature and customs”.²⁰⁶ However, he was the only one allowed to live in the *fondaco* – his numerous family was to be kept separate. Lettino, kept informed of the process, sent another letter to the Senate that was read before the vote on 16 August 1575 and added new arguments to his original supplication (appendix 5).²⁰⁷ He was told beforehand that he needed always to have three or four servants just to keep the place clean as “the Turkish nation is dirty by nature”, as well as that the people and goods inside needed to be kept safe at all times. He also explained how he intended to make money from this undertaking, which he elaborated on by comparing the financial scheme to that in Syria in the *fondachi* for Christians. He sent a separate letter to the *Sette Savi*, confirming that if chosen, his family would live outside the *fondaco* because the goal was to separate the Muslims from the Christians.²⁰⁸ In the same letter, he referred to the *Turks*’ peculiar eating and sleeping habits, positioning himself both as a mediator and a loyal Venetian.²⁰⁹ On the short Senate session of the same day, Lettino’s supplication was approved as a most Christian and beneficial act for both the City and the *Turks*. The *Sette Savi* were ordered to form a board with the Public dragoman Michiel Membré²¹⁰ to see

controlling all of the hospitality and wine related establishments such as the *furatole*, *albergarie*, *magazeni*, *bastioni*, *burchi*, *zattere*, regulating them.

²⁰⁶ “[...] per la pratica che ha delli Turchi, della loro natura, et costumi [...] egli sarà ottimo a questo maneggio.” Ibid.

²⁰⁷ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Aug. 16, 1575; Secreta, Materia mista e notabili (henceforth MMN), b. 55, fasc. II, pp. 1–5. Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 67, under date.

²⁰⁸ Ibid.

²⁰⁹ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 198 also mentions the washing, but I did not find it mentioned in the document Rothman consults (V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Aug. 16, 1575). It was also consulted by Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 131.

²¹⁰ Michiel Membré (c. 1510–1594) a Cypriot-born Greek with Circassian roots. His mother tongue was Greek, he spoke Italian and Turkish, commanded Arabic, Syriac, and limited Persian. During his youth, he worked as a commercial agent in Syria and Anatolia. In 1539 he successfully led a Venetian diplomatic mission to Persia, for which he filled a long report in 1542. He managed to draw on this adventure to become the dragoman of the Republic in 1550 until his death. During his long career, he monopolised the craft and became wealthy, influencing Venetian Eastern commercial policy. For the Republic, he also negotiated in Constantinople, Cairo, and Dalmatia. From the 1550s onwards, he collaborated on a number of maps. His figure can be found on the lower left of the altarpiece he commissioned for the church of San Felice made by the Florentine artist Domenico Passignano in the 1580s. Benjamin Arbel, “Translating the Orient for the Serenissima: Michiel Membré in the Service of Sixteenth-Century Venice,” in *La frontiere méditerranéenne du XVe au XVIIe siècle*, eds. Albrecht Fuess, Bernard Heyberger, (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013); Maria Pia Pedani, “The Interpreter Michele Membré’s Life in Venice,” in *Cultures of Empire: Rethinking Venetian Rule 1400–1700*, eds. Georg Christ, Franz-Julius Morche (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Rothman, *The Dragoman Renaissance*, 103–104.

what was necessary to establish such a *good and saintly work* and to find a place that could serve the needs they will put into writing.²¹¹

Lettino's supplications and the senatorial response function on a dual socio-religious argumentation.²¹² Christian Venetians, even the Christianity of Venice and her honour needed to be saved from the moral decay brought by the *Turks*. In contrast, the *Turks* needed to be physically protected from the Venetians.

To provide for this, an old solution was invoked – that of the *fondaco*. After all, *fondachi* were used for a millennium to host merchant groups such as the Venetians in the Levant. There was the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* in Venice, these buildings could be managed separately from the city, were relatively enclosed, and – as a rule – were locked at night. By invoking grouping, separation, security, nightly closure, and the mercantile character of it, Lettino already laid out a *fondaco* in everything but in name, instead using the terms *ridutto* and *albergo particolare*. However, the name and all other characteristics will be clarified in the building proposals, especially in consultation with Michiel Membré – the official interpreter of the Republic (dragoman) and a man of expertise on the Levant. Starting with Lettino, all future actors will invoke the Ottoman examples as precedents in order to provide the *Turks* with a legitimate solution they would presumably be accustomed to, while maintaining separation.

The need for Muslim-Christian separation is therefore the main motive for the institution of the *Fondaco*, underlined from the start even in the requirement that Lettino's family be kept separate from the guests. As we have seen, the family already had problems with the Inquisition due to proximity to their Muslim guests. The needs and customs of the *Turks* were also addressed but are subordinate arguments that are used to legitimize segregation. As Natalie Rothman proves, Lettino wielded existing prejudice to establish state policy, while also making analogies between Venice and the Levant to present the *fondaco* as

²¹¹ “ [...] che sia comesso alli Sette Savi Nostri in Rialto, che tolto sopra, ciò quelle informazioni che li parerano necessarie per effettur opera cosi buona, et santa, et appresso conferirsi insieme con il fedelissimo Dragomano nostro Michiel Membrè ha vedere che luogo fosse approposito per questo effetto [...]”. BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 7, Aug. 16, 1575 in Pregadi. Cf. Ravid, “The Religious, Economic and Social Background,” 236.

²¹² Noted by Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 130.

something necessary and accustomed to the merchants themselves.²¹³ After all, they used it back home, and more so – the system was reciprocal because the same was provided to the *Christian nation* in the Levant. All subsequent *fondaco* projects will respond to the two prerequisites established in 1574–1575 as spaces of residential segregation that simultaneously provide accommodation according to the Muslims’ cultural and religious needs, at least from the Venetian point of view. To establish how these prerequisites were tackled, it is necessary to take a look at the proposals for the first Muslims’ *fondaco* in Venice, from 1575 until the stabilisation of the *Fondaco dei Turchi* in the Palazzo Pesaro in 1621.²¹⁴

²¹³ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 198.

²¹⁴ Most of these proposals were summarily mentioned by Concina, *Fondaci*, 225–226.

3.2. *Un fondaco per i Turchi: Finding a place*

Two initial proposals came to the Office of the *Sette Savi* that, together with the dragoman Michiel Membrè, was charged with surveying the buildings and making a recommendation. The first was a new project at *contrada* San Fantin proposed by Andrea Malipiero (di Sebastiano) to lodge the *Mohammedan nation*.²¹⁵ Malipiero explained his proposal accompanied by a drawing (not preserved), stating that the building would have a ground floor, a mezzanine, and a first floor with an encompassing internal portico. The ground floor would have three wells and four very large warehouses, with a wide staircase leading to 59 *regular* and 16 *very large* rooms above. An apartment for the custodian would be made above the main entrance. All rooms would be furnished with a fireplace and have small external windows positioned high. Otherwise, Malipiero would provide a stove (*stufa*),²¹⁶ toilets (*necessarij alla loro usanza*), and a separate bathroom (*bagno, che è molto necessario a questa nazione*). He also praised the location, having a *Riva* with convenient access to the Rialto, San Marco, and the *Dogana da Mar*. Isolation was a particular concern and nobody was to see in or out.²¹⁷ This is also evident in the treatment of the Lettino family, which was to be assigned another house just around the street. Malipiero claimed that he could make everything ready in 15–20 days, especially concerning the reduction in the size and number of windows and doors.²¹⁸

The second proposal, endorsed by the heirs of the now-deceased Francesco Lettino,²¹⁹ was the former *osteria Angelo* (*Anzolo* in Venetian) on the Rialto, property of Bartolo Vendramin (di Andrea; appendix 6; fig. 3.2). Vendramin described his four-floor building as being full of numerous rooms of all qualities while having two wells. It was also well

²¹⁵ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, f. 28r, Sept. 7, 1575. Cf. Concina, *Fondaco*, 234–235.

²¹⁶ Although the word *stufa* was synonymous with bathroom (*bagno*), I have opted for the literal translation (stove) because the bathroom is mentioned separately. Because the fireplaces are also mentioned separately, it is possible that the stoves were intended to heat the bathrooms and their water, as a more efficient solution.

²¹⁷ “Chiuso talmente che non vederà se non nel suo proprio luogo et non potrà esser di scandalo a la vicinanza.”

²¹⁸ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, f. 34r, Apr. 11, 1577 – Malipiero repeated his proposal.

²¹⁹ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, f. 35r, no date; a similar one: ff. 30r–31r.

enclosed to the outside so that entry and exit could be controlled easily.²²⁰ He accentuated the vicinity of the port and the market of Rialto “because the Turks come to this city for nothing but trade”. Vendramin also stated that, when in May (1575) he was ordered by the *Collegio* to concede the building to Lettino, Lettino and Membré advised him to provide the stoves (*stufe*) and washing facilities (*lavatoi*) to accommodate the *Turks* (“so that they would voluntarily come”) on which he spent more than 60 *scudi*.²²¹ Further in the letter, he complained that the *Turks* still stayed around the city after they passed customs despite his efforts. If his *osteria* were formally accepted, the Senate would need to oblige the *Turks* to stay in his establishment, which had been prepared for that role even before the formal acceptance of Lettino’s supplication (16 August).²²²

Shortly after, the *Sette Savi* went with the dragoman Membré to survey the building. Membré filed a formal report containing eleven points on the building and changes that needed to be made (appendix 7).²²³ He confirmed that the former *osteria Angelo* has a ground floor, a mezzanine, and three other floors; a very comfortable and bright portico, large and small warehouses on the ground floor, large and small mezzanine and first-floor rooms, and only large ones on the second and third floors. His short description served as a basis for establishing rent prices, so not much more can be said about the disposition of spaces. Membré was more elaborate in the proposed changes and management rules, stating that all doors and large windows should be walled up to be 2.5 Venetian feet high and wide (87x87 cm), placed high, and closed with glass and an iron grille so that no one could enter

²²⁰ “[...] il mio stabile posto in Rialto [...] che soleva esser altre volte l’hosteria con l’insegna dell’Angelo [...] è copioso di molte e diverse stantie di ogni qualità sin el piano da basso per accomodar le mercantile grosse, come in tutti li suoi Quattro solari per il stantiar delle persone di essi Turchi, e conserver le merci piu sottili; è poi cosi ben serato, et unito tutto, che con puoca fatica può esser guardato da quelli, che ne doveranno haver cura; è vicino alla piazza de Rialto.” BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 8. ASVe, Secreta, MMN, ff. 7r–8r, Sept. 9, 1575. In a later correction of his proposal (f. 32r), he is willing to renounce the right to hold a public *hosteria* if his proposal is accepted, which confirms that legally the *hosteria* and the *fondaco* are not connected.

²²¹ “[...] mi cosi commandato et ordinato da questo Francesco [Lettino], e da Michel Membré Dragomano vi feci spesa di piu di sessanta scudi in far le stufte, o lavatori per essi Turchi, in far diverse mostre per le mercantie, et molte altre cose.”

²²² It is likely that Lettino’s Inquisition-related hostelry was already at that location.

²²³ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, ff. 11r–13v, Sep. 21, 1575; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 11. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 135; Concina, *Fondaci*, 324. Concina put forward the idea that Membré filled the similar mediating role as did the German architect Hieronymo Todesco when he was employed on the reconstruction of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* at the beginning of the century. The German merchants seem to have requested his project, which was granted (appendix 2).

or see through them. The argument for this was that it was done so in the *fondachi* of the Levant.²²⁴ The patron (Vendramin) was obliged to keep the (two) cisterns always full of water and remove waste daily keeping the building continually clean, as is done in the Levant. A guard at the door was to lock the building at sunset, open it at dawn, and prohibit access to women and young people (*persone sbarbate*) during the day. He was also charged with preventing the introduction of weapons and other prohibited objects. The brokers (*sensali, sanseri*) were identified as a potential trouble source and were to be heavily regulated. The dragoman further acknowledged that the *Turkish* merchants, although of the same faith, were from different *nations and lands*, and had different *customs*. Therefore, they “would not stay in peace when living together”, and were not used to these forced solutions. To remedy this, Membrè advised that he (both an economic and a cultural broker) and a captain “as the one on the Rialto Bridge” were present to mediate and keep the peace. Acting as a formal consultant, Membrè had the goal of mediating between the Ottoman Muslim merchants’ commercial and housing needs and the requests of the Venetian institutions for social and financial control. To establish an overlapping of these prerequisites, he referred to Oriental models of merchants’ accommodation, such as the khan and the caravanserai. Even in the case of duties and rent prices, he calculated the appropriate amount based on the one that the merchants were used to paying in the Ottoman Empire and would be willing to pay. In referencing these Levantine experiences, Membrè set a precedent for future decision-making.

Six days later, the *Sette Savi* compiled their report.²²⁵ Out of the two proposals, they praised the *ex-osteria*, its many rooms, warehouses, cisterns, stoves, and bathrooms (*for those Turks*) that were recently made when the *Turks* were accommodated in that locale. No time-consuming investment was required other than adjustments to the windows and doors mentioned by Membré. They added that there is another Vendramin house nearby whose first floor could also be used as a warehouse in case of need and above which the Lettino family could live.²²⁶ They did note certain deficiencies. The position was somewhat far

²²⁴ “[...] imperoche questo medesimo ordine è osservato in Levante, in Turchia, e in Soria nella fabrica delli Fontechi de Mercanti.” BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 11.

²²⁵ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, ff. 16r–18r, Sep. 27 1575; BMC, PDc 740, item II, ff. 18v–23r.

²²⁶ A corridor was constructed connecting the two buildings. ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, f. 30v.

from a canal, making goods handling more difficult. The church of San Matteo was considered too close, at an interval of two streets and one house.²²⁷ However, the church was positioned sideways, the portal looking away from the *osteria*. This allows us to precisely locate the building (fig. 3.2). According to the *Sette Savi*, a potential problem could be that the *Collegio* prohibited the *albergarie* on the island of Rialto. Still, they stated that this would not be an *albergaria* whatsoever as it could not harm the nearby public *osterie* because the *Turks* do not drink wine.²²⁸ Finally, they confirmed Membré's proposed management rules, except the ones on a guard captain being posted inside.

The *Collegio* asked for a second opinion from the *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia* who supported the Vendramin establishment because it was already available with minor modifications, while the Malipiero proposal was mostly an unbuilt terrain.²²⁹ However, no final decision was made. At the beginning of 1579, the Senate appointed the *Collegio* with finding a definite location, who in turn entrusted the process to the *Cinque Savi*.²³⁰

In this new turn of negotiations, Andrea Donà (Donato) first sent a new proposal even before the *Collegio* convened, which was supported by Piero Lettino (the son of Francesco's brother Niccolò).²³¹ In Donà's rudimentary description of a building at San Giovanni Crisostomo, he mentioned the most important: two floors, numerous large rooms, a court, water access, position in terms of quays, and goods displays. The *Cinque Savi* did not agree in their report, claiming the building was narrow.²³²

The sons and heirs of Marin Zane led by Bartolomeo proposed a partially built plot "on the street that goes to the bridge leading to the church of San Severo, across from Palazzo Zorzi

²²⁷ Similar preoccupations were expressed pertaining to the Jews. See Dana E. Katz, *The Jewish Ghetto and the Visual Imagination of Early Modern Venice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 80–83.

²²⁸ Both establishments had special wine permits, however the 20–24 *public osterie* (not public property but owned by the patricians) were privileged over the many numerous *albergarie*.

²²⁹ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, f. 15r; V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 31, 1576.

²³⁰ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 23, Jan. 23, 1578 m. v. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1. Not having completed their task, the *Sette Savi* were completely excluded from this point. The *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia* were chosen as the office which dealt with trade and foreigners of special mercantile interest, such as the Germans, the Jews, and the Ottoman Muslims.

²³¹ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, f. 36r. Piero Lettino: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Dec. 17, 1579. Concina, *Fondaci*, 227, locates this building at the *Corte del Milion* due to Giacomo da Nores mentioning he visited *Ca' Milion* in 1620. This is possible, but cannot be confirmed.

²³² ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, Nov. 24, 1578.

and close to Palazzo Priuli” (fig. 3.2).²³³ Although the plot was capable of holding a decent building and was in the same *contrada* of Santa Maria Formosa where the *Turks* tended to stay, the project would cost a lot and the location was deemed too close to San Marco and distant from the Rialto.

Zaccaria Gabriel proposed a locale on the San Giovanni Crisostomo “better than which cannot be desired”.²³⁴ The accompanying sketch (fig. 3.1; 3.2) shows an entire urban block located between the street of San Giovanni Crisostomo and the Canal Grande, bordered by side streets and drainage canals.²³⁵ Gabrieli proposed orienting his 45 storage spaces and the superimposed rooms to the small street in between. By closing it, it would serve as an open court (*corte discoperta*). This internal orientation would allow for isolation, internal communication, and mercantile activities in the court, while high-posted small windows would be built on external walls.

The *Cinque Savi* did not find it suitable because it was too close to the church and only the main street tract was a solid three-floor construction.²³⁶ The rest was only partially usable, made up of old ground-floor structures. As a new construction would be costly and time-consuming, the proposal was rejected.

²³³ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, Mar. 10, 1579. “Habiamo noi sopra la mercanzia [...] visto il terreno delli figliuoli che furono del Clarissimo m. Marin Zane. Il quale è parte vacuo et parte fabricato con case cosi di muro, come di legnami a San Severo per mezo la casa del Magnifico m. Marco Zorzi non vi essendo tra essa casa e terreno altro per la calle commune che porta al ponte che va alla chiesa sopradetta di la dal rio dove anco vi è assai vicina la casa del Clarissimo Procurator Priuli, detto terreno sarebbe capace per bona fabrica, ma vi vorebbe assai spesa.”

²³⁴ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 25; design: ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II. Cf. Concina, *Fondaci*, 226; fig. 62. Corroboration for the proposed location (fig. 3.2) is provided in Odoardo Fialetti’s view of Venice from 1611 who draws low warehouses there. On the view see Deborah Howard, Henrietta McBurney, *The Image of Venice: Fialetti's View and Sir Henry Wotton* (London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2014).

²³⁵ The width of the block is 14 *passi* on the street (24,32m); 12 on the Canal (20,86m) while the length is 38 *passi veneziani* (66m) as measured on the internal street. It is a typical example of a commercial block with shops on the street side, rented rooms and offices above and warehouses on the back easily accessible from the canal. Gabriel writes explicitly: “[...] esso loco è in isola, perche da una parte confina con il Canal grande de Rialto sopradetto, dall’altra con strada commune di San Zan Grisostomo, da un lato confina con una stradella consortina parte, et parte con un latte di grondal, dall’altra con un’altra stradella con calle di grondal, et non ha d’attorno persona di considerazione, ò di rispetto alcuno, perche da una parte vi sono magazeni de diversi, dall’ altra due cassette di pocco momento.”

²³⁶ ASVe, V Savi, 2. serie, b. 187, Mar. 7, 1597.




Fig. 3. 1 Zaccaria Gabriel (?), *The Gabrieli warehouses and depots (at San Giovanni Crisostomo)*, 1579 (ASVe, *Secreta, Materie miste e notabili*, b. 55, fasc. II)

Gabriel and his nephews were not inclined on passing up on this opportunity and proposed a completely new project in the Calle della testa, between the Rio della pana and the Rio Santi Giovanni e Paolo, close to the church of Santa Maria dei Miracoli (fig. 3.2).²³⁷ They were willing to invest a great sum if they would be given management rights of the future *Fondaco*. Gabriel was not very vocal in his description, rather attaching a (lost) drawing that was consulted by the *Cinque Savi* when they investigated the terrain, which had to be capable of holding the proposed several-floor, vaulted building, with a bathroom, a cistern, and uniform rooms with windows placed high.²³⁸

²³⁷ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 27, no date indicated; between April and August 1579. The location was probably in the middle of the Calle della testa, where today is the short Calle Gabrieli. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 229.

²³⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Jan. 4, 1600 m. v. “Di ordine di Collegio li Clarissimi Cinque Savi alla Mercantia vedano il sitto delle sache tra il Rio della Panà, et quello di Santi Giovanni e Paolo, se è

All the proposals were voted on the *Collegio* so that a “proposal so good would not be delayed any further”.²³⁹ The much-praised Vendramin establishment was ultimately chosen. Vincenzo Tron and Lorenzo Priuli of the *Savi di Terraferma* were ordered to survey the building and report on the adjustments to be made. Unexpectedly, they concluded that the *ex-osteria* was utterly unsuitable for the role. Therefore, on the new session of the *Collegio* the decision was changed in favour of the Gabriel proposal for a new building at Santi Giovanni e Paolo.²⁴⁰

Shortly after, the Anatolian Turks filed a petition against the institution of the *fondaco* system based on previous Venetian regulation and their own customs.²⁴¹ They leveraged the power of the sultan and the worth of their trade in highly praised camlets (*zambelotti*),²⁴² stating that the *hosteria Vendramin* was a completely unreasonable solution (*loco veramente fora de ogni proposito et raggion*) unable to host the entire *Muslim nation*. The displays (*mostre*) for the camlets were also missing, without which it was impossible to sell. The first thing they pointed out, also accentuated by Membré in 1575, was the ethnic argument. They claimed that the Anatolian Turks could not possibly share the same space with Greek and Bosnian Muslims (*nationi di Gretia et Bosna*) as it is never done in the Empire, and *there would be blood*. They stated that it was a lie that they caused scandals around town as some people (Lettino among others) claimed in their absence because they tended to be both good guests to their hosts and bring value to Venice. On the other side, in

aproposito per fare il Fontego per l'habitatione delli Turchi. Considerino quante stantie venivano per ogni solaro et quanti magazeni facendolo conformo il Disegno che alle loro SS Clarissime è stato consegnato. Quanta spesa anderà nella Fabricha facendola in volto per sicurtà del Fuogo con il suo Bagnio e con la sua cisterna, et che le camare e Magazeni siano tutti a misura, con le fenestre a luce.”

²³⁹ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 24, Mar. 24, 1579 (same in V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1). Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 131. It seems that the *Asiatic Turks* mostly ignored this decision, as only *Turchi Bossinesi et Albanesi* could be found there. Beside the mentioned locations, another proposal was sent by Pietro Gradenigo but no details on it could be found.

²⁴⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Aug. 4 1579; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 29. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 131.

²⁴¹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, May 2, 1579. *Turchi de Anatolia* is a self-designation therefore I am leaving it as it is. Although a geographical designation, it probably refers to ethnic Turks on this occasion. The same petition was consulted by Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 204–205 to ascertain the legal meaning of the term *Turco*.

²⁴² *Zambelotti* or camlets are luxurious woven fabrics made of camel or goat hair (specifically the woolly Anatolian Angora goat), but also of silk, wool, and cotton. Other valuable textile products connected with camlet production and trade are mohair, cashmere, and Angora rabbit wool. Originally exclusively made in Anatolia and the surrounding regions, by the 18th century imitations started to appear in Western Europe. See Kafadar, “A Death in Venice”; 202.

the Ottoman Empire they could stay where they wanted. Otherwise, if the *Serenissima* would decide on forcing all the Muslims into one *fondaco*, let it at least be a large, well-situated one. This reaction repositions the argument of reciprocity argued by Lettino and Membré. Indeed, a plethora of khans, caravanserais, *funduqs*, and other mercantile hostelries were at their disposal in the Ottoman Empire, but for non-Europeans they were not obligatory, and even this obligation was only observed in Egypt and Syria. Furthermore, Levantine national *funduqs* were indeed spaces of national more than religious grouping, and their implementation was not rigorous. The Venetians, Pisans, Genoese, Catalans, and all others had separate buildings. However, the perplexity of the situation was not explained to the Venetian authorities, who were only notified that precedents in the Ottoman Empire existed. That was enough to make a decision. Nonetheless, they were willing to make certain compromises – if not on the existence of the place, then on where it was and how it should be organised and furnished. In this constant negotiation on the details, mediators were always involved, sometimes to the benefit of the merchants – other times not. These mediators were institutions and individuals whom the authorities could trust but who better understood the realities of Ottoman and Muslim cultures.

This time the *Cinque Savi* were asked to decide. They recognised that Muslims (*Turchi*) were divided into nations just like Christians, but according to their understanding, there existed a more significant divide between soldiers and peasants than among the merchant class. In solving this, they turned to the previous relation of the dragoman Membré who advised on keeping a dragoman and an armed guard in the *fondaco*. Concluding that “the nature of trade aims for peace”, they refused the petition.²⁴³

The Lettino family also complained. By December 1579, the Gabriel *fondaco* had yet to be built so they petitioned the *Collegio* for a solution.²⁴⁴ The proposal of Gulia, Francesco’s widow, to temporarily organise a *fondaco* at a place of her choosing was accepted,²⁴⁵ and it

²⁴³ ASVe, Secreta, MMN, b. 55, fasc. II, May 21, 1579.

²⁴⁴ BMC, PDC 740, item II, pp. 29–30; ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Dec. 16; Dec. 17, 1579.

²⁴⁵ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Dec. 16, 1579.

would stabilise itself under her son Giorgio in the Vendramin *osteria* on the Rialto for the meantime.²⁴⁶

An anonymous letter arrived at the Senate on 13 April 1602 against the institution of the *Fondaco dei Turchi*. It elaborates that this is a service to the Muslims, not the Venetians. The author states that this building will become a “gathering place of the vicious and a bilge of filth”, allowing the construction of mosques and the worship of Muhammad to greater scandal than the one perpetrated by the heretical Germans and the Jews who are at least “depressed without a head or prince.”²⁴⁷ However, it seems the letter did not have any effect on the decision-making.

The *fondaco* system was already passed into law and functioned in the Vendramin Rialto house, but the legal segregation of all visiting Muslims could not be rigorously implemented before a more suitable place was found. In the meantime, the *Cinque Savi* did not stop searching for a new location, and from 1608 started mentioning the Palazzo Pesaro, which would become the permanent solution only in 1621. An interesting proposal was made by the merchant Domenico Bossello and his company in 1618.²⁴⁸ They proposed a completely new building “similar to the Fondaco dei Tedeschi, with rooms, vaults, warehouses, apartments, and other amenities”.²⁴⁹ In exchange, they asked for the monopoly on hosting *Turks* and certain tax exemptions. The *Cinque Savi* decided to rather keep the current arrangement under Giambattista Lettino, Francesco’s grandson.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁶ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, June 20, 1588 in Pregadi. The Senate was interested in finally settling the issue. Giorgio confirmed that the house served as a *fondaco dei Turchi* in the interim, probably based on the petition of his mother Giulia in 1579. As the Gabrieli *fondaco* was never finished, the Vedramin house was formally accepted only in 1592 and leased to Giorgio for the annual sum of 145 ducats. BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 34, Mar. 5, 1592; ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 5, 1592. Cf. Concina, *Fondaci*, 227; 232–234.

²⁴⁷ Sagredo, Berchet, *Fondaco dei Turchi*, 28; Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 132; Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 200, according to: BMC, cod. Cicogna, 978, f. 17.

²⁴⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., fasc. 1, Dec. 5, 1618; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 40–42.

²⁴⁹ “Noi compagni sudetti proponiamo et s’obblighiamo fabricare et erigere un nuovo et capasse Fontico alla similitudine del Fontico de Tedeschi con stanze, volte, magazeni, apartamenti et altre comodità in tanta quantità che sarà capace, et comodo per albergare et ricevere tutti li Turchi, et altri suditi del Gran Signore, che con loro persone et Mercanzie capitano in questa Città, et sarà come in sicuro, et Pubblico ricetta custoditi chiusi la Notte, albergati et serviti, con loro sadisfatione, et con Pubblico Augmento de Datij per la frequenza et concorenza.”

²⁵⁰ ASVe, V Savi, b. 187, fasc. 1, Feb. 18, 1618 m.v. Lettino of course objected to the Bosello proposal after it came, on Jan. 21, 1618 m. v. Cf. Concina, *Fondaci*, 230




Fig. 3. 2 Location of the various proposals: 1) Bartolomeo Vendramin; 2) Bartolomeo Zane; 3) Zaccaria Gabriel; 4) Zaccaria Gabriel; 5) Antonio Priuli (based on: Lodovico Ughi, *Iconografica rappresentazione della inclita città di Venezia*, Venice 1729)

When uniting all of the proposals, several arguments can be made on the formation of space and its uses. They range from the common ones, pertaining to any *fondaco*, to the specific ones, often accompanied by the reason that it is done in the Levant or needed by the *Turks*. To surmise the common ones: it needed to be a spacious building with a courtyard and a portico, close to a canal and the Rialto market, with internal heating and merchandise displays. Therefore, it needed to unite the functions of a residential hostelry and a warehouse, having enough courtyard and portico space for displaying and controlling goods and conducting business.²⁵¹ Simplistically speaking, any large *casa-fondaco* would do.²⁵² However, the specific requisites complicated the search, as only Malipiero and Vendramin fully acknowledged them, with only partial mentions in other cases. The

²⁵¹ At the same time, a courtyard, cloister or an atrium was the perfect form for large housing and multipurpose units that wanted distinction from the crowded, smelly, and noisy urban surroundings. It was a semi-public space, in which the degree of intrusion from the outside could be regulated by the proprietor. In segregated spaces, such solutions were a necessity. If outside openings were to be small, ventilation and illumination needed to be supplemented from the inside. Even then, as a person could not exit when they wished, they provided an internal open space for work and leisure, also providing a venue for limited communal life and business. While being nodes of communication, both on the inside and with the outside, they also allowed for the supervision of this communication.

²⁵² Having in mind the problematic, overly economic implications of the term *casa-fondaco*.

building should not have been close to a church, visual contact or unsupervised entry had to be impossible, it had to be provided with toilets (*necessarii*) and bathrooms (*bagni, lavatoi*), wells were to be always kept full and spaces clean, stoves (*stufe*) were to be provided for separate food preparation (and heating). Access was to be restricted – the *fondaco* was locked during the night while entry was completely prohibited to women and young people – groups seen as particularly susceptible to moral manipulation already in Lettino’s supplication.²⁵³ The presence of ethnolinguistic and regional differences among Muslims was noted by Membré and in the petition of the Anatolian Turks themselves but will not be tackled until later projects. From this, it becomes clear that a *Fondaco dei Turchi* is a new invention in the Venetian architectural tradition and regulatory practices. In part it references older models – the Mediterranean *fondaco* system represented by the Ottoman *funduq*, not the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, but reimagines it as a space of religious otherness and residential segregation similar to the Ghetto, all the while adding new content through the process of mediation such as hygienic, sleeping, and cooking arrangements. The *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* was never so strictly regulated because it aimed to separate German merchants from the Venetian and Mediterranean markets. Even Protestants could stay in the private houses surrounding the *Fondaco* if they were not merchants.²⁵⁴ In theory, the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* also originated from the same Levantine models of organisation and served a similar function; thus we will find similarities in basic architectural typology in all buildings used for mass storing-selling-lodging. However, no contemporary except Bosello saw any connection between the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* and an ideal *Fondaco dei Turchi*, confirming that it was something new in the Venetian tradition. The Ghetto was much more often invoked. If we take a look at the specific building requirements, such as latrines and baths, they were never mentioned in any of the 907 documents concerning the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi* transcribed by Henry Simonsfeld.²⁵⁵

²⁵³ The trope of the morally weak and easily corrupted woman and child is a general one, shared among the Abrahamic religions. Islamic tradition holds that in the early days of the new religion, the Kuraysh clan (the polytheistic rulers of Mecca) objected to Abu-Bakr (the future first caliph) having a private Islamic prayer space in his courtyard next to the gate, as it could be seen by (pre-Islamic) women and children. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 6 (1991), s.v. “masdjid” (p. 645).

²⁵⁴ Philippe Braunstein, *Les Allemands à Venise (1380–1520)*, (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2016), 146.

²⁵⁵ Simonsfeld, *Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi*.

This does not mean these facilities did not exist, just that they were not a preoccupation. The only testified preoccupations were food and table arrangements and nightly closure, as mentioned in the introductory chapter of this thesis. An architecture housing the *Turk* in Venice thus started with the general idea of a *fondaco* and similar mercantile lodging spaces. However, by invoking Ottoman general models, the Venetian base (an *osteria*, for example) became enriched with adjustments pertaining to the Ottoman housing culture – at least in the Venetian mind. As specifics on how these spaces and facilities should look were not provided by Lettino, Membré, or anybody in the *Cinque Savi*, the solutions were diverse and will be tackled in the following chapters.

3.3. *Il Fondaco dei Turchi* at Palazzo Pesaro

It seems incidents were common in the *Fondaco* organised at the Vendramin house because the *Avogadori de Comùn* (public prosecutors) needed to intervene in 1594 and 1613 and prohibit insulting the Muslims and the custodian while banning entry to armed persons due to several robberies and property damages that occurred.²⁵⁶

However, tensions between the locals and the Muslims escalated on the Feast day of Saint Matthew – 21 September 1619. The unnamed author, probably the parish priest of San Matteo, wrote that the Turks often go in and around the church, laughing and mocking its rituals (appendix 13). This most relevant scandal occurred on the Saint's Feast day, during solemn mass and the vespers, when a group of Bosnians fired their guns just outside the church window. This provocation, deliberate or not, led the author to employ a known rhetoric, calling them enemies of the Christian faith while invoking the Republic's Christian character, especially its patronage of churches. He kindly asked the Senate to relocate the *Fondaco* to a location further away from any churches.²⁵⁷ The *Cinque Savi* investigated further, and it seems that the Bosnians tended to hang around the church, teasing the passersby – women in particular, watching mass from the doors, ridiculing processions as they apparently did on Good Friday (the most serious Christian Holiday). The *osteria* is said to have been surrounded by houses of honourable folk who avoided even appearing in their windows not to witness the regular scandals.²⁵⁸

On 8 June and at the request of the new proprietor Nicolò Foscolo, the *Giudici di Forestier* decided to give Giovanni Battista Lettino and his *Fondaco* the eviction notice. The building

²⁵⁶ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 37, Jan. 10, 1612. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 131.

²⁵⁷ ASVe, V Savi, 2. serie, b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 12, 1620; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 48. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 133; Concina, *Fondaci*, 231. The letter was, due to its language, logically attributed to the unnamed parish priest by Preto. It was not the first such reaction. During the restoration of the church of San Giacomo di Rialto in 1598, Gerolamo dell'Aqua – San Giacomo's parish priest, complained that the surrounding offices, warehouses, and shops are actually built on the ex-cemetery – meaning sacred ground. Furthermore, the offices of the *Cinque Savi* and the *Rason Nove* were in the adjacent buildings on the north-eastern side of the church, which extended over the side chapel and part of the main apse. As the offices were often frequented by *infidels*, this would technically mean that they were walking on top of the Holy Sacrament. However, the offices were not moved. ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 152, Nov. 27, 1599, allegati n° 7–8. I wish to thank Nicolas Moucheront for this information.

²⁵⁸ BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 49-50, 1620.

was to be vacated by 3 August.²⁵⁹ The *Cinque Savi* asked for an extension, and the whole thing went back and forth,²⁶⁰ but the matter was closed – a new location was to be found. The incident accelerated the decision making, as already in 1608 the *Cinque Savi* wrote the first of many elaborations on the 13th-century Palazzo Pesaro (*Palazzo del Duca di Ferrara*) located on the Canal Grande just some 500 meters north of the Vendramin house.²⁶¹ The palace was considered optimal because of its large size and position on the Rialto side of the Canal Grande, which allowed for easy cargo handling on both land and water. More importantly, it could be accommodated cheaply in a short time span.²⁶² After the incident at San Matteo, the *Savi* again took it into consideration, adding that it has a large courtyard, two wells, and two quays (*rive* on the Rio del Meggio and the Canal Grande). Therefore, even the Turks would find it more convenient than the old *osteria*. This

²⁵⁹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, June 8, 1620; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 51.

²⁶⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Aug. 22, 1620; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 51.

²⁶¹ Although lacking clear confirmation, it is believed that the palace was built by Giacomo Palmieri da Pesaro around 1225 (Marcello Brusegan, *I Palazzi di Venezia*, Rome: Newton & Compton, 2007, 160–162). The first documented mention is from 1309. For unpaid credit, the Government took possession of the building in 1381 and gave it to Niccolò II d'Este, the marquis of Ferrara. During the following century, it was used by the Byzantine Emperors Manuel II and John VIII Palaiologos, Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III, condottiere Cesare Borgia, queen of Hungary Anne de Foix, Henry of Valois future king of France and Poland, archduke Maximilian of Austria, and many less important guests of the Este and the Republic. During the War of the League of Cambrai, the palace was repossessed by the government and given to the Pope in 1512, who installed his legate there in 1517 – the bishop of Pula (*Pola*) Altobello Averoldi. Averoldi restored the Canal Grande façade. When he died in 1531, the Ferrarese counts repossessed the building and made extensive repairs. When the son-less Alfonso II Este died in 1597, the remaining heirs started litigations on the ownership, but an accord was made and the building was sold to the procurator of Saint Mark (later Doge) Antonio Priuli (Schulz, *New palaces*, 152–156). For a reconstruction of the medieval building see Schulz, *New palaces*, 157–163. On the basis of disparate roof structures, stylistic irregularities, differences in spatial disposition and sizes, he argues that the palace (as found in the 16th century) was an agglomeration of earlier buildings and subsequent expansions. The scenic Canal Grande tract with the loggia would be younger (mid or later thirteenth century; *terminus ante quem* 1381) and the inner courtyard tract older (later eleventh century). The connecting tract, subsequently built, significantly reduced the size of the inner court.

From 15 July 1604 it became the residence of the Imperial ambassador François Perrenot di Granvella (Francesco Pironotto). The contract was renewed for two years with the new ambassador Georg Fugger (Georgio Fuccaro) on 11 March 1608 and again on 16 September 1610 for another two years. BMC, PDc, 740, item II, p. 36, Mar. 20, 1608; Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 132. For dealings of Priuli's procurers with the Imperial embassy see the entirety of fasc. III (BMC, PDc 740, item I). Sagredo and Berchet (*Fondaco dei Turchi*, 16) note Pironotto as Pisonotto, the Cossack ambassador, without reference. Schulz (*New palaces*, 156) notes that the palace was also the seat of the cardinal legate of France – François de Joyeuse, who negotiated the end of the papal interdict in 1607.

²⁶² Concina, *Fondaci*, 232 says that the peripheral location was deliberate. “[...] il Fondaco era tuttavia lontano dalle due piazze, da Rialto e da San Marco e, oltre a ciò, dai luoghi deputati alla diffusione dell'immagine pubblica di Venezia.” On the choice of the palace, Concina states that the medieval palace was suited for this role because of its functional character (p. 236).

time they attached the opinion of the new dragoman Giacomo da Nores.²⁶³ In his view, the large building could be divided in two between the European Muslims (*Nazioni Bossinesi et Albanesi*) who were staying at San Matteo and the Asian Muslims (*Nazione Asiatica*) who were spread around the city, in disregard of unenforced previous decisions.²⁶⁴ Although Membré warned of this problem earlier, this was the first proposed solution of an internal separation between various Ottoman Muslims in the *Fondaco*, as requested by the Anatolian Turks in 1579. Otherwise, the *Cinque Savi* thought that Giambattista Lettino should continue being the custodian. The whole relocation process was indeed instigated by Giambattista, Francesco's grandson, in a bid to continue his and his family's employment.²⁶⁵ The dragoman's response followed in eleven points. As Membré before him, da Nores held that the need for the seclusion of all Muslim merchants stems from examples in Syria, Alexandria, and Constantinople (appendix 14). As Palazzo Pesaro had not been formally accepted yet, he spoke generally, saying that a certain Ca' Milion at San Giovanni Crisostomo was rejected due to high costs. His ideal building would be three floors high, with each floor used by a separate nation between the Asians, the Bosnians, and the Albanians. On the other side, the *osteria Anzolo* was not appropriate for all the Muslims, just for the Albanians and the Bosnians "by nature more bold and insolent", so they and the rest still frequented the brothels. Da Nores mentioned that the *osteria* was far from a canal, too tall, having four floors with very steep staircases, and did not have an appropriate portico or sufficient storage spaces for merchandise that was subsequently deposited everywhere, resulting in brawls between merchants. According to da Nores' opinion, no better building could be found than the palace of the Doge Antonio Priuli (Ca' Pesaro) at San Giovanni Battista Decollato due to it being isolated on its own block,²⁶⁶

²⁶³ Giacomo da Nores was born around 1569 in Nicosia, then-Venetian Cyprus, in a distinguished noble family. During the Ottoman conquest of the island in 1571 he was enslaved and raised in the service of an Ottoman officer, traveling with him around the Empire until he was ransomed in 1587 and employed by the Venetians as a dragoman under Membré two years later. His aunt converted to Islam and her daughters later became wives of Sultan Mehmet III. Da Nores had to learn Italian after arriving in Venice, but commanded his native Greek, as well as Turkish, and Persian. Cf. Ravid, "The Religious, Economic and Social Background," 240; Rothman, *Dragoman Renaissance*, 189–190.

²⁶⁴ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Nov. 11, 1620.

²⁶⁵ BMC, PDe 740, item II, p. 52.

²⁶⁶ The 11th-century parish church of *San Zan Degola* is only 50 meters away, but divided by three other houses and not in direct way to the Rialto market.

having two quays, a multitude of warehouses and rooms, a large courtyard, two staircases, and two wells. It would be perfect when corridors, internal partitions, baths, and other things *necessary for the Turks* were installed. He added that this large building should be divided in two with a wall, which could be done because it had two staircases and two gates, while the main hall was so spacious it could easily be partitioned. Da Nores held that Bosnians and Albanians chose to sojourn together; therefore, one part should be assigned to them and the other to the Asians. In his ninth point, he proposed that a part of the mezzanine, clearly divided from the *piano nobile* and having a separate entrance from the Fondamenta del Rio (del Meggio), should be given to the Armenians, who were having trouble finding private accommodation and sometimes stayed together with the *Turks* to the inconvenience of both. Lastly, he confirmed Lettino as a good choice.²⁶⁷ After the *Collegio* formally accepted Palazzo Pesaro for the new *Fondaco* on 11 March 1621,²⁶⁸ da Nores made new rules for its refurbishment “to the comfort and need of those nations”.²⁶⁹ He pointed out that windows should be encased in iron bars for safety, corridors made to establish a new communication scheme, baths and displays made for the camlets while underlying the need for partition walls (*tramezzi*) to divide the main hall and the rest of the building between the Asian and Constantinopolitan *Turks* on the somewhat smaller side, and the Bosnian and Albanian Muslims on the larger side. Each part would have its separate entrance, staircase, and courtyard. He proposed that the Armenians and the Persians would also be hosted here to avoid scandals that were bound to happen, especially because the Persians are “very much dedicated to luxury and other vices, although of different rite and customs than the Turks” (Turk this time meaning Ottoman subject).²⁷⁰ Therefore a part of the rooms should be assigned to them but separated from all others. The next point concerns the former dragoman Membré’s opinion, which da Nores commended,

²⁶⁷ BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 53–58; No date is given but the opinion should be dated sometime before the opinion of the *Cinque Savi* of Nov. 11, 1620 to which it is attached. Same in: ASVe, Collegio, Notatorio, fz. 237, attached to the decision May 28, 1621. Cf. Concina, *Fondaci*, 236.

²⁶⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 11, 1621; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 62. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 133.

²⁶⁹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 29, 1621; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 63.

²⁷⁰ “[...] per ovviare alle operationi scandalose et inconvenienti che possono esser comessi non meno da essi Persiani, che dai Turchi, per esser massime essi di natura più inconvenienti, et più dediti al lusso e ad altri vicij [...] è necessario meterli separatamente dai Turchi per la diversità dei costumi e del ritto, se bene sono tutti Maometani.”

especially in the part that the windows looking over the neighbourhood should be small, square, and posted high up while those on the ground floor and the mezzanine should also be enclosed in iron bars. He repeated that external doors should be locked at sunset (*alle hore 24*) and opened at sunrise, while no Christian woman or young person (*donne ne persone sbarbate che siano Cristiane*) should be permitted entry during the day. He established a regulation that forbade the introduction of any weapons to the building. As Membré before him, he proposed to regulate the brokers and other people dealing with the guests' merchandise to protect the incoming merchants from theft and fraud. He repeated the recommendations that wells must always be kept full of water "because that nation consumes a lot of it".²⁷¹ Only two gates were to remain: the main entrance on the *salizada* and the other on the Canal Grande, which was to be kept always locked unless goods were being moved. Two men were to be kept at the gates.²⁷² On the same day, all lessors that worked with *Asian Turks* and other Levantines were interrogated to establish acceptable prices.²⁷³

The *Cinque Savi* did not stop their inquiry there. This time they consulted Ottavio dall'Oglio (1560–1627), a merchant who made his career on the *scala di Spalato*, the former Venetian trade consul in Bosnia, and the *conduttore delle galee della mercanzia* (lessee of state merchant galleys), who in 1609 acted as the representative of the Ottoman merchants of Split (see chapter 4.3.3.). Dall'Oglio was against rent altogether, proposing a system of customs duties to finance the building's expenses, as was done in Split.²⁷⁴

Assembling every past decision and opinion, the *Cinque Savi* proceeded to precisely regulate the new *Fondaco*, establishing 33 rules for the modification of the building and its

²⁷¹ "Che il custode habbi carico che li Pozzi di detto Fontego siano sempre abbondanti d'Aqua della quale esse Nationi ne consumano molta."

²⁷² ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 29, 1621.

²⁷³ All of them were from the parish of San Giovanni Nuovo, and were as follows: Anna wife of Iseppo Sartor at the Balbi house, Ellena Vedova (possibly meant as a surname instead of widow) in the Orio house at the Ponte da Ca' Leon, Botta Vedova in the Ca' Briani at the Ponte da Ca' Leon, Gerolima Vedova at the Gradenigo house also at the Ponte da Ca' Leon, Stefano Galetto at the Ca' Soranzo. It seems that the Anatolian Turks tended to group in that zone between San Giovanni Nuovo and Santa Maria Formosa, where the Zane proposal of 1579 mentions them. BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 64–65.

²⁷⁴ BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 66–67.

future management “so the Turks can enjoy as much comfort as possible” (appendix 15).²⁷⁵ The first point gives Giovanni Battista Lettino management rights, but only if he would finance the works and respect all the rules set by the *Cinque Savi*.²⁷⁶ After modification, they would inspect the building and no tenant was to be introduced before that. According to the *Collegio* decision of 11 March that year, all Muslims were constrained to stay at the *Fondaco* – any private person found hosting them would be punished (rule 31).²⁷⁷ All the entrances were to be walled up except the main gate on the *salizada* and one door on the mezzanine to the custodian’s house (rule 2). The existing canal bank was to be expanded to the sides and kept enclosed in a high wall – opened only in need of transport (3, 5). Isolation was further accentuated in the large open court. As the court was on the southern end of the plot, two private houses were just on its border. They were divided from the *Fondaco* court by a low wall and had windows looking in. This wall was to be elevated up to the line of the eaves of the lower house and all the windows looking in were to be walled up (4). Twenty-six warehouses were to be made on the ground floor, out of which three on the corner between the Canal Grande and the Rio del Meggio were to be assigned to the custodian’s wing and separated from the others. Windows of the remaining 23 warehouses (24 were realised according to the rent regulation) were to be raised under the ceiling and encased in iron bars. Those on the Canal Grande were to be closed completely (6, 7). The custodian was obliged to keep the wells always full of water “so the Turks, who consume a lot of it, can be satisfied” (24). The building was to be cleaned several times a day (25). Its

²⁷⁵ The 33 rules will be sent to the *Collegio* where they will be approved. This explains the multiple copies: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, parte I, May 27, 1621; ASVe, Compilazione delle leggi, b. 210, ff. 184r–192r, May 27; May 28, 1621; ASVe, Collegio, Notatorio, fz. 237, May 27, 1621; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 73–82. A partial transcription published in: Chambers, Pullan, eds., *Venice: A Documentary History*, 350–352. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 133; Concina, *Fondaci*, 236–237; Calabi, *Market and the City*, 200–201; Calabi, “Stranieri nella capitale della Repubblica Veneta nella prima età moderna,” *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome: Italie et Méditerranée* 111, no. 2 (1999): 728; Özkaya, “Theaters of Fear and Delight”; Rothman, *Dragoman Renaissance*, 201.

²⁷⁶ Lettino will however be financed by the proprietor Antonio Priuli up to the sum of 2000 ducats. BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 85, July 21, 1621.

²⁷⁷ The *Collegio* decision is transcribed in: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1, Mar. 11, 1621. It seems the decision was sometimes avoided because the *Cinque Savi* had to establish hefty fines for the brokers and ship patrons who were not taking the Muslims and their merchandise there. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, June 13, 1624; May 26, 1625; Mar. 11, 1631; BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VI, f. 222r–v, May 6, 1769. In case of sickness or other objective reasons, permission might be given to individuals to stay outside the *Fondaco*: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, Feb. 13, Feb. 14, 1636; Apr. 21, 1638; Apr. 11, 1669; fasc. 3, Sept. 18, 1673.

gates were to be locked at sunset (*the 24th hour*) and opened at sunrise (26). Two men were to guard them – one at the *salizada*, the other on the Canal Grande gate (27) to help the merchants but prohibit entry to women and young people (28), and the introduction of weapons (29).

There would be 25 rooms on the mezzanine. The seven on the Canal Grande/Rio del Meggio corner, together with the belonging Canal Grande terrace, were to be given to the custodian and would have no direct communication with the rest of the building.²⁷⁸ Of the rest, eight rooms on the Rio del Meggio side (East) were to be given to the Asians and Constantinopolitans, and the remaining ten on the *salizada* (West) to the Bosnians and Albanians. All external windows were to be raised, enclosed in iron bars and larch window shutters (*trombi di larese*) “so the neighbours could not see inside” (8). Another room would be made of the terrace on the Canal Grande with a separate staircase and windows to the enclosed quay (9). The two upper floors were to be divided similarly. The Canal Grande loggia and the main hall of the *piano nobile* were divided into two equal parts, as was the rest of the building. The half towards the Rio was assigned to the Asians and Constantinopolitans, and the one toward the *salizada* to the Bosnians and Albanians (10, 11). The Asian part would have twelve first and six second-floor rooms with their bathroom (*lavatoggio*) and a toilet (*loco commune*) in the same place as on the mezzanine.²⁷⁹ A new corridor was made from the corner of the hall to the loggia (12). The Bosnian and Albanian side followed the same spatial disposition with eleven rooms (nine existing ones plus two made from the kitchen) on the first and seven on the second floor; a corridor; a bathroom, and a toilet that follow the ones of the mezzanine (13). The wall of the loggia was to be elevated by one Venetian foot from the existing handrail (14). All the first and second-floor external windows were to be elevated six Venetian feet (208,6 cm) from the floor and

²⁷⁸ Except for one door on the mezzanine from rule 2.

²⁷⁹ The two cesspits (*cloaca*) encased in the ground-floor warehouses are only present in the Maccaruzzi plan of 1768 (fig. 3.19) but could have been realised at this time. The building had no similar solution earlier so the Canal was probably used as a direct sewage removal system while the number of residents was low. When it became the *Fondaco*, this solution must have been most inconvenient due to a large number of residents without free exit to the Canal or servants who would be in charge of sewage removal. Further testifying to this solution is the number of warehouses – if we compare their number (24) and sizes to the Torello plan (fig. 3.7), more could fit but were not realised, leaving more than enough room for the accommodation of cesspits.

enclosed with larch shutters on the outside (15), with the windows to the Canal Grande being seven feet tall (243,3 cm; rule 16). Two corner towers on the Canal Grande façade were to be destroyed (to the roof level; rule 17)²⁸⁰. There was a low attic (*soffita morta*) holding the roof construction. Access to it was forbidden except to the custodian in case of urgency (18). All the rooms needed to have a separate single door (12, 13) indicated with a number (21), a fireplace (19), and raised, connected planks used as beds (*t[av]olati per habitarvi e dormirvi secondo l'uso loro*; rule 20). Rule 22 deals with rent prices,²⁸¹ established on a monthly basis confirming the usual (several-month) stay of the guests. It was possible to keep the merchandise in the corridors, halls, and porticos. Moreover, we learn that seven warehouses were considered major (n. 1–3, 12, 17, 21, 22), three big (4, 11, 20), four minor (5, 8, 19, 23), six small (6, 9, 10, 14–16), and four smallest (7, 13, 18, 24) – affecting rent prices. On the mezzanine, three rooms were considered to be major (8, 10, 16) – available to host seven people. Four rooms could host six people and were categorised as big (11, 12, 20, 21). Four other rooms – considered minor – could accommodate five people each (1–3, 22). Small rooms (5, 7, 12, 18) could hold four people, while the smallest ones (14, 15, 17, 23) could hold three people. On the *piano nobile*, there were nine major rooms (1, 3, 6, 13–16; 20, 21) for six persons each; four big rooms (4, 5, 7, 12) for six people; two minor rooms (2, 22) for six people; two small ones (18, 19) for four people; two smaller rooms (11; 17) for three people, and two smallest ones (9, 10) for three people. On the top floor, only one room was considered major (1) and could hold seven people. The three big rooms (8, 12, 13) were for six people, the three minor ones (3, 11, 14) for five, the small one (27) for four, the smaller one (9) for three, and

²⁸⁰ This confirms their previous presence – as on the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, although not their exact form. Berchet (*Fondaco dei Turchi*, 75) claims that these were destroyed in 1627 to prevent the Turks spying on the city and not to give additional nobility and power to the building. Below we will argue that the *Turks* were “not to see or be seen” due to a different reason.

²⁸¹ To board a ship out of Venice, the Muslims had to have a *mandato per imbarcar* issued by the custodian of the *Fondaco* that confirmed they paid rent. One of those is preserved in: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, Apr. 28, 1623. A reprint was of the rent regulation made in 1751 and posted in the port of San Marco, on the Rialto, and the door of the *Fondaco* (BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VI, f. 201r). However, paying rent was avoided in several ways. One of them was to claim that servants which accompanied the merchants were not obligated to pay it and the other was to import the majority of the goods to Venice under a name of a Christian agent, therefore avoiding paying rent for the warehouses. BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VI, ff. 204r–206r; 213r–217v.

the two smallest ones (5, 6) also for three people. The other two mentioned rooms must have been used as toilets and/or bathrooms.

All of the aforementioned were to be respected by the custodian under threat of corporal and monetary punishment and the loss of the custodian's license (32). Therefore, we can safely assume that all the rules were put into practice. The last point gave the *Cinque Savi* the exclusive right to change or regulate anything pertaining to the *Fondaco*. The *Collegio* approved all the orders the following day, without changes.²⁸²

By superimposing these 33 rules to the plans of Cesare Torello called Franco (fig. 3.7–3.9) made just twenty years earlier and comparing them to later sources (such as fig. 3.15–3.17), it is possible to make a detailed conjectural reconstruction of the new *Fondaco* (fig. 3.10–3.14).²⁸³ The 1621 modifications, although considered minor in construction terms, dramatically changed the spatial organisation of the original palace. As Juergen Schulz writes and the Torello plan confirms, the ground floor spaces and the mezzanine rooms above were initially connected via independent staircases and used as small two-floor rental apartments.²⁸⁴ Other ground floor spaces were leased as even smaller living spaces, sometimes shops and warehouses, or used by the proprietor as storage and service rooms. A similarly parcelled space would be expected in any other contemporary palace. The repurposing of the palace as the *Fondaco* reoriented the whole building to the inside, rigorously uniting almost the entire perimeter and shifting its axis towards the two courtyards.²⁸⁵ When we look at the new staircases that united all the floors, the large courtyard remained the central communication node, with a secondary one added through

²⁸² BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 82, May 28, 1621; ASVe, Compilazione leggi, b. 210, ff. 184r–192r, May 28, 1621; ASVe, Collegio, Notatorio, fz. 237, May 28, 1621; ASVe, Collegio, Notatorio, reg. 81, ff. 42r–45v. The last document is probably the original as it contains the approval of Doge Antonio Priuli as the proprietor on the margin.

²⁸³ The reconstruction is based on the one of the ground and first-floor plans from Schulz, *New palaces*, fig. 133–134 (fig. 3.6), itself based on Torello and Sagredo, Berchet, *Il Fondaco dei Turchi*, tav. II–III (fig. 3.25–3.26). With minor modifications and the addition of the mezzanine and the second floor, the 33 rules were superimposed on that existing plan. In cases when these were not clear enough, possible solutions were sought in the post-reconstruction plans of Bernardino Maccaruzzi (1768, fig. 3.19–3.23) and the pre-reconstruction view of the *Fondaco* by Domenico Lovisa (ca. 1720, fig. 3.15). The broken roof line is already represented by Jacopo da Barbari in 1500 (fig. 3.4), the result of uniting the two separate structures. This will be confirmed by sources from 1751 later in the thesis.

²⁸⁴ Schulz, *New palaces*, 26.

²⁸⁵ Most of the ground-floor spaces were oriented to the street and used as entrances to the mezzanine apartments which had no direct connection to the internal courtyard or the *piano nobile*.

the Canal Grande loggia. Previously non-existent corridors had to be established on the *piano nobile* so the rooms could become independent living units.²⁸⁶ The same is testified in the rule that each room had to have a fireplace, at least one window, and a numbered door accessible from the corridors (on the *piano nobile*). The loggia and the main hall lost their representational aspect by being halved, becoming both transitory spaces that connected the floors and, probably, spaces of business and leisure. Central kitchens were no longer necessary as each guest could prepare their meals, buy them outside, or from the custodian (the *Cinque Savi* regulated food prices).²⁸⁷ There were two new additions of a sanitary nature: a set of latrines and bathrooms. From Torello's drawings, the inventory of the *piano nobile* of 1608, and earlier sources it seems that the original Palazzo Pesaro had no such dedicated rooms.²⁸⁸

This reorganisation must have caused several problems, such as confusing floor plans, the problematic incorporation of the mezzanine, uneven lighting or a lack of it, toilets or stairs being too close or far, and similar. They are all the result of the inherited plan of the Palazzo that used the *enfilade* system, had the main court on the back, and only a narrow central court to provide minimal light and ventilation where it was most needed. The Canal Grande loggia supplemented these roles in the original building but was now detrimental by providing monumentality and visibility. A more modern solution of a central courtyard with a portico would have been much more efficient in uniting the building and providing equal-quality lodging to all. This was the preferred plan of all the building types that provided rooms and services to numerous people, such as hospices, hospitals, lazarettos, monasteries, and guest houses such as the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, even the ideal Ottoman caravanserai. This solution will be used in Split, where a lazaretto, a customs house, and a *fondaco* were purpose-built from 1588 to 1600.

²⁸⁶ The mezzanine seems to have been left as it is, except being divided in three sections with independent staircases.

²⁸⁷ Food and drink prices repeat through the archival records. Francesco Lettino was the first to propose such prices in his supplication of Aug. 16, 1575. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 1.

²⁸⁸ Unlike contemporary examples of Ca' Barozzi and Ca' Loredan where latrines were just above the canal – to ease their emptying. Schulz, *New palaces*, 109–111, transcript no. 2; 188–189, transcript no. 2. Find the transcript of the inventory of 1608 in Schulz, *New palaces* 139–140, transcript no. 17.

The 33 rules are only the elaboration of Giacomo da Nores' recommendations, which in turn closely follow the ones of Michiel Membré made for the Vendramin establishment. The significant change (other than the one caused by the new location) was the internal separation which must have resulted from the refusal of Asian Muslims to be housed together with the European ones. However, there are differences in the discourses used by the dragomans, the *Cinque Savi*, and higher government bodies such as the *Collegio* and the Senate. For the *Collegio*, the Senate, and the *Cinque Savi* who issued orders, segregation was the norm. Analysing the 33 rules, Natalie Rothman states that: "The main purpose of the fondaco was to sever its tenants' 'scandalous' ties to Venetians – that is, any kind of contact that might go beyond purely economic transactions. The familiarity and intimacy that were believed to grow from physical proximity and the sharing of living space were the main targets."²⁸⁹ As with the Jews, Venetian tolerance went hand in hand with segregation. After all, it was to be for the good of both groups. But freedom of movement and cohabitation were not the only targets; obstruction of vision was also an important part.²⁹⁰ Nobody was, as Membré explicitly stated for the Vendramin house, to see in or out. This is evocative of the Ghetto, where doors were also locked at sunset, but the matter did not stop there. The *Cinque Savi* was also the overseeing office for the *Ghetto Vecchio* – populated by Sephardim Jews who were a group of particular mercantile interest involved in Levantine trade. In 1560 the *Savi* decreed that new unperforated walls were to be built around the Ghetto and that the outward-looking canal-side windows were to be walled up to prevent visual contact.²⁹¹ As well as an entry point for thieves, windows could be places of visual and verbal contact (as they were around the *osteria Anzolo*), and witnessing customs and rituals outside of the Venetian social order could produce disturbances. The dragomans were there to mediate while being loyal employees of the *Serenissima*. Both Membré and da Nores had direct experiences of the Orient and were charged with two

²⁸⁹ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 201.

²⁹⁰ "At least one-third of the thirty-three regulations were concerned with the obstruction of vision and movement, as well as the creation of internal barriers to prevent vision and movement among the three wings of the house." Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 201.

²⁹¹ Katz, *Jewish Ghetto*, 56. This decree might have been observed for a while, but it was irrational to keep for a long time so windows were reopened, but it was decreed that they should be closed in iron grates. Another example of architecture that relies on visual obstruction are female monasteries in which the *clausura* was protected from outside view, primarily that of men.

tasks.²⁹² Firstly they had to find Ottoman precedents to legitimise the means of segregation. They conveyed the size of windows, the control of entry, the nightly closing, and other means through which isolation was implemented, but they could not find any precedent to obligate the Muslims to stay in such buildings. This resulted in objections from the traders tackled in the following chapter. What they could do in this regard was to do their job – to mediate and translate. This phenomenon will be further explained in the conclusions after all the case studies, but Membré and da Nores tried to implement parts of the Muslim commercial and housing culture(s). Through latrines, baths, and personal food preparation, but also by providing a central place of commerce where they could more easily provide their translation services, the dragomans tended to shift the discourse from a segregated place to the only place in Venice where the *Turks* could have all their needs fulfilled. After all, the traders used khans and *funduqs* for this reason, not of any formal obligation.




Fig. 3. 3 Vincenzo Coronelli, *Palazzo, o Fondaco de' Turchi* (*Singolarità di Venezia, I palazzi*, Venice: Coronelli, 1710, tav. 4.0.10.)

²⁹² Michiel Membré built his successful carrier following a diplomatic missions to Persia which he led in 1539. He detailed it in a long manuscript, mentioning he experienced the *caravassarà* (caravanserai) translated as *fontego*. Michiel Membré, *Relazione di Persia (1542)*, eds. Francesco Castro, Gianroberto Scarcia (Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1969), 10–13; 22; Rothman, *Dragoman Renaissance*, 107. As stated before, he also held experience as a commercial agent in Syria. Giacomo da Nores was his pupil about whom we have little background information, but it can be convincingly claimed that he too had similar experiences, living for 16 or so years in the suburbs of Istanbul and traveling around the Empire in servitude to an Ottoman officer.



Fig. 3. 4 Jacopo de Barbari, *View of Venice* – detail, 1500 (Schulz, *New palaces*, fig. 147)





Fig. 3. 5 Juergen Schulz, *Elevation and partial section of the courtyard façade* – conjectural reconstruction (*New palaces*, fig. 135)




Fig. 133 Venice, Fondaco dei Turchi, ground-floor plan, ca. 1600 (extant walls stippled; demolished walls outline).

Fig. 134 Venice, Fondaco dei Turchi, first-floor plan, ca. 1600 (extant walls stippled; demolished walls outline).




Fig. 3. 6 Juergen Schulz, *Reconstructions of the floor plans of the Fondaco dei Turchi (New palaces)*




Fig. 3. 7 Cesare Torello called il Franco, *Pianta del Palazzo già Pesaro poi dei Marchesi e Duchi d'Este* – ground-floor plan, ca. 1600 (Archivio di Stato di Modena, *Mappario Estense*, n. 329)




Fig. 3. 10 Petar Strunje, Ante Spahija, *Conjectural reconstruction of the Fondaco dei Turchi after 1621 – ground-floor plan.*




Fig. 3. 11 *Mezzanine*




Fig. 3. 12 *First floor*




Fig. 3. 13 *Second floor.*




Fig. 3. 14
Petar Strunje, Ante
Spahija, *Elevation of
the Fondaco dei
Turchi after 1621 –
conjectural
reconstruction*



*A. Fondaco de Turchi
Granato publico* Veduta del Fondaco de Turchi *C. Palazzo Battaglia
D. Traghetto di S. Marco*

Fig. 3. 15 View of the Fondaco de Turchi (Domenico Lovisa, *Il Gran Teatro di Venezia*, Venice, ca. 1720, tav. XLVIII).

3.3.1. The reaction of the tenants

The new tenants reacted strongly to the institution of the *Fondaco*, which almost turned into an international incident due to the involvement of a regional administrator, and subsequently, the sultan. In 1625 a group of merchants led by the sanjak-bey of Szekszard (Hungary) appeared on the *Collegio* with a petition in hand, stating that “the roof was leaking, the neighbours were mean, and the location [...] was too far from the Rialto market.”²⁹³ Furthermore, they were attacked recently and were protesting the nightly closure. Due to the delicate situation involving a high-ranking Ottoman official, Doge Giovanni Cornaro (1624–1630) proceeded to remedy the matter personally. Firstly, he claimed that the attackers were punished severely to deter any future attacks because the *Serenissima* wants the *Turks* to be well treated and safe (in fact, it was obliged to ensure that by the Capitulations of peace). He continued that the *Fondaco* was indeed established to that aim at the best possible place, with the consent and participation of those in Venice at the time, and that no one had objected until that moment.²⁹⁴

The *Turks* were not convinced and the discussion continued. This turn, they objected to the *fondaco* system as such, claiming it inconvenient to hold all of them under the same roof, especially with the Persians roaming freely. The matter was left to the Senate. It prohibited the *Turks* from addressing the *Collegio* directly, as the office of the *Cinque Savi* was there specifically for their requests. The *Savi* were notified to tell the dragoman Giovanni Battista Salvago (1607–1644) to summon three to four influential traders they had to convince. If the traders would still object, they were given the unlikely possibility of finding a different house to host all of them, as big and convenient as the Palazzo Pesaro. It also had to be on

²⁹³ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 203. This is probably the same petition quoted by Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 136 who states that a large host led by the sanjak-bey of Szekszard, Hungary on December 14, 1624 petitioned the *Collegio*. Both of them reference the same document: ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Costantinopoli, reg. 16, cc. 139v–144r, but Rothman also uses a copy from the V Savi, l. s., Risposte, b. 146 under the date Dec. 14, 1625 – therefore the information from Preto needs to be corrected. Also found in Ravid, “The Religious, Economic and Social Background,” 241. The sanjak-bey is an administrative and military official in charge of a sanjak – the administrative district, a province of the Empire, part of an eyalet (beylerbeylik or pashadom) – the largest administrative unit of the Ottoman Empire.

²⁹⁴ Ravid, “The Religious, Economic and Social Background,” 241. There is no evidence of this. Just the contrary if we take into account the petition of the Anatolian merchants from 1579.

the Canal Grande and have separate wings for each Muslim *nation*. The Senate instructed the *Savi* to accentuate that they offer this because of their particular fondness for *Turkish* merchants. In all other matters, the *Cinque Savi* were to accommodate the merchants.

At the same time, the *bailo* Sebastiano Venier (1626–1629) was instructed to inform Sultan Murat IV (1623–1640) of the petition to avoid incidents involving the sanjak-bey. He was to accentuate (the probable falsehood) that the *Fondaco* was established with the consent and desire of the *Turks* themselves and that living around town would endanger their lives and material well-being due to attacks and thefts that occur at night. Furthermore, he was to praise the palace, where they had all and any convenience. In the part that addressed the *bailo* directly, they acknowledged: “The aim of some Turks was to possess ‘harmful freedom’ with scandalous aims that were prejudicial to their own interests in order to commit outrageous indecencies to which one had reacted with revulsion at the time they had lived spread out at the risk of danger to their lives and property, all of which were eliminated when they lived together in one place.”²⁹⁵

This negotiation process confirms the hypothesis that the aim of the *fondaco* system was segregation and social control similar to the Ghetto, but that the situation was much more delicate. After all, unlike the Jews who also directed great financial value, the Ottoman Muslims had outside representation – one far stronger than Venice. Thus, the *Fondaco* involved a degree of appeasement and negotiation – not in its establishment, but rather in the way it was presented and in the accommodations and facilities provided to the users.

Both parts are evident in the process we witnessed insofar and will be found throughout this research: institutional decree – dragoman’s mediation – building realisation – merchants’ petition – dragoman’s mediation – institutional decree – building modification. To conclude this process, building modifications were ordered five months after this event. It seems that either Giovanni Battista Lettino or his guests did not respect the division, so in 1626 the *Cinque Savi* decreed that the mezzanine door that directly connected the custodian’s wing with the *Fondaco* was to be walled in and the windows between the two parts reduced in size by half. Also, the warehouse floors were to be repaired, and an additional bathroom

²⁹⁵ Ravid, “The Religious, Economic and Social Background,” 242–243. Cf. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 136–137.

made on the ground floor. The roof was repaired previously.²⁹⁶ As before, it was made a criminal offence to molest, offend, attack, disturb, or slander Muslims.²⁹⁷ The *Cinque Savi* made the first general inspection of the building in 1637. They concentrated on the main gate, the well in the court whose water was not completely satisfactory, and the other abandoned well full of putrid water without a puteal – seemingly used as a septic tank. This was forbidden to prevent contamination of the other well, so it was to be emptied and closed, while a system of *gatoli* was to be installed. Otherwise, a few of the warehouses had faulty doors and locks.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁶ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, May 4, 1626. Giovanni Battista Lettino died in the following weeks, before May 18 when Giovanni Francesco Visconti, tutor of his underage sons, was made custodian until the children came of age (Ibid., May 18, 1626). We do not know what happened with the sons (Giuseppe was the oldest) because a certain Giovanni Alessandri was custodian before 1671, when he was replaced by Francesco Orsolini (BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 115), who was in turn succeeded by Andrea Simeoni in 1684 (Ibid., p. 125). After the Morean War (1684–1699), Baldassare Lettino (son of Giuseppe q. Giambattista) was elected custodian on May 14, 1699, re-establishing the Lettino guardianship (Ibid., pp. 127–128). The Pesaro countered this, claiming that the Lettino family does not have the custodianship *in perpetuo* (Ibid., pp. 131–133; 143–160). After a year of going back and forth, the *Collegio* sided with the brothers Francesco, Girolamo and Giovanni Pesaro (Ibid., pp. 156–157) and the *Cinque Savi* elected Steffano Bressin as the new custodian among nine candidates, ending the Lettino presence completely (Ibid., pp. 158–160, Mar. 5, 1701). Most of the candidates were merchants or mercantile brokers (*sanseri*).

²⁹⁷ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 87. Cf. Turan, “Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi,” 268.

²⁹⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2 s., fasc. 2, Dec. 30, 1637. *Gatoli* are drains and collectors which can be used for sewage removal or water collection, so their use in this instance remains uncertain.

3.3.2. Defining a *Turco*: The question of the *Fondaco dei Persiani*

Contrary to the recommendations of dragoman da Nores, neither Persians nor Armenians were separately mentioned in the 33 rules. The Armenians, being Miaphysite Christians for the most part, were not included in this regime and could stay at a place of their choosing.²⁹⁹ The regulatory attitude towards the Persians, however, changed over time. Hassan Bucca and Hajji Murat were permitted in 1633 to stay at the Santa Maria Formosa because they were Persians.³⁰⁰ This difference in categorising the various Muslims indicates that at least the *Cinque Savi* acknowledged the ethnic and regional differentiation introduced by the dragomans.³⁰¹ But if the reason behind the institution of the *Fondaco* system was the seclusion of all Muslims due to supposed moral and religious differences from Christians, how was it then possible that a Muslim group such as the Persians was the exception? This can be explained by changes in trade policy and the ambiguity of the term *Turco*. In 1608 a large Persian silk caravan arrived in Split and the *Cinque Savi* wanted to install a formal trade regime between the two countries.³⁰² This was possible in 1613 when another silk caravan was joined by the emissaries of the Shah.³⁰³ They were never legally excluded from the *fondaco* system per se, but their low number and the relatively high value of their silk trade allowed for exceptions without endangering the system. The ambiguity of the term *Turco* provided a legal basis for such exceptions. In the 17th century, the term could have had three possible meanings: a Muslim, a subject of the Ottoman (*Turkish*) sultan, and an ethnic Turk. The Asian and Constantinopolitan Turks were often part of all three categories, while the Bosnians and Albanians were often everything but ethnic Turks.³⁰⁴ On the other side, the Levantine (Ottoman) Jews were subject to the usual

²⁹⁹ They tended to group around Santa Maria Formosa. This is testified by several decisions. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, Nov. 27, 1624; Mar. 14, 1637.

³⁰⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 2, Apr. 4, 1633. Note that this was an exception.

³⁰¹ Cf. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 203–204.

³⁰² Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*, 42.

³⁰³ Ibid. It is unknown how this episode unraveled after 1613 when the emissaries were being convinced that it was much more dangerous to go through the straits of Hormuz (to Egypt) or around Africa (to the Iberian Peninsula), and much safer, faster, and cheaper to go overland to Split.

³⁰⁴ When the Albanians were Christians, they could stay where they wanted (BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 126).

Ghetto seclusion. They were not Muslim, but they were not Christian either. The Armenians were subjects of the sultan same as the Levantine Jews but were Christian. This confirms that the term *Turco* was primarily meant in the religious sense, further acknowledged by the fact that Hassan Bucca and Hajji Murat needed a special permit that recognised them as not being *Turco*, which allowed them freedom of residence outside the *Fondaco*. This precedent was overturned in 1662. To clarify that *Turco* meant Muslim above all else, the *Cinque Savi* issued an order stating that all the *Mohammedan nations*, including the *Persian Turks* (*Turchi Persiani*), were to be secluded in the *Fondaco dei Turchi* so that “they could exercise their [religious] rites without danger of corrupting Christian life”.³⁰⁵ To prove their point, the *Cinque Savi* described an incident that was allowed to happen because the Muslims “staying outside the *Fondaco* could more easily corrupt the good customs and modest life of the youth, sometimes leading them away from the Religion”. They recounted that a few years earlier a *Turk* abducted a boy from Piacenza working in a spice shop near the Ghetto and took him to the Ottoman Empire via Dubrovnik. After a few years, the Muslim merchants took the boy back to Venice but kept him secluded in the *Fondaco*. Luckily, he managed to escape through a window.³⁰⁶ Whether true or not, repeating stories like this cemented the stereotype of Muslims as child

³⁰⁵ “È stata sempre mente publica, che li negotianti havessero a godere in questa Città li vantaggi maggiori, et alli Turchi in particolare, ha proveduto di stanze distinte, e separate, così per loro salvezza, come principalmente perche potessero esercitare liberalemnte li loro Riti, senza osservatione, e pericolo di corrompere il Christiano vivere [...]. Non poter cader in dubbio, che la deputatione della Casa del Fontico non sia stata dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato decretata ad'oggetto, che le Nationi Mahomettane in esso havessero ad habitar Separatam[en]te da Christiani, così ricercando il publico, e privato Servitio, e q[ue]llo sopra tutto della Religione, com'è stato considerato, onde quando i Turchi Persiani havessero libertà di ricovrarsi, ove meglio volessero, sup[er]fluo sarebbe il Fontico, mentre ogni uno non piu semplicem[en]te Turco, ma Turco Persiano si farebbe denominare, et il far di questi la distintione, e la vera cognitione non è di così facile riuscita, che però la esecuzione de gli Ordeni già stabiliti nella erretionne del Fontico, stimiamo necessaria, acìo Ii Turchi di che conditione esser si voglia habbino ad habitare.” ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 3, June 2, 1662. Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 207–208. Also see fasc. 3, June, 16, 1662; Aug. 23, 1662.

³⁰⁶ “Con la libertà ancora di star fuori del Fontico li Turchi possono con facilità maggiore corrompere li buoni costumi, e modesto vivere della Gioventù, e divertirne alcuno dalla Religione ancora, come già qualche anno è occorso, che havendo un Turco sviato un Giovane Piasentino era di Bottega del spitier alle due sirene alla Porta di Shetto, questo condotto per via di Ragusi in Paese, habbi rinegato, ma poi ricondotto, non è molto in questa Città, senza lasciarlo però uscire dal Fontico, ne praticare con alcuno, habbi finalmente questo Giovane scollato la finestra, e fuggito [...].” ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 3, June 2, 1662.

kidnappers – which found its way into legislation.³⁰⁷ The only problem, recognised by the Senate, was how to unite the small number of Persians with the two Ottoman groups in the *Fondaco*.³⁰⁸ The ethnic and political subdivision was still valid as long as the overreaching religious category remained unquestioned. The Persians strongly protested this decision, stating that the Turks were their enemies of a different rite and that their lives would be in danger if forced together.³⁰⁹ The *Cinque Savi* accused them of lying, stating that the Ottomans and the Persians associated all the time – in public squares, during Muslim holidays (*Bairami de Turchi*) and funerals, often frequenting the *Fondaco* to conduct business, eat and drink, and some of them even keeping a room there.³¹⁰ The *Savi* were, however, willing to provide them with separate rooms. If they would decide to leave Venice (less than six of them were there), let it be so.³¹¹ This concluded the question of the Persians, confirming the *Fondaco dei Turchi* as a system including all Muslims. Otherwise, Venetian tradition holds that a separate *Fondaco dei Persiani* existed in the place of the 19th-century Palazzo Ruzzini on the Canal Grande next to the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*.³¹² Up

³⁰⁷ This is an often found phenomenon. Salzberg (“Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange,” 10) brings the case from 1591, when a ten-year-old Russian slave of an Ottoman merchant begged the housekeeper Camilla Dioda to help him return to the Christian faith from which he had allegedly been forcibly removed. Dursteler (*Venetians in Constantinople*, 170) points to a 1605 denunciation about the sale of Christian boys to the Turks.

³⁰⁸ ASVe, V Savi, n.s., b. 187, fasc. II, June 10, 1662; BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 106.

³⁰⁹ Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 208–209.

³¹⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 3, Aug. 23, 1662; Rothman, *Brokering Empire*, 210.

³¹¹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 3, Sept. 13, 1662. They indeed left Venice, but this did not mean that trade with the Persians would not continue in the future. In 1690 a Persian man died and was buried somewhere in Venice. It seems an informal cemetery existed for Muslims on the Lido, similarly to the Jewish one. Out of the 78 Muslim deaths between 1632 and 1764, a minority were slaves serving mostly on private galleys, the majority being from the *Fondaco*. A mysterious death that occurred on Dec. 10, 1763 confirms the regular use of the bathing facilities: “Amet Bergge da Scutari mercante turco d'anni 50, il quale questa mattina dopo levato dal letto ed andato essendo conforme il suo costume a lavarsi nel solito è poi ritrovato morto nel medesimo lavatogio in Fontego de Turchi.” Giuliano Luccheta, “Note intorno a un elenco di Turchi morti a Venezia,” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 15 (1997): 136; transcript 77.

³¹² Alethea Wiel, “The demolition of the Warehouse of the Persians in Venice,” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 13, no. 64 (July, 1908); Donatella Calabi (*Market and the City*, 199–200) took this connection between the Persians and the Ruzzini family as fact, locating their *Fondaco* at the Palazzo Ruzzini. Calabi confirms this through short-term licenses given by the *Savi alle decime* to the Ruzzini family in 1537 and 1582 to operate an *albergheria* for the Persians at various locations in *Castello* (not the Canal Grande Palazzo) but these precede the institution of the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and do not point to a special *Fondaco dei Persiani* in any way, in the same way that the grouping of Asian Muslim groups at Santa Maria Formosa does not constitute a *Fondaco dei Turchi* – which was simultaneously operating in the Vendramin Rialto house. Cf. Brusegan, *I palazzi di Venezia*, 327. Concina, *Fondaci*, 243–244;

to date, no document proving this has been found and – given the decision of 1662 and the generally small number of Persian merchants – we must confirm that it never existed.

3.3.3. Pesaro management and mismanagement of the *Palazzo Pesaro*

The *Fondaco dei Turchi* returned to the Pesaro family's possession in 1648 as the dowry of Marietta Priuli (Doge Antonio's granddaughter) who married Leonardo Pesaro.³¹³ Meanwhile, the documents do not point to any significant maintenance efforts since the 1621 adaptation. This resulted in a series of structural problems pointed out in the 1670 tenants' letter to the Doge, after which the *Cinque Savi* confirmed that the *Fondaco* was left desolate during the long Candian War (1645–1669).³¹⁴ However, nothing was done, and soon the Morean War erupted (1684–1699). After it, the custodian Baldissera Lettino and the *Cinque Savi* warned of the urgent need for repairs.³¹⁵ Building surveyors led by Angelo Gornizai, *proto* of the *Savi ed esecutori alle acque*, compiled the appraisal (appendix 18).³¹⁶ They started their survey in the court saying that the water in the two wells was of good quality, but the caissons' walls needed to be cleaned, and many pieces of stone

Similarly, a *Fondaco degli Arabi* has been envisioned in the Palazzo Mastelli del Cammello due to a number of Orientalising *spolia* on its exterior. Ennio Concina (*Fondaci*, 241) refuted this.

³¹³ Schulz, *New palaces*, 141.

³¹⁴ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 1917, July 30, 1740 (merchants: July 30, 1670; V Savi: Dec. 2, 1670; Senate: Dec. 18, 1670. Copies in: ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 4, under date). Schulz, *New palaces*, 141–142. When the war broke out there were 60 Ottoman merchants in Venice and they were guaranteed security. Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 137–138.

³¹⁵ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 139, Jan. 2, 1699 m.v.

³¹⁶ A short internet search of the online database of the Archivio di Stato di Venezia – *moreveneto* (<http://asve.arianna4.cloud/entita/6a4ff7ef-ecd0-4002-a323-9367222fe8b2/angelo-gornizai/oggetti-collegati?page=3&size=10>) reveals that Gornizai was *proto* of the *Fiumare* from at least 1683 to 1707 where he authored a number of drawings concerning hydraulic works. In this employment he applied for the reconstruction of the *Ponte di San Giobbe (Tre archi)* in Cannaregio in 1688 (Susanna Biadene, “Progetti per il ponte di San Giobbe a Cannaregio,” in *Le Venezie possibili: Da Palladio a Le Corbusier*, eds. Lionello Puppi, Giandomenico Romanelli (Milano: Electa, 1985). From 1692 he worked on the expansion of Palazzo Zenobio (Bernad Aikema, “Il famoso abondio”. *Abbondio stazio e la decorazione a stucco nei palazzi veneziani: circa 1685–1750*,” *Saggi e Memorie di storia dell'arte* 21, 1997: 91). In 1696–1698 he worked on the new locutory (*parlatorio*) at the complex of the Convertite on the Giudecca, in 1699 he worked on the Murano monastery of San Marco ed Andrea while in 1706 he became the *proto* of the church of San Biagio e Cataldo on the Giudecca (Aikema, Meijers, *Nel regno dei poveri*, 192; 195)

replaced in the internal steps. The courtyard needed to be cleared of ruins, particularly the crumbling staircase at the *Rio del Meggio* side, which required a partial reconstruction.³¹⁷ Most of the warehouses needed new floors, doors, and windows. On the Riva, three semi-circular wooden steps were missing, and the fallen top of the wall separating the Canal Grande needed to be replaced (compare fig. 3.17). The rotten beams of the portico required shoring, and the wooden staircase a complete remake.³¹⁸

On the *piano nobile*, only a part of the rooms was usable, while the other part lacked doors, doorframes, windows, parts of floors, fireplaces, and occasionally even beams and the ceiling. In the main hall, the flooring and a part of the ceiling needed to be redone, as well as the wash basins (*lavelli*) – also found in the Canal Grande loggia.³¹⁹

The surveyors could not reach the second floor because the staircase fell, so they peeked up from the rooms where the ceiling was missing. From what they could see, the situation was even worse, with missing doors, doorframes, windows, flooring, and staircases.³²⁰

From the first floor, they came down to the mezzanine full of construction debris; rooms without doors, windows, and window shutters. The stairs were steep and slippery and needed to be remade, as well as the partition wall between the two parts.³²¹ Finally, the custodian's house with its five rooms on the mezzanine was orderly, as was the five-room *bottega* with a separate house below (that the custodian seems to have rented). The *bottega* occupied part of the previous Canal Grande portico (fig. 3.16) and the quay, diminishing it. The small guard's house on the other end of the quay was completely in order.³²² The owner Leonardo Pesaro (di Antonio) slowly started repairs and quickly put the *Fondaco*

³¹⁷ It would be removed completely in the reconstruction of 1751–1768.

³¹⁸ The estimated price for the ground floor was 350 ducats. BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 140–141; Jan. 20, 1699 m.v.; same in ASVe, V Savi, 2 s., fasc. 4, under date.

³¹⁹ This would cost 220 ducats. BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 141. The presence of the wash basins might point to the logical assumption that these halls were used for dining, as these facilities are usually found in front of monastery refectories.

³²⁰ The cost estimate could not be made. BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 141. While static damage is the result of abandonment, neglect, and misuse, the movable elements were probably ransacked. A similar occurrence happened to Palazzo Venezia in Rome in the 1680s. Chiara Scarpa, “Venezia a Roma: il palazzo di San Marco,” in *La storia del Palazzo di Venezia: dalle collezioni Barbo e Grimani a sede dell'Ambasciata veneta e austriaca*, ed. Maria Giulia Barberini et al. (Rome: Gangemi, 2011), 192.

³²¹ The cost was estimated at 500 ducats. BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 141–142.

³²² BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 142. Cf. Schulz, *New palaces*, 142 analysed the building survey, incorrectly transcribing the surname as Ganizai.

into function, but the Second Morean War (1714–1718) broke out, disrupting trade. After it, the situation only deteriorated, and around fifty tenants again complained in 1740 of the crumbling state of the building, pointing to the incident eight years prior when the floor collapsed under two of the merchants.³²³ The *Cinque Savi* thus requested a new survey from the architect Lorenzo Boschetti (1670–1750).³²⁴ Boschetti concluded that the exterior wall on the Rio del Meggio leaned and will fall if the existing rotten shoring across the Rio is not replaced (appendix 20). The small internal court was also shored from one side to the other. The front and the back façades were heavily damaged,³²⁵ requiring a lot of work. The architect again warned of the rotten beams, accusing the tenants of washing and drying the clothes in the rooms and leaving all sorts of garbage around. However, the proprietor Leonardo Pesaro was unwilling to repair the building, wanting to vacate it for different use. Therefore, after receiving this survey, the *Cinque Savi* wrote to the *Signoria* reminding them of the injured residents. They ordered a new survey from Giovanni Pastori,³²⁶ proto of the *Magistrato al Sal*, who estimated the cost of the repairs at 14 000 ducats. Furthermore, the *Savi* compiled a history of the *Fondaco* at Palazzo Pesaro to point out past agreements with the proprietors.³²⁷ The decision was left to the Senate, which concluded that the *Fondaco* was to be kept there, obligating Pesaro to renovate the building. In the meantime,

³²³ They said the usable parts are very narrow, lacking a kitchen and water. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 9, Mar. 7, 1740. Cf. Schulz, *New palaces*, 138.

³²⁴ Boschetti was a Venetian architect, engineer, and mathematician active as the proto of the *Savi ed esecutori alle acque*. He made the project for the Bridge of San Giobbe (Tre archi, 1688 ?), the façade of the church of San Stae (1709), and the palazzo Venier dei Leoni (Guggenheim, 1749). Boschetti's only known realised work is the reconstruction of the church of San Barnaba (1749–1772). Elena Bassi, "Lorenzo Boschetti," in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Volume 13 (1971): https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lorenzo-boschetti_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ (accessed 21.6.2022). Also see Antonio Dall'Aglio, "Lorenzo Boschetti proto al Magistrato dei Savi ed Esecutori alle Acque, (1670–1750)," (Master's thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1982); Lionello Puppi, Giandomenico Romanelli, eds., *Le Venezie possibili* (Milano: Electa, 1985), 116–117, 134–135.

³²⁵ Lit. *sconcerti nelli muri*. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 9, Mar. 16, 1740. Cf. Schulz, *New palaces*, 142.

³²⁶ Pastori worked on the reconstruction of the *scala dei Giganti* of the *palazzo Ducale* from 1725. He made a number of public buildings' surveys and repaired the Fabbriche Nove from 1750. Elisabetta Molteni, "Pubblico e architettura a Venezia nel Settecento," in *L'edilizia pubblica nell'età dell'illuminismo*, vol. 2, ed. Giorgio Simoncini (Florence: Leo S. Olschki editore, 2000), 338–339; 354; 356; 358.

³²⁷ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 9, June 10, 1740; Schulz, *New palaces*, 142. The Pastori survey is not attached, but is referenced in this document.

the tenants could stay in the part towards the *salizada*, which was in better condition due to it being illegally leased to Christians since the wars.³²⁸

Although Leonardo Pesaro was bound to accept, nothing was done before May 1750, when the *Cinque Savi* again intervened. This time they went there personally, escorted by the *proto* Paolo Rossi (1699–1769) in charge of making a new survey of the building.³²⁹

It must be said that the economic viability of the project was dubious for Pesaro. Due to the reduced competitiveness of the Venetian market, trade steadily decreased during the 18th century. Of those merchants that remained, the change in commercial methods meant that

³²⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 187, fasc. 9, July 28; July 30, 1740; Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 1917, July 30, 1740. Cf. Schulz, *New palaces*, 142.

³²⁹ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 161. “Avendo questo Magistrato di noi Savi alla Mercanzia fatto sopra luoco nel Fontico de Turchi di questa Città con l’assistenza di voi Paulo Rossi Protto vi resta con le presenti ingionto di dover prender in esame la Fabrica del Fontico medesimo denotando la sua struttura, si per le camere erano solite abitarsi da Turchi, si per li magazeni ne quali si ricoverano le loro merci, e si finalmente degl’altri luochi inserventi al commun uso. Aggiungerete qual sia la loro presente positurto [?], i loro diffetti, e caducità derusante o dall’atual interna deboleza della Fabrica, o dal pericolante stato de muri esterni. Soggiungerete a parte a parte quali debano esser i ripari per farsi una stabile riparazione notando in numeri le diverse località bisognare, spiegando ciò che ad ogni una appartenza per la sua solida riparazione e sussistenza formando poi una poliza che abbozzi il dispendio di tutti i materiali, e delle mercedi da corrisponderi agl’operarij. Osservarete quante siano le camere attualmente habitate o abitabili senta pericolo de Turchi, e quanti i magazeni, ne quali riponer le loro mercanzie rimarcando particolarmente se siano soggetti all’aqua, e perciò in evidente pericolo le merci che vi si richiudessero di rimaner pregiudicate, il tutto a dovuto lume di questo magistrato e per quei riflessi che munissero. Data dal Mag[istrato] de V Savi alla mercanzia li 2 Maggio 1750.”

Rossi’s subsequent report must have existed because it was referenced later, and was the basis for his designs and models, but it was not attached to any of the decisions and I was not able to find it.

Paolo Rossi was the son of the more famous architect Domenico (1657–1737) and father of Filippo (1727–1795) – *proto dell’Arsenale*. Paolo was the *proto dell’ospedale dei Derelitti*. In 1742 he worked on the expansion of the *Ospedaletto della Santa Maria dei Derelitti*. As the *proto dell’ospedale della Pietà* (from 1738) he was the supervising engineer (*proto*) of the church and hospice complex of the *Santa Maria della Pietà* under Giorgio Massari 1744–1763. In 1750 he conducted a limited refurbishment on the Canal Grande Palazzo Ruzzini-Soranzo-Loredan (the so-called *Fondaco dei Persiani*). Elena Bassi, *Architettura del Sei e Settecento a Venezia* (Naples: Edizione scientifiche Italiane, 1962), 232; Concina, *Fondaci*, 243; Aikema, Meijers, *Ner regno dei poveri*, 166; 200–201. Furthermore, he worked as the engineer of the *Savi ed esecutori alle acque* (ASVe, *Savi ed esecutori alle acque, Disegni, Adige*, dis. 28, Mar. 5, 1705; dis. 33/a, 33, 34, all dated Feb. 10, 1709 m.v.). In 1735 Rossi made a drawing of the southern part of church of San Giovanni Crisostomo and the surrounding area for the *Giudici del Piovego* to serve as the elaboration of the request of the parish priest to add an additional chapel dedicated to Saint Anne, requested by the parish priest so that the altar to the Saint might be levelled with that of Saint Joseph next to it. The present situation and the measurements correspond to his proposal (ASVe, *Giudici del Piovego*, b. 168, dis. 1, June 4, 1735). On biographical notes, such as his year of birth see Marco Saterini, “Domenico Rossi, l’architetto principe alle origini della committenza Manin: l’ultimo grande progetto culturale dell’aristocrazia della Serenissima” (Master’s thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1993), note 14.

they preferred to employ trade agents, which could be done in Split, rather than personally travelling to Venice.³³⁰



Fig. 3. 16 Francesco Guardi (att.), *Fondaco dei Turchi*, 1745–1750 (Swiss private collection)³³¹

³³⁰ Most of the agents were Jews and Dalmatians. See Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 139; Paci, *La scala di Spalato*; Nataša Bajić-Žarko, *Split kao trgovačko i tranzitno središte na razmeđu istoka i zapada u 18. stoljeću* (Split: Književni krug, 2004).

³³¹ Sold at Koller auction, Lot 3062 – Article 152, Egidio Martini, *La pittura veneziana del Settecento* (Venice: Edizioni Marciane, 1964), fig. 283, note 273: *poco dopo il 1745*.

3.3.4. The long reconstruction 1751–1768

Half a year later, Leonardo Pesaro personally wrote to the *Cinque Savi* (implying that the letter would be forwarded to the Senate), describing his plan for a complete reconstruction (appendix 22). Although it is the least researched one, this period can be reconstructed relatively in detail, seeing that the entire negotiation effort between Pesaro, the *Cinque Savi*, and the Senate is preserved, together with Bernardino Maccaruzzi's report and drawings made in 1768 after the construction was finished. It was the last significant change to the building before the partial demolition and reconstructive restoration of the 19th century, so certain observations can be drawn from Sagredo and Berchet, who depicted the Canal Grande tract and described specific segments.

Returning to Pesaro's report, due to the building's more than four centuries (*sic!*) of age, long periods of being closed, and misuse by the *Turks*, it would be easiest to demolish it – he claimed. After consultation with the *Cinque Savi*, Pesaro made the new reconstruction plan with the expert (Paolo Rossi) respecting the 1621 rules with particular attention paid to the internal separation between Asian and European Muslims. He proposed a more organic division into floors with the much more numerous Europeans (Bosnians and Albanians) comprising the mezzanine (21 rooms) and the first floor (16 rooms), with the Asians and Constantinopolitans on the second (16 rooms). Rooms would be more uniform than before, each being able to host five to six guests, numbering the maximum capacity at 220 persons just on the mezzanine and the first floor – which Pesaro claimed was excessive. The second-floor rooms were to be left unfinished until the tenants started to arrive in large numbers.³³² A new system of internal communications would be established, with an additional room for the safekeeping of weapons. Interestingly, he also proposed the addition of two mosques, one for each *nation*. The façade on the Canal Grande was to be preserved and repaired in its present form, while the ground-floor level (*fondo*) was to be elevated by one foot to prevent flooding. The custodian's wing would be reorganised on the

³³² Preto, *Venezia e i Turchi*, 139 notes that out of the 29 *Turks* that died in Venice in the period 1707–1764, only one was *Asian*.

corner between the Canal Grande and the Rio, while a guard would be provided with a small house next to the gate (moving him from the Riva). In return, Pesaro asked for the wing towards the *salizada* to be divided from the *Fondaco* and allowed to be rented to Christians. When approved, the four attached plans (one for each floor) would be elaborated in two models.³³³

These plans, first presented to the *Cinque Savi* and then forwarded to the Senate, were accompanied by a short explanation – a reading tool (appendix 22, n. 2), unsigned but probably made by Rossi together with the designs. In this explanation, it is claimed that a part of the building was such a ruin that it was incapable of restoration. Although not detailed, the short explanation does inform of the number of spaces and their functions on each floor. It can be compared with the drawings made by Bernardino Maccaruzzi in 1768 (fig. 3.19–3.23), especially on the points where they do not overlap.³³⁴ On the ground floor, 20 warehouses (19 realised) and several toilets were planned (none realised, but two bathrooms were). The proposed mezzanine contained 21 rooms (20 realised) but grouped around corridors, contrary to the previous situation. No toilets were planned (two realised). The first-floor plan consisted of 16 rooms, a mosque, toilets, and two large halls accessible from that floor (the *Sala Grande* and the loggia – both realised and present in the original structure, but the loggia was separated by Maccaruzzi). A separate room for the safekeeping of weapons was there, towards the Rio (signed E on Maccaruzzi’s plan; fig. 3.21). No bathrooms were mentioned, but as will be seen, Maccaruzzi countered Rossi’s plan for the baths (*ingresso*; room 8) to prevent water damage to the support structure below.³³⁵ The top floor is the least explained (Maccaruzzi draws it only as a simple scheme;

³³³ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2128, allegato 1 (Feb. 2, 1750 m.v.) to the Senate decision (Feb. 11, 1750); BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 162–167. I was not able to find the designs or the models. Schulz, *New palaces*, 143 provides a rudimentary survey of the documents in fz. 2128 as part of his chronology of the building, without mentioning the Rossi project that is explicitly mentioned in BMC, PDc 740, item II; ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2134.

³³⁴ In the same year Maccaruzzi finished the restoration of the Casino (Manlio Brusatin, *Venezia nel Settecento: stato, architettura, territorio*, Torino: Einaudi, 1980, 51–52). Copy of his plan: V Savi, Registri, reg. 155: “A. Disegno del Fondaco dei Turchi: Primo febraro 1805, Venezia. Copia tratta dall'originale disegno formato dall'architetto Bernardino Maccaruzzi per riscontro del modello costruito l'anno 1751 dello stabile detto il Fondaco dei Turchi in contrada S. Giacomo dall'Orio di ragione della nobile famiglia Pesaro/ Matteo Zonta Proto perito”.

³³⁵ Each room (except for room 16 – the proposed mosque) had a relatively large wash basin (ca. 90x90 cm) which must have been made according to Rossi’s plan as their grouping suggests the presence of pipes,

fig. 3.22) – a staircase, corridors, a mosque, and 16 rooms are mentioned. The loggia and the *sala grande* spanned the height of two floors (fig. 3.26).³³⁶ Thus they were inaccessible from the second floor, as can be seen from the Maccaruzzi plan and the one by Berchet (fig. 3.25). Finally, the position of the windows was separately measured. Those on the ground floor were to be positioned ten Venetian feet up (348 cm), the mezzanine ones 7.5 feet (261 cm), the first-floor ones ten feet, and the second-floor ones eight feet (278 cm).³³⁷ Maccaruzzi's plan shows that most rooms had two such windows, which was necessary to receive any light at such height. Therefore, the internal orientation and the external obstruction of vision were not only kept but enhanced. The same is also observed in the new position of the staircases inside the building, which might have been the general practice of the time, but it also removed a possible vantage point from which to look over the perimeter walls.

The *Cinque Savi* compared Pesaro's proposal to their 1621 rules and the previous situation, approving it (appendix 22). They requested the locking of the staircase from the first to the second floor to prevent unauthorised access to the attic before the completion of the second floor, and contact between the groups after. The *Savi* guaranteed that all Muslim traders and their merchandise would be transferred to the *Fondaco* if the old rent prices were not changed. They stressed that a new, straight partition wall without any openings had to be built between the Christian wing on the *salizada* and the rest of the *Fondaco*. Once the wooden models were made according to the present drawings, the realised building and any future maintenance would be done according to them.³³⁸ Therefore, there should have been

which is something that Maccaruzzi could not have done in his relatively short employment, and does not mention. As will be explained further, Muslim daily customs require a small amount of water, so its splashing would not present a problem to the structure as the full body wash would. Other than personal and religious hygiene, these wash basins could have been used in food preparation, being paired with a fireplace.

³³⁶ This height would have been the norm, as the *sala grande* was around ten meters wide; therefore it should not be only four meters high – as suggested by the height of the windows on the first floor.

³³⁷ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2128, attachment n. 2 (Feb. 1, 1750 m.v.) to the Senate decision of Feb. 11, 1750 m.v. Appendix 22.

³³⁸ The presence of two wooden models is a curiosity, but easily explained though the complicated commission process that involved two parties – the government (represented by the *Cinque Savi*) who strictly regulated the project, and the proprietor Leonardo Pesaro who financed it. The *Savi* had a copy made so they could be sure that Pesaro, who conducted the works (and any future successors), would not change anything to the prearranged project.

no additions to the plan they claimed to have made together with their nominated *proto* (Rossi). Finally, any new rules for the management of the *new Fondaco* were to be made by the public dragoman Iseppo Volta and approved by them, continuing earlier practice.³³⁹

Two days later, the Senate approved the project, paying particular attention to the well “which was to be made in a way in which it could keep the water clean, which is very necessary to the needs and practices of the Turks” (appendix 22).³⁴⁰

One of the models was given to the *Cinque Savi* before 30 April and forwarded to the Senate on 5 May 1751.³⁴¹ Based on it, the *Savi* redacted a new set of 17 rules for the management of the reconstructed *Fondaco*, referencing the points from 1621 and their opinion of 9 February that year.³⁴² The model (one in public hands, the other with the Pesaro family) was to be consulted in the future so that the material state of the building remains unchanged (1). Iron bars were to be installed on ground-floor and mezzanine windows, as well as window shutters (*trombe*) on those windows that looked towards Christian houses on the *salizada* (2). A small bathroom was to be built, like the one that existed before (3). The building was to be divided between the Bosnians and Albanians (first two floors) and the Asians and Constantinopolitans (top floor) with their appertaining mosques (4). All the rooms were to be furnished with raised surfaces made of planks (*solaro; tavolato*) – used as beds (5). All rooms and warehouses were to be indicated with a number so the *Turks* would know the connected monthly rent price indicated in a visible place in Italian and Turkish. The room prices and their classification by size were not changed from the 1621 guidelines, but their numbering does not correspond to either the original situation or the Maccaruzzi plans. However, their cumulative number does conform to the realised plan, meaning that the Rossi project was changed following the request of the *Cinque Savi* and the Senate (6–7). The custodian was to keep a lamp in each corridor during the night, the well always full, and the building clean (8–10). He was to

³³⁹ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2128, attachment dated Feb. 9, 1750 m.v. to the Senate decision of Feb. 11, 1750 m.v.; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 168-172.

³⁴⁰ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2128, Feb. 11, 1750 m.v.; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 173–174.

³⁴¹ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2134, under date. The *Savi* mention that Paolo Rossi, the *Proto Pubblico* should be reimbursed for making the models, having been employed by them for the last nine months.

³⁴² ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2134, Apr. 30, 1751; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 179–186.

have two loyal guards at the gates (at the *salizada* and the Canal Grande), which were to be locked when the sun sets (11–12). The guards were there to assist the merchants while prohibiting the introduction of weapons and entry to young people and women (13–14). Once more, anyone was prohibited from hosting the *Turks*, who were to stay exclusively at the *Fondaco* (15). The custodian was obliged to implement the 17 rules, which were not to be changed by anyone except the *Savi* (16–17). The Senate approved them ten days later, ordering Pesaro to commence the reconstruction according to the model made by Paolo Rossi, for which Rossi was awarded 100 ducats.³⁴³ In September 1752, Pesaro still had not started the works, the tenants complained, and the *Collegio* reminded him of his obligations.³⁴⁴

Unfortunately, we have yet to learn how the construction process proceeded, but the building was largely in use by August 1762 when the custodian Angelo Dolcetta was replaced with Giacomo Vicci.³⁴⁵ His hiring was accompanied by an eleven-point rulebook that strictly regulated the custodian's role in living within his wing of the *Fondaco*, regulating entry and exit of weapons, goods, and people, the cleaning regimen, and internal discipline.³⁴⁶

Although the building was in use since at least 1762, the *Cinque Savi* employed the architect Bernardino Maccaruzzi (c. 1728–1798) to inspect the restored building and make rectifications in late November 1767. The Pesaro brothers (Francesco, Nicolò, Giovanni) confirmed the completion of the works only in June 1768, after which Maccaruzzi submitted his report and plans in August (fig. 3.19–3.23; appendix 24).³⁴⁷

³⁴³ ASVe, Denato, Deliberazioni, Terra, fz. 2134, Mag. 15, 1751; BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 187–188.

³⁴⁴ BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VI, f. 209r–v, Sept. 9, 1752. The *Turks* again complained of their confinement and feared an increase in rent. However, they had two specific requests. The first was that the three former staircases are remade: two in stone, one in wood. The second was that the *Fondaco* remains in the same form and place, under realistic and honest prices and management. If not, they ask for a new location to be made in agreement with them or the abolishment of the system.

³⁴⁵ BMC, PDc 740, item II, p. 188. The diarist Pietro Gradenigo reported already on Jan. 4, 1755 that the building was restored. Lina Livian ed., *Notizie d'arte tratte dai Notatori e dagli Annali del N.H. Pietro Gradenigo* (Venice: La Reale Deputazione, 1942), 14.

³⁴⁶ BMC, PDc 740, item II, pp. 188–190. In 1763 the rules were again revised and numbered 15 points in total: pp. 191–194.

³⁴⁷ Schulz, *New palaces*, 143. ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 372, fz. 131, item 3; the plans are kept in: ASVe, *Miscellanea mappe*, n. 571, signed: *Bernardino Macaruzzi architetto*, with the scale of 60 *piedi*. According to his plans, the lot measures as 42,25 m on the Canal Grande façade which can be confirmed from the Berchet plans of the Canal Grande tract (Sagredo, Berchet, *Fondaco dei Turchi*, tables II–III).

As requested, Maccaruzzi relied on Rossi's wooden model and the 17 points of the *Cinque Savi*. During his building adjustments, the dragoman Giovanni Bellato served as his consultant, again confirming that no major work was done on the *Fondaco* without an Ottoman-related specialist. For the most part, Maccaruzzi concentrated on the visual obstructions to the outside, the internal communications, ventilation, and illumination. A major change to Rossi's vertical division of ethnicities was the introduction of four separate rooms (fig. 3.20; n. 17–20) with a toilet on the mezzanine, accessible only through wooden stairs from the ground floor. Maccaruzzi was informed that they were for the Tripolitans (*Turchi Tripolini*).³⁴⁸ The mezzanine saw the most significant change from the proposed model. Maccaruzzi found that floor unsatisfactory, with inaccessible rooms, and unconnected, dark, and stuffy corridors. He immediately rectified this, extending the corridors along the floor and opening new windows. A balcony, differing from the model, was made by the builders inside the courtyard portico not to reduce the size of the rooms, which Maccaruzzi welcomed. For the *piano nobile*, we find out that the loggia was intended to be completely separated from the rest of the floor as the centre point of a separate tract containing the rooms 6–9 and the weapons room. However, Maccaruzzi reunited the rooms with the floor, forming a new corridor (D) but leaving the loggia and the weapons room outside. The mosque – called the prostrating room (*luogo della riduzione*), was originally planned in room 16, supposedly with the bath in the ante-room. Maccaruzzi

The back measures as 36,2 m on the dividing wall, while the sides are 58 m (*salizada*) and 59,56 m (*Rio*). Schulz (*New palaces*, 158) corrects the measurements, confirming that Maccaruzzi made mistakes in the angles of the lateral and internal walls.

³⁴⁸ Tripolitania is the coastal part of Lybia, corresponding to the Ottoman province of Tripolitania. The regular presence of Tripolitans is not testified in the historiography, but the proprietor must have found it necessary to provide a space for them, and to separate those African Muslims from the Asians and the Europeans. This coincides with the Republic's signing of peace treaties with the Ottoman-vassal Barbary states: Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli, which for the first time guaranteed free and secure shipping to Venice in exchange for yearly tribute. Andrea Pelizza, "Il riscatto degli schiavi a Venezia," *Storicamente* 6 (2010): 2. E-journal, DOI: [10.1473/stor453](https://doi.org/10.1473/stor453)

They were signed in 1764, so the new rooms could not have been envisioned by Rossi, and were instead formed sometime between 1764 and 1767. Judging by the lack of any further mention in documents or literature, it is possible the Africans never came, and that this decision was just a political one. It still demonstrates that the Venetian government was willing to recognise a third entity for the Muslims, something it was unwilling to do for the Persians a century before. Other than political-geographical or ethnic concerns, the Maliki school of Sunni Islam is prevalent in the Maghreb, contrary to the Hanafi school in the Balkans, Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt. In the absence of Africans, the rooms could have been used for the Asian Muslims.

found this impractical due to the planned second-floor staircase nearby,³⁴⁹ moving the mosque to a new annexe. The same he did with the bathrooms (one in the place of room n. 8), reducing them to marginal spaces *outside the walls* so the splashing water would not damage the support structure below.³⁵⁰ In contrast with Rossi's plan, where the mosque and the bath would be centrally placed (and so utterly invisible from the outside), Maccaruzzi moved them to the southeast angle. The uppermost floor was left unfinished, having only bare walls.

The final result can be contrasted with the 1621 situation. The most obvious change was the removal of the whole tract on the *salizada*, where four units were formed as rented apartments.³⁵¹ As previously arranged, the much more numerous European Muslims occupied the mezzanine and the first floor. The Africans would ideally move into the smaller part of the mezzanine, while the top floor would be assigned to the Muslims of Asia and Constantinople. However, it seems the top floor was never finished (together with the second mosque),³⁵² so the Asians must have used the small tract of the mezzanine in the absence of (or together with) the Africans. A small ground-floor house for the guard (signed F) was added in the courtyard next to the main entrance. Out of 24 warehouses that existed after 1621, nineteen were left even after the removal of the *salizada* tract. Major changes were introduced on all floors. The mezzanine saw a new spatial organisation with long corridors connecting the rooms. The custodian's wing was significantly shortened, and 20 rooms were organised instead of the previous 25. Two toilets were installed (exactly two were requested by the *Cinque Savi* in 1621), one for each tract (the smaller one was on the Canal Grande tract of the four rooms). On the first floor, 23 rooms with two sets of toilets and bathrooms existed before; now only sixteen were made with one toilet, and a room designated for the mosque with an antechamber and a bathroom in front.

³⁴⁹ Probably in the supposed bath – the room marked as *Ingresso*.

³⁵⁰ It can be observed that Maccaruzzi's *piano nobile* bath was a wooden addition protruding from the wall, while the other two were made on the ground floor.

³⁵¹ BMCV, PDc 740, item I, fasc. V/3, May 16, 1774. Two of the units are shown on the Berchet plans. Sagredo, Berchet, *Fondaco dei Turchi*, tables II–III (fig. 3.24–3.25), signed as A and B. *Casa abitata da Christiani* on the Maccaruzzi plans (3.19–3.23).

³⁵² The same can be confirmed from Sagredo and Berchet who do not mention anything specific about it, and count only one mosque.

The top floor was expanded significantly, leading Pesaro to consider it entirely new, albeit it was left unfinished. Previously only thirteen generally small rooms existed on that floor – eleven of them were bedrooms and two service ones. Now, sixteen could be furnished, even without the tract on the *salizada* rented to Christians. On the material, Berchet informs us that the partition walls were made of plastered boards (*assiti intonacati*), the staircases in the Canal Grande loggia of wood (as in 1621) and confirms that each room was numbered, had a fireplace and a raised platform made of planks used as a bed.³⁵³

Following the request of the Pesaro brothers and based on Maccaruzzi's report and drawings (mentioned explicitly), new rent tariffs and a simplified list of rules in fifteen points were introduced by the *Cinque Savi* – printed in 1769 and posted in the *Fondaco*, defined as the “Lodging house of the Turks and all other Mohammedans of any sect”.³⁵⁴ All the rooms were to have a number pointed above *in abbaco* (our contemporary standard Arabic numerals), which corresponded to prices indicated in this rent table that was also to be translated into Turkish. From point 3, we learn that mason Domenico Brunello served as the *capomastro* of the project, for which he occupied three warehouses.³⁵⁵ Duties of the custodian were repeated once more: the guarded gates were to be locked at sunset, no armed man, any woman, or youngster could enter, and the custodian was to clean the building and fill the wells, among other duties.

³⁵³ Sagredo, Berchet, *Fondaco dei Turchi*, 58; 68.

³⁵⁴ “Alloggio de' Turchi e di tutti gli altri Maomettani di qualunque Setta”. BMC, PDC 740, item I, fasc VI, f. 221, Jan. 26, 1768 m.v.

³⁵⁵ While it is not possible to undoubtedly attribute to Brunello the whole reconstruction, Maccaruzzi was employed for half a year (Nov. 27, 1767 to Aug. 2, 1768) and his changes to the project were minor. Warehouses n. 9, 10, and 15 were the larger ones, in any case superfluous for Maccaruzzi's rectifications so Brunello was most probably the *capomastro* even before, employed by the Pesaro as the contractor to realise Rossi's project. The only information about Domenico Brunello is that he managed the construction of the San Servolo hospital complex with a certain Gaetano Brunello and the assistance of Giorgio Massari after Giovanni Scalfarotto was replaced in 1752. Antonio Niero, “Architetti e pittori nell'isola di S. Servolo: precisazioni e recuperi,” *Arte Veneta* 35 (1981).



Fig. 3. 17 Francesco Albotto (att.), *View of the Fondaco dei Turchi*, 1752–1755 (Turin, Galleria Sabauda).



Fig. 3. 18 Circle of Michele Marieschi, *Venice with a View of the Canal Grande and the Fontego dei Turchi*, after 1755 (private collection).³⁵⁶

³⁵⁶ This painting was last sold at the Lempertz auction 1153 in Cologne, lot 2103. It was attributed to Marieschi and dated to 1740 by Ralph Toledano, *Michele Marieschi, Catalogo ragionato* (Milan: Leonardo, 1995), 114–115, n. V39a, V39b. However, Marieschi died in 1744, not being able to witness the restored Fondaco. According to Schulz, *New palaces*, appendix 3, n. 8, thirteen such paintings were made starting from 1751, slightly differing in the staffage and the state of the Fondaco.



Fig. 3. 19 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, *Fondaco dei Turchi* – ground-floor plan, 1768 (ASVe, *Miscellanea mappe*, n. 571)




Fig. 3. 20 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, *Fondaco dei Turchi* – mezzanine plan, 1768




Fig. 3. 21 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, *Fondaco dei Turchi* – first-floor plan, 1768.




Fig. 3. 22 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, *Fondaco dei Turchi* – second-floor plan, 1768.





Fig. 3. 23 Bernardino Maccaruzzi, *Fondaco dei Turchi* – roof layout, 1768.



ICNOGRAFIA DEL PIANO TERRENO



ICNOGRAFIA DEL MEZZANINO




Fig. 3. 24 Federico Berchet, *Ground-floor and mezzanine plan of the Fondaco dei Turchi as present in 1858* (Sagredo, Berchet, *Il Fondaco dei Turchi*, tav. II)

Tavola II.

PIANO TERRENO.

- A. *Casetta a ridosso del prospetto.*
 - a) Stanza terrena e scala di legno che conduce al piano superiore.
 - b) Cucina con focolajo.
 - c) Magazzino che non riceve luce diretta da alcuna finestra.
- B. *Casa con ingresso dalla Salizzada.*
 - d) Entrata dall'esterno, con una cisterna da un lato.
 - e) Magazzino a sinistra.
 - f) Altro magazzino a destra.
- C. *Loggia terrena, in parte chiusa da assiti e in parte da muro.*
- D. *Portico o androne di comunicazione coll'interno cortile.*
- E. *Sei magazzini locati alla officina dei tabacchi.*

PIANO DEI MEZZANINI.

- A. *Casetta a ridosso del prospetto.*
 - a) Scala di legno.
 - b) Quattro camere.
- B. *Casa con ingresso dalla Salizzada.*
 - c) Scala di legno che dalla entrata terrena mette a tutti i piani.
 - d) Anticamera.
 - e) Cucina con focolajo e fornelli.
 - f) Retro-cucina.
 - g) Stanza.
- C. *Scala provvisoria di legname che dalla loggia terrena conduce ai mezzanini.*
- D. *Altra scala di legno che dai mezzanini mette alla loggia superiore.*
- E. *Corridoi di comunicazione.*
- F. *Sette camere, in ciascheduna delle quali esistono gli avanzi di un focolajo ed accessori.*


Berchet's legend to tav. II

Tavola III.


PIANO PRIMO O DELLA GALLEBIA.

- A. *Loggia superiore divisa in diciotto arcate.*
- B. *Tre camere della casa avente ingresso dalla Salizzada.*
- C. *Corridoi di comunicazione.*
- D. *Sette Camere, ognuna con focolajo ed accessori.*

Berchet's legend to tav. III (below)



ICNOGRAFIA DEL PIANO PRIMO



ICNOGRAFIA DEL PIANO A TETTO

Fig. 3. 25 Federico Berchet, *First and second-floor plan of the Fondaco dei Turchi*, 1858 (Sagredo, Berchet, *Il Fondaco dei Turchi*, tav. III)

Spaccata principale della chiesa
attuale del Tombeo dei Torloni

5




Fig. 3. 26 Federico Berchet, Cross section of the canal-side tract, 1861 (Schulz, *New palaces*, fig. 168)

3.3.4.1. The question of the Venetian mosque

Considering that the mosque is not explained in scientific literature, it deserves a separate chapter. It was one of the repurposed rooms, with mats and carpets on the floors and inscriptions made by the tenants on the eastern – *qibla* wall.³⁵⁷ Although its form does not point to any imported influence, the tripartite spatial organisation does show a degree of understanding of Muslim religious spaces and customs. Typically, any mosque has a tripartite functional organisation that allows the transition from the wider secular world into the religious space of the prayer hall – the mosque proper. Generally, walled courtyards, atriums, and porches are used to separate religious spaces from the outside. In them, an ablution space and/or a fountain are found. It is universally forbidden to practice prayer if partial or complete ritual ablution is not made beforehand – that is, valid prayer cannot be made if not in the state of purity. Spiritual purity involves physical cleanliness.³⁵⁸ After ablution, the faithful proceed to a foyer – functionally a cloakroom, where outer garments and, necessarily, shoes are removed and deposited before entry to the prayer hall. Therefore, this spatial disposition required a degree of cultural mediation. It could have been the product of consultation with dragoman Volta or (less likely considering previous experiences) with one of the Muslim tenants. While this spatial disposition might be commonplace, its existence on Venetian soil is not. No Islamic sacral space existed in the *Stato da Mar* or anywhere near Venice. The mentioned Slave prisons largely fell into disuse by the mid-18th century, but the simple sequence of rooms is not in any case dependent on a model. As we have seen, the mosques were proposed by Leonardo Pesaro

³⁵⁷ Berchet described it as follows: “Una stanza più grande, posta a levante sul cortile, era destinata a moschea. Squallida, senza segno di cattedra, alquante sentenze del Corano avea scritte sulle muraglie: un rimasuglio di stuoja ed un lacero tappeto levantino erano stesi sul pavimento” (Sagredo, Berchet, *Fondaco dei Turchi*, 68). This description is confirmed by the Venetian court of law 20 years earlier, which on Oct. 21, 1840 established that “the mosques are nothing more than two simple rooms, same as all others except for signs on the walls, no majestic temples whatsoever [...]”. This is a denial of the earlier claim of Saddo Dristi – the last tenant, who did not want to move from the *Fondaco*, (falsely) stating that the building was rented *in perpetuo* to the Ottoman subjects, and that the mosques are important temples containing stones from the Holy cities, which makes them holy together with the space above and below them. Both in: BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VII/B, appendix 10, 1839. The only other mention of the mosque is found in Concina, *Fondaci*, 239 who quotes Sagredo and Berchet.

³⁵⁸ Purity is one of the five cultic acts (*ibadat*) that make the base of Islam.

in 1750, never by the tenants or the dragomans. This is indicative because one who is better acquainted with Muslim religious life knows that special prayer spaces are unnecessary. Unless a place of significant religious and historical events or the burial of important figures (*mashad*), the mosque is not considered a holy place and does not require sanctification like similar Christian structures.³⁵⁹ The simple Islamic act of worship (Arabic: *salat*; Persian, Turkish, Bosnian: *namaz*) creates a mosque, wherever it may be.³⁶⁰ The fact that these religious spaces required no special treatment by the Venetian authorities, or any legal status whatsoever, allowed them to exist. The space might have been used as a mosque, but legally it was a room like any other. Otherwise, as no person susceptible to moral contamination (women, young people) could enter and no one could see inside the complex, there was no danger in their existence. The same can be observed for the first synagogues in the Ghetto, again confirming that Venetian tolerance went hand in hand with segregation.³⁶¹

That is why the tenants or the dragomans never requested it, instead focusing on something that is indeed a prerequisite of prayer and Islamic daily life – water and sanitation.

³⁵⁹ Even then it can be negotiated. The expansion of the Holy cities of Mecca and Medina in recent years caused the demolition of many monuments important to the early history of Islam.

³⁶⁰ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. “masdjid” (pp. 645; 655). According to Islamic dogma, God is indifferent to places. Therefore, humility in the presence of God, of which ritual prayer is the expression, could be demonstrated anywhere. The saying goes that the Prophet had been given the whole world as a *masdjid*, while earlier prophets could only pray in churches and synagogues. “Wherever the hour of prayer overtakes thee, thou shalt perform the *salat* and that is a *masjid*.” Otherwise, it is permissible to sleep, eat, conduct business, and socialise in mosques. The *salat* is obligatory (*fard*) five times a day.

³⁶¹ Donatella Calabi, *Venice and its Jews*, 70.

3.3.4.2. Sanitation as culture

As narrated by the French traveller to Istanbul Guillaume Grelot (b. ca. 1630), when a Syrian merchant visited Paris in the 17th century, he was properly disgusted when he had to relieve himself in the open, not having time to get to the nearby bridge with the public latrines. Then he could not find a public bath to clean himself, comparing the situation to his native Damascus, where thirty latrines could be found around the central square and a hamam afterwards where he could bathe and have his clothes cleaned.³⁶² Grelot will inverse the situation, recounting the ablutions and the hygienic habits in the Islamic world:

Of all the nations in the world, there is not one which holds cleanliness as important as the Mahometan does, the Ottomans as much as the Persians. All these peoples have made it a fundamental principle, or better said, the whole essence of their religion [...]. As a result, they have been obliged to build many elegant places for baths [...].³⁶³

Washing habits are a central theme in the early modern European Ottomanist discourse. One of the first travel writers about the Ottoman World, Luigi Bassano da Zara recurrently returned to the connection between religion and cleanliness in Islam. He starts his narration in this manner, relating that the Turks awake at sunrise when called to the temple for prayer. The first thing they do is go to the baths “because the law commands that they must be clean in the temple in the presence of God.”³⁶⁴ The longest, second chapter is entirely dedicated to baths, which he appreciated greatly and described in detail: their size, disposition of rooms, price of materials and ornaments, interior furnishing, water temperature, and the customs for using them. From there, he continues to the third chapter – the women’s baths. He could not enter, so did not miss the opportunity to sexualise the

³⁶² The description is much more detailed and naturalistic, brought by Guillame-Joseph Grelot, *Relation nouvelle d'un voyage de Constantinople* (Paris: Pierre Rocolet, 1680), 299–301. Cited in Sarti, *Živjeti u kući*, 130. By 1750, when bathing as a means of skin-care started getting into fashion again, only 6% of Parisian households had a bathroom. *Ibid.*, 223.

³⁶³ Grelot, *Relation nouvelle d'un voyage de Constantinople*, 232. A large section of the book (pp. 231–264) is dedicated to hygienic and religious habits, understood in connection.

³⁶⁴ Peter Madsen, “Luigi Bassano,” in *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 6. Western Europe (1500–1600)*, eds. David Thomas, John Chesworth (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014), 502. Bassano, *I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de' Turchi*, 1545.

narrative (which he does throughout his treatise) and imagine them as places of lesbian intimacy. This interest in Islamic baths and bathing can be seen in a set of drawings kept in the Austrian National Library in Vienna (two Ottoman originals, one copy in German) from the last quarter of the 16th century that show a hamam,³⁶⁵ while more than a century later Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach (1656–1723) decided to represent the Ottoman Imperial baths of Buda (fig. 3.27). On another note, in the popular and several times reprinted *On the old and new costumes of the world* published in 1590 by Tiziano’s cousin Cesare Vecellio (1521–1601), the Turk is presented as so clean that when it rains he covers under a broad hat (fig. 3.28).³⁶⁶




Fig. 3. 27 Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, *The Imperial bath in Buda*, 1725 (*Entwurf einer historischen Architectur*, Leipzig, 1725, book 2, table 1)

³⁶⁵ Gülru Necipoğlu-Kafadar, “Plans and Models in 15th and 16th-Century Ottoman Architectural Practice,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 45, no.3 (1986).

³⁶⁶ Cesare Vecellio, *De gli abiti antichi, e moderni di diverse parti del mondo libri due* (Venice: Damiano Zenaro, 1590), f. 383v: “Hanno i Turchi grand’avvertenza alla pulitezza, e però quando essi sono à cavallo, & che faccia pioggia, sempre avvertiscono di non bagnarsi; ò imbrattarsi; perilche portano sopra il Tulipante [...]”



Fig. 3. 28 Cristoforo Guerra and Tiziano (?), *A Turk when it rains* (Cesare Vecellio, *De gli habiti antichi, e moderni di diverse parti del mondo libri due*, Venice: Damiano Zenaro, 1590, f. 383r)

While we seldom discuss these matters, relieving oneself and bathing are among the central cultural questions. The approach to these questions differs widely between cultural circles and has a plethora of relative subconscious *mores*, customs, and habits which reflect on the built environment. As the Syrian visitor to Paris, each of us becomes acutely aware of the distinctions when we cross cultural borders and are left confused between our taught practices and foreign customs.³⁶⁷ Even more, hygiene and cleanliness are considered evolutionary civilisational practices, a clear sign of progress. We are better (than other people or our ancestors) because We are cleaner! The same is found in the still prevalent fallacy that the Europeans did not wash since Roman times due to some unascertained moral teaching of Christianity, a rhetoric that originated during the Enlightenment.³⁶⁸ Not to depreciate the luxuries of contemporary life or give visibility to any racist rhetoric, a 15th-century example will suffice.

Flavio Biondo (1392–1463), in his *De Roma Triumphante* (1459), narrates a dispute on the superiority of the modern house over the ancient Roman one. Finding that no toilets could be identified among the ruins of the many Roman *domus*, people claimed that the early modern house must be better. Biondo took the opposite stance, claiming that the Romans had no need of such filth in the home, as they would relieve themselves in a pot, which the many servants would then carry away to the canals and sewers where they would wash them. Otherwise, the Roman city was so well furnished that public latrines existed on every corner.³⁶⁹ For Biondo (and Leon Battista Alberti), the toilet was not to be introduced into the house, and its introduction was seen as a step backwards. While encompassing research on early modern sanitation is lacking, a heterogeneous mosaic can be made, especially taking into account those architects that did not follow Biondo's and Alberti's vision.

³⁶⁷ Remember the recollection of the emir of Lebanon from the Livornese *Bagno dei forzati*.

³⁶⁸ Among other cited works Peter Thornton makes the most elaborate argument to the contrary. *The Italian Renaissance Interior: 1400–1600* (New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1991), 242–245. Just the opposite from the prevalent argument, the obsession with beauty (blondness as one standard) seems to have caused excessive hygiene among noble women, although not of the sort we would imagine today. On a practical note, wash basins and ewers were widespread for everyday use such as hand-washing.

³⁶⁹ Pier Nicola Pagliara, “‘Destri’ e cucine nell’abitazione del XV e XVI secolo, in specie a Roma,” in *Aspetti dell’abitare in Italia tra XV e XVI secolo: distribuzione, funzioni, impianti*, ed. Aurora Scotti Tosini (Milan: Unicopli, 2001), 61, 63, note 183. Leon Battista Alberti supported this approach, using the naturalist example of birds that do not foul their nest. Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 248.

When observing the Maccaruzzi plans of 1768 (fig. 3.19–3.21), the three communal toilets (*luochi comuni*) and two cesspits (*cloaca*) seem to dominate it as a central preoccupation of the project, in tune with the toilet as a requisite mentioned by the *Cinque Savi*, the dragomans, and the owners-investors in the discussions. The central role of water and the need for baths were stressed already in 1575 by Membré and Francesco Lettino. These facilities were present in the Vendramin *Fondaco*, and all subsequent projects. Three baths were made in the 1751–1768 project (in front of the *piano nobile* mosque and two others on the ground floor), while every room was furnished with a sink.³⁷⁰

While public baths were a common occurrence in the Middle Ages, they fell into a rapid decline during the 16th century, outright banned by central authorities due to moral and epidemiological reasons.³⁷¹ Thus bathing moved to the private sphere of the household, where it still primarily resides to this day.³⁷² Separate bathrooms were rare, and could not be found in most houses, hospices, inns, and other *fondachi*. However, they did occasionally appear, sometimes as elaborate projects.

Returning to Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472), one of his rare preserved projects is for a therapeutic bath – one which is a rendering of simple contemporary practices and does not reference Vitruvian small baths or ancient Imperial *thermae*.³⁷³

Sebastiano Serlio (1474–ca. 1554) and his unpublished Sixth book *On domestic architecture* presents a great starting point for analysing the ideal domestic environment of the age. For Serlio, bathrooms as dedicated rooms were exclusively found in noble ambients, primarily ones of suburban leisure.³⁷⁴ In these projects, Serlio draws them as

³⁷⁰ The sinks were ca. 90x90 cm, and positioned next to a fireplace for water heating, usually under a window for better illumination, and paired on each side of the wall to ease drainage via tubes. Curiously, they are not mentioned in written documents.

³⁷¹ Virginia Smith, *Clean: A History of Personal Hygiene and Purity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 179–180. This coincides with the increase in syphilis.

³⁷² Smith notes that bathing on Saturdays was common. *Ibid.*, 170–172. It was mostly done in a wooden tub carried to the bedroom, or rarely in dedicated ground-floor rooms often located next to the kitchen to provide heating and ease water carrying. Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 315–318.

³⁷³ The drawing was made mid-stage during the project elaboration, and demonstrates a sequence of simple rectangular rooms (*loggia*, *vestibulum*, *tepidarium*, *lavatio*, *sudarium*) with the heating and water systems in the basement. Howard Burns, “Leon Battista Alberti,” in *Storia dell’architettura italiana: Il Quattrocento*, ed. Francesco Paolo Fiore (Milano: Electa, 1998), 126–129.

³⁷⁴ He envisions them in other Italian cities but not in ideal patrician residences in the centre of Venice (plate 58r), Columbia University Library, Avery Manuscript – AA520 SE619F, Sebastiano Serlio, *Sesto libro dell’architettura*, c. 1550. Online:

central spaces positioned in the private part of the residence at the back of the building, often next to the kitchen to conserve heat, in a sequence that goes from a dressing room to a heated room (sometimes a hypocaust) and finally the bath (at times a small pool) – recreating the *frigidarium* and the *caldarium*.³⁷⁵ The Sienese architect and theoretician Pietro Cataneo (ca. 1510–ca. 1574) wrote about the healing properties of mineral water and proposed several solutions for modern bath complexes based on simplified Roman principles.³⁷⁶ For Andrea Palladio (1508–1580), baths were parts of the ancient world, of noble houses and Imperial *thermae*.³⁷⁷ He never mentions them in the context of contemporary domestic architecture. This was rectified by Vincenzo Scamozzi (1548–1616) who, more closely reading Vitruvius, positioned baths in the (affluent) ancient domestic environment. He standardised their form as *mostly round, of medium size* to maximise heat exposure, and facing west because of the Roman habit of bathing in the afternoon.³⁷⁸ However, it cannot be observed in his palace projects. Furthermore, Scamozzi dedicated a part of his treatise to sewage disposal, describing the Venetian *gatoli*.³⁷⁹ This usual system for most post-15th century palaces (patrician or not) consisted of a vertical tube leading to a small sewage tank where gravity separated liquid and solid excrement. Another tube, below sea level at tide, connected it with a canal. When the tide rose, it

https://dlc.library.columbia.edu/catalog?f%5Blib_project_short_ssim%5D%5B%5D=Sebastiano+Serlio+-+On+domestic+architecture&page=1. For a printed copy cf. Sebastiano Serlio, Myra Nan Rosenfeld, *Sebastiano Serlio on domestic architecture: different dwellings from the meanest hovel to the most ornate palace: the sixteenth-century manuscript of book VI in the Avery Library of Columbia University* (New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1978). The presence of baths in houses of the well-off is confirmed by Thornton (*The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 318–319) who adds that they became a status symbol of a life of leisure but they too went out of fashion by the end of the 16th century. Cf. Giustina Scaglia, “‘Stanze-stufe’ e ‘stanze-camini’ nei ‘trattati’ di Francesco di Giorgio da Siena,” *Bollettino d’arte* 39–40 (Sept.–Dec. 1986).

³⁷⁵ See plates and backside notes: 16, 32, 39, 52, 54, 58, 71. One known example is the Palazzo Ducale of Urbino where a small *frigidarium* and *caldarium* have been found in the substructures. Another example is the *stufetta* of cardinal Bibbiena (1470–1520) in the Vatican or the warm and cold bath in the Castel Sant’Angelo commissioned in 1530 by pope Clement VII Medici (1523–1534). In most cases their presence was more of a palliative than hygienic nature. Sarti, *Živjeti u kući*, 134; Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 315.

³⁷⁶ Pietro Cataneo, *L’architettura, Libro sesto* (Venice: Paolo Manuzio, 1567), 142–149.

³⁷⁷ Andrea Palladio, *I quattro libri dell’architettura* (Venice: Domenico de’ Franceschi, 1570).

³⁷⁸ Vincenzo Scamozzi, *L’idea dell’architettura universale* (Venice: Giorgio Valentini, 1615), 238:44–55.

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 356:12–20. Giorgio Gianighian, “Scarichi veneziani in epoca moderna: canoni da aqua – canoni da necessario,” *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 7 (1983); “La costruzione della casa doppia nella Venezia del Rinascimento,” *Mélanges de l’École française de Rome: Italie et Méditerranée* 120, no. 1 (2008): 89–90; 94; for a *Renaissance* toilet see fig. 15 in the article.

would *flush* the septic tank, while the regular currents would *clean* the lagoon. Somewhat modified with filtrating septic tanks, the system is in use even today. Households had sewage disposal systems usually in kitchens. They consisted of openings connected with pipes to the canal.³⁸⁰ Interestingly, the *Fondaco dei Turchi* was removed even from the Venetian sanitation system, instead opting for the cesspit, a solution used on the mainland (when used at all).

Except in architecture isolated from the surroundings, such as monasteries, castles, lazarettos, and hospitals, dedicated rooms for latrines rarely existed.³⁸¹ Cities used public latrines often positioned next to rivers and canals (one example is the Venetian *Rio delle latrine*). Raffaella Sarti, analysing a multitude of sources, statistically concludes that in most houses, rich or poor, hygienic installations were non-existent.³⁸² People in the cities would instead use latrines in courtyards shared among several houses, those public ones, or a simple chamber-pot.³⁸³ A private latrine was a luxury which caused more problems than it

³⁸⁰ Chamber-pots were emptied in them. Not to claim that a majority had these systems. From the 14th century onwards, dedicated waste pits were sectioned on the streets for garbage collection (both human and otherwise). Street cleaners (*scoazzeri*) would empty them during the night, carrying the waste on barges to be used as manure, for filling the lagoon or in the production of gunpowder. David Gentilcore, “The cistern-system of early modern Venice: technology, politics and culture in a hydraulic society,” *Water History* 13 (2021): 389. An example where the lack of a sewage system was lamented was the Palazzo Venezia in Rome. Scarpa, “Venezia a Roma,” 110–111.

³⁸¹ Notable exceptions, however irregular, are several hospitals and lazarettos in which waste removal is a question of public health. It was believed that the stench, the *miasma* produced by the waste of the sick could infect the healthy. The lazarettos of Milan (1488–1513) and Verona (1549–1551; 1591–1628) had waste chutes in most rooms, connected to a moat, while the *Crociera* (1459–1465) of Filarete’s hospital of Milan had an abundance of latrines on the outer arms which were flushed by rainwater or buckets in the absence of it, depositing waste in the basement cesspits through which a canal was rerouted. Indeed, Antonio Averlino Filarete (ca. 1400–ca. 1469) is the only architect to have provided a detailed instruction on building a plumbing system. Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439–1502) said that latrines (*destri*) need to be accessible (preferably next to the bedroom) and well ventilated, while taking considerable care to rid the house of stench. To that goal he proposes a cesspit that is an inverted arch or pyramid and filled with sand for drainage. He is the only architect to provide us with a design of a toilet (fig. 3.29)! Sebastiano Serlio in his unpublished Sixth and Seventh books proposed building a *necessario* in the garden, the kitchen or in a small room next to the bedroom. Pagliara, “‘Destri’ e cucine,” 65; Douglas Biow, *The Culture of Cleanliness in Renaissance Italy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 4–5. Fabrizio Nevola, *Street Life in Renaissance Italy* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2020), 88–89.

³⁸² Sarti, *Živjeti u kući*, 118.

³⁸³ *Ibid.*, 131–132; 150–151. Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 245, 248–249. As a piece of furniture, the chamber-pot was incorporated into a box, a night cabinet, or most often a chair – then called a close-stool (*sediotta*). These chairs with a hole were sometimes richly decorated in woodwork and textiles. The act of sitting while relieving oneself is a European cultural practice, resulting in the modern Western sitting toilet. For urinating, there was the *orinale* – a portable caped vessel usually made of glass and encased in leather.

solved, and dedicated rooms were almost non-existent. But this does not mean that an architect would not know how to make one and that toilets were completely neglected in architectural theory or practice. Concentrating on those examples that existed in 16th-century Rome, Pier Nicola Pagliara proves that some architectural thought and, consequently, improvement happened in the field of latrines and waste disposal.³⁸⁴ While solutions were largely heterogeneous and some treatise writers were either disgusted with the notion of an indoor toilet (Alberti) or intentionally omitted them from their writing (Palladio), plenty of patrons opted for indoor latrines, and a significant number of important projects included them, especially those that served many people.³⁸⁵

In terms of treatise writing, Francesco di Giorgio Martini and Sebastiano Serlio proposed that toilets (*destri*) be built in a corner next to the bedroom, and this solution slowly started to spread during the 16th century, but this was still an exception.³⁸⁶ The solutions, when they existed, varied widely. Even Serlio draws them only occasionally, sometimes he groups them, and other times they are private spaces. Most of the time, he will position them next to a staircase at an accessible point to use the staircase for some illumination and ventilation. One comparable example to a *fondaco* is Serlio's *Loggia dei mercanti* at Lyon, a project he envisioned for the visiting Tuscan merchants (fig. 3.30–3.31).³⁸⁷ The three-floor structure with an attic and a portico would have shops and warehouses on the ground floor and the mezzanine, with rooms for the merchants on the upper floors, situated on the sides of the main hall. Considering that the building would house a lot of people, toilets

³⁸⁴ Pagliara, “‘Destri’ e cucine”. There is some dissonance between architectural and urban history on the matter due to the fact that architectural historians can only analyse that which is material and exists, while urban historians can debate on the habits of public and private life, percentages, widespread occurrences, and similar. The first tend to concentrate on the exceptions, the second tend to neglect them.

³⁸⁵ Pagliara (“‘Destri’ e cucine”) brings forth a number of examples such as Bramante's Palazzo dei Tribunali, Palazzo della Cancelleria (attributed), Raffaello Sanzio's project for a palace in via Giulia, and the Palazzo Branconio, Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane's numerous projects which provided us with the most well-thought out approach to toilet position and design. Good examples that ensure maximum privacy and ventilation are his projects for Palazzo Pucci in Orvieto, and the house of Agnolo da Castro in Castro.

³⁸⁶ Both their treatises were unpublished. Sebastiano Serlio, *Architettura civile: libri sesto, settimo e ottavo nei manoscritti di Monaco e Vienna*, ed. Francesco Paolo Fiore (Milano: Il Polifilo, 1994), 119–123; Francesco di Giorgio Martini, *Trattati di architettura, ingegneria e arte militare*, vol. 1, ed. Corrado Maltese (Milan: Il Polifilo, 1967), 72; cited in Sarti, *Živjeti u kući*, 150–151. However, Serlio recommends positioning them in the garden when possible, as he has seen it usually done like that. Pagliara, “‘Destri’ e cucine,” 63.

³⁸⁷ Sebastiano Serlio, *Il settimo libro d'architettura* (Frankfurt: Jacopo Strada, 1575), 192–193. Cf. Pagliara, “‘Destri’ e cucine,” 67.

were an essential preoccupation, so Serlio surrounds the spiral staircase with (private and communal) latrines, piercing the otherwise redundantly thick wall. Pagliara notes the much more liberal approach to modesty and shame in the early modern toilet compared to the modern *mores*, noticing that in most cases these had no compartments between seats, similar to the ancient Roman latrines. Moreover, in the case of *private* niches, the toilet seat was most often open to other rooms of various purposes or a staircase, making it much less private.³⁸⁸ Otherwise, a latrine (or at least a waste chute) could often be found in kitchens, where a sink could be connected to the same disposal system, but there was no rule.³⁸⁹ It is difficult to draw final conclusions on this understudied topic. What can be said is that the Islamic practice takes modesty and privacy seriously, so these public solutions would not work. Nobody should see the other's genitals or talk while on the toilet.³⁹⁰ As a result, the privy is much more private, as can be observed on the stalls of the latrines in the *Fondaco dei Turchi*. However, as a solution, the toilet cubicle or stall cannot be exclusive to a single culture, and it is recorded in monasteries.³⁹¹ The bath and the abundance of water were explicitly mentioned as a *Turkish need*. As mentioned, European practices caused some shock to the visiting Muslims. Through this short survey, it can be seen that the problem seems not to have been the complete absence of sanitation but its unregularity, which is in strong contrast to the prescribed practice in the Islamic world.

Cleanliness in Islam is not just a question of personal etiquette; it is a religious requisite (*fard* – obligation commanded by God) stemming from the Quran itself: “[...] God loves those who keep themselves pure and clean.”³⁹²

³⁸⁸ This *type* of toilet could not fit a person if the door was closed, being too narrow. Noted extreme examples are Palladio's Villa Foscari, Bramante's Palazzo dei Tribunali, and Raphael's Palazzo Branconio. Pagliara, “Destri' e cucine,” 73. To them one might add Antonio da Sangallo the Younger's Palazzo Farnese, in which a single room with rows of tightly packed seats served as the toilet.

³⁸⁹ Pagliara, “Destri' e cucine,” 72. For those latrines that survive in Venice, this was done almost exclusively. Egle Renata Trincanato, *Venezia minore* (Milan: Edizione del milione, 1948), 115. Further confirmed by Gianighian, “Scarichi veneziani in epoca moderna,” 179, this was because the latrine was primarily a waste chute.

³⁹⁰ In terms of bath culture, Luigi Bassano provides a glimpse into the sense of privacy. In hamams, towels are necessarily used to hide the *shameful* parts. Those who do not do it are driven out and beaten. Bassano, *I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de' Turchi*, f. 2v.

³⁹¹ Roberta J. Magnusson, *Water Technology in the Middle Ages: Cities, Monasteries, and Waterworks after the Roman Empire* (Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 156.

³⁹² *The Clear Quran* 2:222. Also see: 4:43; 5:6; 9:108. The hadith memorise Muhammad saying: “Cleanliness is half of faith.” Abu al-Husayn Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, *Sahih Muslim*, vol. 1, tr. Nassirudin al-Khattab, ed.

In terms of religious observance, the following hygienic practices are obligatory before prayer: partial ablution before daily religious practices (Arabic: *wudu*; Turkish and Bosnian: *abdest*), and complete ritual ablution (strongly encouraged but not obligatory) on Fridays, holidays, and after repentance (Arabic: *ghusl*; Turkish: *güsül*, Bosnian: *gusul*). *Abdest* is done by washing one's hands and arms up to the elbows, feet, toes and ankles, face and head in the prescribed order and manner. Cleaning of the mouth and the nasal cavity is recommended.³⁹³ As part of Islamic hygienic etiquette, *abdest* is also required after lesser daily impurities such as urination, defecation, flatulence, bleeding, vomiting, deep sleep, and any loss of consciousness (drunkenness included). Touching related unclean matter also requires washing.³⁹⁴ *Güsül* is required after sexual intercourse that included ejaculation, completion of the menstrual cycle, the burial of a deceased, and after touching an unwashed dead person. It is done with the pure intention to cleanse oneself of all impurities. After repeating the *bismillah* ("In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful"), the whole body is washed alone in silence, without facing the *Kaaba* naked.³⁹⁵ The purifying agent is always clean water (dry earth can be used only in the lack of it), which can be from a stream, lake, well or a cistern, but it must not be green in colour, tainted by alcohol, carcasses, faeces or urine.³⁹⁶

Abu Tahir Zubair 'Ali Za'I (Riyadh: Darassalam, 2007), 2:432. The entire second book of this most common book of hadith is *The Book of Purification*. Relieving oneself and cleaning afterwards is prescribed in detail. One of those rules is to not allow your genitals to be seen, and to not do the act facing the Mecca. As mentioned, by chance or not, the *Fondaco* latrines face west and south, and are separated in compartments. A set of dedicated utensils and vessels for cleaning exists in the Islamic tradition – all using water, while in Europe the simple rag was used, which explains the modern prevalence of toilet paper. Cf. Magnusson, *Water Technology*, 159.

³⁹³ This obligation is explicitly mentioned in the Quran 5:6 "O you who believe! When you rise to pray, wash your faces and your hands and arms to the elbows, and wipe your heads, and your feet to the ankles. If you had intercourse, then purify yourselves. If you are ill, or travelling, or one of you returns from the toilet, or you had contact with women, and could not find water, then use some clean sand and wipe your faces and hands with it. God does not intend to burden you, but He intends to purify you, and to complete His blessing upon you, that you may be thankful." For the connection of water with mosques, see *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, s.v. "masdjid" (pp. 666–668). The ablutions are also described by Bassano (*I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de' Turchi*, f. 10r–v) and Grelot (*Relation nouvelle d'un voyage de Constantinople*, pp. 245–253) who differentiates between the *gouslu* and the *abdest*.

³⁹⁴ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 9 (2002), s.v. "wudu". Depending on the religious school, the requisites can be stricter, such as touching the opposite sex.

³⁹⁵ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (1991), s.v. "ghusl".

³⁹⁶ This is pointed by Sa'dullah Idrisi (Saddo Dristi) who, in his bid to remain in the *Fondaco*, said that in Venice there is no sweet running water and that the Muslims cannot use the other cisterns because if somebody (a Christian) used a wine container to grab the water from them, the remainder would become

Islamic hygienic jurisprudence also includes cleanliness of living spaces and clothes, personal hygiene and grooming, table and toilet etiquette. *Istinja* is the act of purification after relieving oneself in which water is used to clean the relative areas.³⁹⁷

As was argued, regular Muslim households would often have minimal furnishing connected with mundane hygiene because everything else was provided in the urban surroundings of any Muslim town. Nonetheless, they had them in a regular, prescribed, and repetitive manner.³⁹⁸ However, in the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and similar edifices, all the functionalities of a Muslim household and neighbourhood needed to be united under one roof, as they could not be provided anywhere else. This gave it the character of an enclave similar to the Ghetto. In fact, much of Islamic hygienic jurisprudence can be traced back to Judaism, which also prescribes toilet spaces, (less rigorous) ablutions, and regulates kosher foods.³⁹⁹ As a rule, houses in Islamic countries are furnished with hygienic facilities (toilets, washing rooms), while baths and latrines were a constant preoccupation of Ottoman and Arabic architectural cultures, resulting in relatively homogenous solutions.⁴⁰⁰ However, the question is not who is cleaner. What this subchapter aimed to prove through a short survey of Italian solutions and Islamic practices is that the Venetian authorities saw the Islamic hygienic customs as different from their own, probably influenced by Islamic hygienic jurisprudence. Through the emphasis put on these facilities, together with clean water access, the cleaning regimen, and the persistent referencing of Ottoman models of the *funduq-khan*, we can start speaking about the impact of Muslim housing cultures on these architectural environments, but not before we see how Venetian experiences reflect in the *Stato da Mar*.

impure and unusable for washing and religious purification. BMC, PDc 740, fasc. VII/B, appendix 10, 1839.

³⁹⁷ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., vol. 4 (1997), s.v. “istindja”.

³⁹⁸ For example, the bath is rarely a separate room, instead being a multipurpose closet.

³⁹⁹ The most commonly used compilation of Jewish law is *The Set Table (Shulchan Aruch)*, published in Venice in 1565. See Joseph Karo, *Shulchan Aruch* (Venice: Alvise Bragadin, 1565). For the effect on the Ghetto urban and architectural space see Kenneth Stow, “Was the ghetto cleaner...?” in *Rome, Pollution and Property: Dirt, Disease, and Hygiene in the Eternal City from Antiquity to Modernity*, ed. Mark Bradley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

⁴⁰⁰ This is especially evident in public architecture. See Gülru Necipoğlu-Kafadar, “Plans and Models in 15th and 16th-century Ottoman Architectural Practice”; *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire* (London: Reaktion Books, 2005).




Fig. 3. 29 Francesco di Giorgio Martini, *Destro* from the *Trattati di architettura ingegneria e arte militare*, ms. II.I. 141, f. 14r. Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze (Biow, *The Culture of Cleanliness*, p. 5)




Fig. 3. 30 Sebastiano Serlio, *The Merchants' loggia in Lyon*, 1575 (*Il settimo libro*, p. 195)





Fig. 3. 31 Sebastiano Serlio, *First and ground-floor plan of the Merchants' loggia in Lyon, 1575* (*Il settimo libro*, p. 193)

3.3.5. Epilogue

Documents do not note any further changes to the building after the reconstruction. In 1766, the *Fondaco* merchants complained that the Canal Grande in front of the building needed excavating because a beach formed out of sludge, preventing embarkation and causing an *intolerable stench*. This was done in 1774, marking the last investment.⁴⁰¹

With the arrival of Napoleon and the dissolution of the Republic in 1797, all physical forms of ethnic and religious segregation were abolished. The Ghetto gates were torn down, and the *fondachi* dissolved. The single Albanian merchant Sa'dullah Idrisi remained living in the *Fondaco*, refusing to leave Venice. In the meantime, the building changed hands and was left without a function for the time being. In 1830, Pietro Pesaro – the last male descendant of the family, died in London, leaving the building to his nephew Leonardo Manin. Manin sold it in 1838 to Antonio Busetto called Petich, an investor who demolished everything but the Canal Grande tract in 1841, constructing tobacco depots there.⁴⁰² Finally, the city acquired the building in 1859 for the use of the Civic Museum (Correr), whose natural history department is still housed there (fig. 3.36). Reconstructive restoration of the façade was done from 1862 to 1869 on the project of Federico Berchet – the municipal engineer, which was expanded in the period 1871–1887 according to project changes made by Anibale Marini.⁴⁰³ The heavily criticised project, made at the waning of Viollet le Duc's approach to stylistic reconstruction, was made at a time of Venetian self-reimagining and renewed interest in the Orient, thus accentuating the *original Veneto-Byzantine* characteristics that include Arab elements.⁴⁰⁴ Curiously, the palace kept its name

⁴⁰¹ BMC, PDc 740, item I, fasc. VI, f. 223r, Feb. 20, 1765 m.v. On the verso: "Senato comete al Mag[istrat]o Aque l'escavazione della spiaggia al Fontico de Turchi." The excavation was conducted in 1774 together with the wider Canal Grande tract (fasc. V/3, May 16).

⁴⁰² Schulz, *New palaces*, 143; "The Restoration of the Fondaco dei Turchi," *Annali di Architettura* 7 (1995).

⁴⁰³ Schulz, *New palaces*, 144; Guido Zucconi, "Il rifacimento del Fondaco dei Turchi nella Venezia del secondo Ottocento," *Territorio (nuova serie)* 68 (2014).

⁴⁰⁴ John Ruskin drew his detail of the façade in 1845, fig. 3.34. Zucconi, *Il rifacimento del Fondaco*, noted that scientific interest in the building was first demonstrated by Pietro Selvatico Estense, who positioned it as the only surviving *casa-fondaco* of Byzantine Romanesque architecture with Arab characteristics, on par with the basilica San Marco, church of San Donato di Murano, and the Palazzo Ducale. This *exceptionality* instigated the 1860 monograph (quoted throughout this text) by Agostino Sagredo and

and Oriental character, but that character was now pre-Ottoman – testifying to a new repositioning of the city toward the East.



Fig. 3. 32 Dionisio Moretti, *View of the Grand Canal*, tav. 13 in: Antonio Quadri, *Il Canal grande di Venezia*, Venice: Dalla Tipografia di Commercio, 1831 (The Getty Research Institute)




Fig. 3. 33 Detail

Federico Berchet where the reconstruction plan is already laid out, which coincides with the opportune moment when the city was looking for a location to house the municipal museum.



Fig. 3. 34 John Ruskin, *The Fondaco dei Turchi* – watercolour original used for the engraved frontispiece of *the Stones of Venice*, vol 2: *The Sea Stories* (1853), 1845, private collection, UK.




Fig. 3. 35 Federico Berchet, *Proposed reconstruction* (Sagredo, Berchet, *Il Fondaco dei Turchi*, tav. VIII)



Fig. 3. 36 *The Fondaco dei Turchi*, today the *Museo di storia naturale di Venezia Giancarlo Ligabue* (author Didier Descouens, https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Fondaco_dei_Turchi.jpg accessed 26.6.2022)

4. *STATO DA MAR*

4.1. Coexistence in the *Stato da Mar*

The *Fondaco dei Turchi* was at the end of a funnel that brought the Ottoman merchants to Venice. Even without this trans-Adriatic connection, the Eastern Adriatic coast was in everyday contact with its Ottoman hinterland. Before the First Morean War (1684–1699), the entire coast could be considered a border zone. It had high levels of contact and co-dependency with the Ottoman-administered hinterland, for which the coastal towns largely remained economic centres and focal points (fig. 4.1).⁴⁰⁵ The situation changed after the treaties of Karlowitz (1699) and Passarowitz (1718) when the border was moved further inland.⁴⁰⁶ The new border mostly followed mountain ranges and went through sparsely populated lands, meaning it could be more efficiently controlled. This led to the creation of a true border through which movement could be (relatively more) controlled – at least that of large groups such as caravans. Among those new restrictions, the cordon sanitaire aimed to prohibit any direct cross-border contact and led to the separation of the populace.⁴⁰⁷ Therefore the *Stato da Mar* material can easily be divided into pre and post cordon sanitaire, that is – pre and post-1731.

From the Venetian point of view, the *Stato da Mar*, and among it Dalmatia as its largest part, was different. While dominantly directed from the centre, it had different institutions, laws, and traditions. Its people were of a different *nation*, be it *Schiavona* or *Dalmata*, speaking *Illyrico* (also called *Schiavonesco*; with the prevalent use of Venetian as the

⁴⁰⁵ This co-dependency went hand in hand with attacks and pillaging in times of conflict. Every town was besieged at least once and its surroundings pillaged. On the other hand, the many islands had no significant Ottoman presence so were left out of this study. The same can be said of the Ionian Islands. The sea proved to be the zone in which Venetian control was efficiently exercised. See Elias Kolovos, “Border(is)lands: The Ottoman-Venetian Frontier of the Ionian Islands (Late Fifteenth to Late Seventeenth Century,” *Ο Νέος Ελληνισμός, οι κόσμοι του και ο Κόσμος. Αφιέρωμα στην Όλγα Κατσιαρδή-Hering* [Modern Hellenism: Its Worlds and the World. Festschrift in Honour of Olga Katsiardi-Hering], eds. Anastasia Papadia-Lala et al. (Athens: Eurasia Publications, 2021).

⁴⁰⁶ It completely corresponds to the modern Croatian-Bosnian border in the region.

⁴⁰⁷ The *cordon* was ideally always active, but is generally accepted that it was not universally exercised unless there was suspicion of an epidemic.

lingua franca), and many minority groups such as Morlachs,⁴⁰⁸ Jews, Greeks, Albanians, Armenians, and others were present. The existence of different identities never presented a problem for the *Serenissima* as long as political loyalty was not questioned. One of the pillars of social and political order was religion and its observance. The *schismatic* Orthodox (who served the Republic as *stradioti* – soldiers) could have their churches as long as there was a Catholic altar in them as well. The Jews were confined to the ghettos, except for Split, where Ottoman trade depended on them and they were *kept in check* with privileges. However, the entire province of Dalmatia and Albania bordered the Ottoman Empire, and its province of Bosnia had a large Slavic-speaking Muslim population.⁴⁰⁹ It was the only Venetian province with a land border with the Ottoman Empire, other than the Peloponnese (*Morea*), which was in Venetian hands only from 1688 to 1715.

Furthermore, the regions were co-dependent. It is well known that the economy of Venice relied on Eastern trade, but the thin strip of Venetian Dalmatia could not feed itself without its hinterland.⁴¹⁰ On the other side, Ottoman Bosnia needed sea access for trade and Dalmatian salt to preserve food. This gave rise to beneficial economic relations, and trade flourished.⁴¹¹ Additionally, Dalmatians continued to work the land in Ottoman hands.⁴¹²

⁴⁰⁸ The Morlachs were originally Romance Orthodox Balkan peoples (Vlachs, Illyrians, Aromanians, etc.) that lived in the interior of the peninsula. The Venetian administration extended the term to include all cattle breeding (and therefore nomadic) hinterland population, most of whom were Orthodox Serbs.

⁴⁰⁹ Split, Zadar, Šibenik, and Trogir each had their own dragoman whose first task was to translate between the Venetian count and those locals that did not speak Italian, then with the hinterland of the Bosnian pashadom (primary subdivision of the Ottoman Empire, large administrative unit also called *eyelet*, *beylerbeylik*). Also note that Venetian Albania does not correspond to modern Albania, instead comprising the thin coastal strip of the *Bocche di Cattaro* (Boka Kotorska) in Montenegro.

⁴¹⁰ For example, the count Paolo Trevisan claimed in 1605 that all the food for Split is provided by Ottoman subjects. ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Polo Trevisan da Spalato 9 maggio 1605*: “Della vittuaria per uso del popolo et dei soldati non vi è alcuna provisione, ma viene tutto portato da Turchi e da Morlachi [...]”

⁴¹¹ For example, mid-18th century Sarajevo had around a 100 merchants trading with Italy. In some Venetian towns, such as Split, Ottoman merchants had their representatives which were selected among the locals. Known are Marko Kavanjin, Ottavio dall’Oglio, Antonio Mucatto, and Frane Marković. Ćiro Ćičin Šain, “Pisma Marka Kavanjina splitskog trgovca iz prve polovine XVII stoljeća,” *Starine* 49 (1959): 205; Traljić, “Trgovina Bosne,” 344, 348.

⁴¹² There were (unsuccessful) attempt to counter this. In 1562 the Doge Girolamo Priuli (1559–1567) warned the rector of Zadar Benedetto Contarini not to allow Ottoman peasants on Venetian territory, or Venetian subjects on Ottoman territory to settle or lease the land. Josip Vrandečić, “Had an Ottoman combatant any chance to win the love of the daughter of the rector of the Dalmatian town Zadar? (Islam in Ottoman Dalmatia in the 16th and 17th century and its coexistence with the Christian world of neighbouring Venetian Dalmatia),” *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 33 (1994–1995): 177. Marin Mudazzo, the

Stockbreeders moved between borders with their livestock;⁴¹³ bishops had parishes on the Ottoman side; smuggling was rampant;⁴¹⁴ people visited markets, migrated and had cousins on each side.⁴¹⁵ More importantly, the use of highly intelligible South-Slavic idioms (*schiavonesco*) was prevalent – even among the upper class.⁴¹⁶ Although delineated, the ca. 500 km long border was highly porous and close contact was inevitable.⁴¹⁷ The locals could differentiate those from other towns and the hinterland, but it was difficult for the Venetian outsider (namely the patrician administrator) to see who was Catholic or Orthodox, their subject or an Ottoman Christian. It was far easier to distinguish a Muslim from a Jew or both from a Christian, due to visible differences in physical appearance: race, hair, clothes, and grooming habits.⁴¹⁸ These differences made it possible to segregate with the intention of controlling the social and cultural impact of such (mundane) exchanges on the local population and the religiously based social order, together with sanitary and fiscal control of border crossings.⁴¹⁹

The government in Venice was willing to limit the impact of such exchanges on several levels. Like in Venice, one of the tools was the Inquisition. Unlike Venice, Dalmatia was

count of Split warned of the inability to stop this. ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Marin Mudazzo ritornato di Conte e capitano a Spalato e Provveditore alla Sanità 26 giugno 1614*.

⁴¹³ Nikola Čolak, “Promet stoke u zadarskoj skeli u XVIII. stoljeću,” *Radovi Zavoda povijesnih znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 37 (1995).

⁴¹⁴ See: Maria Pia Pedani, “Ottoman merchants in the Adriatic: trade and smuggling,” *Acta Histriae* 16, n. 2 (2008).

⁴¹⁵ In the case a Muslim wanted to immigrate, it was obligatory he converted. Otherwise, in case of Venetian conquest, all Muslims had to convert or emigrate. Mayhew, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian rule*, 223–226. The relative tolerance provided to the Orthodox, Protestants, and Jews did not extend to Muslims.

⁴¹⁶ The border societies and their interconnection in the Venetian-Austrian-Ottoman triple frontier is explored in the series of publications of Drago Roksandić’s project *Triplex confinium* ongoing since 1996 between the Universities of Zagreb, Budapest (CEU), and Graz. Web page with the publications: <http://ckhis.ffzg.unizg.hr/hr/istrazivanja/projekti/triplex-confinium/>

⁴¹⁷ See: Walter Panciera, “Building a Boundary: The First Venetian-Ottoman Border in Dalmatia, 1573–1576,” *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest*, 45 (2013); Maria Pia Pedani, *The Ottoman-Venetian Border (15th–18th Centuries)*, (Venice: Edizioni Ca’ Foscari, 2017).

⁴¹⁸ On the importance of clothes as a component of identity see Ulinka Rublack, *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012). Changing clothes meant changing ones identity in terms of cultural and religious affiliations. The ability of the dragoman to manipulate such cross-cultural visual markers is testified by Giovanni Battista Salvago (the dragoman of the Republic: 1607–1644), who acquired a permit from Sultan Ibrahim (1640–1648) to dress as a Muslim and wear a turban while traveling. Rothman, *Dragoman Renaissance*, 96.

⁴¹⁹ Klemen Pust, “‘Le genti della citta, delle isole e del contado, le quale al tutto volevano partirsi’. Migrations from the Venetian to the Ottoman Territory and Conversions of Venetian Subjects to Islam in the Eastern Adriatic in the Sixteenth Century,” *Povijesni prilozi* 40 (2011).

subjected to three Inquisitorial offices: the Venetian, the Papal, and those of the local bishoprics. This is not to say that the inquisitorial regime was all too efficient and, therefore, strict, but it testifies to the efforts of limiting cross-religious contact and apostasy that could arise from it in this Age of Confessionalization. The *Libro d'oro* of the Split municipality incorporates a letter from 1578 written by the apostolic nuncio to Dalmatia, the Veronese bishop and cardinal Agostino Valier (1532–1606), who advised the *Consiglio dei Dieci* to send inquisitors to Dalmatia, to counter all forms of heresy.⁴²⁰ Valier was connected with the three synods convened in Zadar (*Zara*, the seat of Venetian provincial administration) to regulate Tridentine practices in the archdiocese and the province. The conclusions of these synods resemble the preoccupations of the Holy Office in Venice mentioned earlier. The all-Dalmatian Synod (archbishoprics of Zadar and Split) in 1579 advised keeping girls in houses as much as possible, not to be kidnapped or corrupted (not exclusively but by the Turks and their raiding parties).⁴²¹ It expressly forbade widows and unmarried girls to house Turks or go unescorted to Ottoman lands, asking the Venetian government to put a stop to these occurrences.⁴²² Article 14 (On the Muslims and their customs – *De Turcis eorumque consuetudine*) of the 1598 Synod of Zadar Diocese aimed to regulate Catholic–Muslim contact. It made clear that marriage between a Christian woman and a Muslim man was specifically prohibited. Moreover, any contact between Christian women and Muslim men was seen as unfavourable, while sex with them would result in excommunication, even for prostitutes. Muslims were also prohibited from visiting churches during mass and observing church art, liturgical objects, and relics.⁴²³ It was strictly forbidden to house Muslims in private inns and houses in the same paragraph that

⁴²⁰ Vedran Gligo et al., *Zlatna knjiga grada Splita*. Vol. 1 (Split: Književni krug, 1996), 554–557.

⁴²¹ Zvezdan Strika, “Pokrajinski sabor južnohrvatskih biskupa u Zadru 1579. godine,” *Croatica Christiana periodica* 87 (2021): 161.

⁴²² Tomo Matić, “Hrvatski književnici mletačke Dalmacije i život njihova doba,” *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razreda historičko-filološkoga i filozofičko-juridičkoga* 101 (1925): 237.

⁴²³ In 1549 the Benedictine monks of Zadar asked the government to exclude the Turks from the welcome they were generally obliged to provide to travellers. Seid Traljić, “Zadar i turska pozadina od XV. do potkraj XIX. stoljeća,” *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11–12 (1965): 215.

stressed the observance of fast and other food restrictions.⁴²⁴ This is connected to the arguments observed in Venice, where cohabitation could lead to breaking Christian religious observance, possibly even heresy and apostasy. One of the most recurring papal bulls – *In Coena Domini* (published repeatedly between 1363 and 1770), deals with heresy and the cause for excommunication. One such cause was supplying the enemies of Christendom. The bull was referenced by the archbishop of Zadar Minuccio Minucci (1594–1604), who wrote it was impossible to observe in his diocese because of the dependence on commerce with the Muslims.⁴²⁵

Cross-religious romantic love, which was singled out in the Synods and to which girls were seen as particularly susceptible, seems to have been particularly targeted. Josip Vrandečić notes a series of such occasions that caught the attention of Venetian officials. On 23 October 1571, six Ottoman cavalymen appeared at the gates of Zadar and challenged six defenders to a duel. It caused great attention, and many citizens climbed the roofs to observe. After the duel, which resulted only in light injuries, one Ottoman combatant begged to be allowed to enter the town, curious to visit the churches and attend mass. The city rector refused him due to a rumour that he was in love with the rector's daughter.⁴²⁶

During the Fourth Ottoman-Venetian War (1570–1573), the *honest* (Muslim) salesman on the Split market Adil (18) fell in love with the local girl Marija Vornić (14). After her parents were notified, they secluded her in a monastery. Adil begged them to allow them to marry in the Catholic rite, proposing to convert. The parents refused, and she allegedly died soon after.⁴²⁷ The same rector wrote to the government in 1574 about a girl from nearby Vranjic (*Vragizza; Piccola Venezia*) who had a contact too close for comfort with an

⁴²⁴ Zvezdan Strika, “Zadarska dijecezanska sinoda 1598. godine,” *Croatica Christiana periodica* 83 (2019). The synod was the effort of papal nuncio cardinal Agostino Valier and archbishop Minuccio Minucci (1594–1604) to formalise Tridentine practices.

⁴²⁵ “La vicinanza dei Turchi et il continuo commercio che s’ha con loro causa similmente contatti contro la bolla *In Coena Domini*, quasi impossibil a prohibirsi; perché venendo essi nella città ogni giorno, comprano zappe et altri ferramenti d’agricoltura et di cucina, si fanno ferrare li cavalli et talvolta acconciare archibugi o altri simili servitii che, col prohibirli tutti, restaria prohibito il commercio più che necessario alla città, finchè da loro si ricevono li grani et li carnaggi con altre merci. Però si supplica le signorie vostre illustrissime a prescrivere all’arcivescovo come s’habbia da governare in questi casi.” Giuseppina Minchella, “Alterità e vicinanza: cristiani, turchi, rinnegati, ebrei a Venezia e nella frontiera orientale,” *Giornale di storia* 4 (2010): 13, www.giornaledistoria.net.

⁴²⁶ Vrandečić, “Islam in Ottoman Dalmatia,” 163.

⁴²⁷ *Ibid.*, 172.

Ottoman soldier from Klis (*Clissa*). When the soldier asked for water, she offered wine and they spoke at length. The rector understood this as a romantic engagement and kept this information from her father and brother to keep her from being secluded in a monastery or, worse, to prevent physical danger to her in an honour-based society. Although we do not know what happened after, the rector quoted many other cases of runaway girls to warn of the dangers of such contacts.⁴²⁸

The moral and religious well-being of girls was a constant preoccupation, but the government was more often faced with true apostasy and conversion to Islam. Ottoman Dalmatia was desolate, so the Empire offered free land to colonists, regardless of religion. Most of them remained Catholic but changed allegiances – some more than once. A different situation was slavery. In Ottoman territories, the *devşirme* (child-levy) system meant that Christian boys were willingly or unwillingly seized by the State, becoming slaves of the sultan. They were converted and entered the military and administrative apparatus. In a parallel system, slaves captured during raids could apply for freedom if they converted to Islam and could join the relatively meritocratic Ottoman administration. This was by no means an exception as most of the highest-ranking Ottoman officials were born Christians. Many of them were from these borderlands. Murat bey Tardić (d. 1545) was born in Šibenik (*Sebenico*) as a Christian and had a brother Juraj who was a priest. Captured and enslaved, he converted to Islam and became the conqueror and first sanjak-bey of Klis in 1537.⁴²⁹ When in 1532 he visited his brother in their paternal home, he was welcomed with a diplomatic ceremonial of the highest degree.⁴³⁰ *Hrvat* (here a nickname; Turkish for Croat) Rüstem Pasha Opuković (1500–1561), the Grand Vizier and Suleiman the Magnificent's son-in-law, was from Skradin (*Scardona*) or Makarska (*Macarsca*). Another example was the Vizier and Ottoman Grand Admiral *Silahdar* Yusuf Pasha (1604–1646), born Josip Mašković in Vrana (*Laurana*) near Zadar, where he commissioned a residential complex with a caravanserai that will be mentioned again. It is sometimes possible to trace entire *dynasties* of slaves. Ali Bitchin (c. 1560–1645), the Grand Admiral of Algiers, is believed to have been born in Venice in the Piccini or Piccinino family.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*, 170.

⁴²⁹ Traljić, “Zadar i turska pozadina,” 206; 214.

⁴³⁰ Matić, “Hrvatski književnici mletačke Dalmacije,” 240–241.

Bitchin was captured by the Governor of Algiers Hassan Veneziano (born in Venice as Andrea Celeste, 1544–1587), who in turn served as a slave to the Governor of Algiers and Grand Admiral of the Ottoman fleet Uluç Ali known in Italy as *Occhiali* (1519–1587). This famous captor of Miguel de Cervantes was born Giovanni Dionigi Galeni in Calabria. Some from the elites converted to Islam, which resounded far and seldom happened the other way. The Genoese nobleman Scipione di Cicala, the nephew of the cardinal Giambattista Cicala (1510–1570), became remembered as the Grand Admiral and Vizier Cıǧalazade Yusuf Sinan Pasha (1545–1605).⁴³¹ A well-known example is Alvise Gritti (1480–1534), the illegitimate son of Doge Andrea Gritti (1455–1538) and a friend and counsellor to Suleiman the Magnificent. Due to proximity, this was more often in Dalmatia than in Italy. In 1560 a certain Ivan from Šibenik, an officer made famous during the Third Ottoman-Venetian War (1537–1540), ran away and became a Muslim for which the sultan awarded him a large estate.⁴³² These people were also uniquely suited for espionage. On these grounds, Jonus (*Yunus*) bey, a confidant of the Grand Vizier whose Christian name was Lucio Doria, was banished from Pula (*Pola*, Istria) in 1593.⁴³³ Due to confrontations with the *provveditore generale* and the count of Trogir (*Traù*), the lawyer and nobleman from Hvar (*Lesina*) Girolamo Fasaneo (*Jerolim Fazanić*, 1590–1632) was banished from Venetian territories in 1624. In 1630 he threatened to convert to Islam if not repatriated and if the government's harassment did not stop. He consequently converted, and the *bailo* had him assassinated in Mostar (Herzegovina).⁴³⁴ The ruling elite could not be allowed to appreciate Islam publicly. The Inquisition launched a process in 1589 against a Veronese noble who supposedly commented in church during a baptism of a converted Muslim that the “Muslim religion is better than the Christian one.” While his choice of time and place can be considered improper, a great scandal was caused in 1616 by the Venetian patrician Cristoforo Canali, accused of saying that “he would like being a Turk under the authority of the sultan since everyone is well under his law.”⁴³⁵ While he was speaking hypothetically,

⁴³¹ Antonio Fabris, “Hasan ‘il veneziano’ tra Algeri e Costantinopoli,” *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 15 (1997).

⁴³² Vrandečić, “Islam in Ottoman Dalmatia,” 170.

⁴³³ Pust, “Migrations and Conversions,” 154

⁴³⁴ Josip Alačević, “Le disgrazie del Dottor Girolamo Fasaneo,” *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata* 23 (1900); Antonio Fabris, “Il dottor Girolamo Fasaneo, alias Receb,” *Archivio veneto*, series 5, 23 (1989).

⁴³⁵ Minchella, “Alterità e vicinanza,” 9.

acknowledging the successes of the Ottoman legal system, this was cause enough for the Inquisition to hit him hard, with the blessing of the State.

Control of government officials was more direct and outside our scope, but it also testifies to the same argument of social control, and state security. In 1587, the counts of Posedarje (*Possedaria*) near Zadar had problems with the *Quarantia criminal* due to allegedly eating, drinking, and socialising with local Muslims.⁴³⁶ Those most sympathetic to Islam (relative to other professions) seem to have been soldiers, which presented a severe problem.⁴³⁷

Certain Ottoman subjects, some of them Muslim, kept houses and occasionally lived in Dalmatian cities. The priest Bernardo Bonitio bequeathed his house in Split to a confraternity on the condition that it would not be rented to a Turk or a Jew. The sea captain Ivan Filipović laid out the same condition in 1629.⁴³⁸

At the same time, peaceful and courteous relations with Ottoman subjects were advised and even legislated alongside the prevention of proximity. On one occasion, the count of Split Niccolò Correr (1580–1583) decreed that “none should dare to go to Turkey or send a letter to Turks”. If one should receive such letters, they should report them to his office. This same anti-espionage decision guaranteed the *Turks'* safety from any offence.⁴³⁹ In any case, the significant presence of foreigners with different loyalties was also a question of security. Besides espionage, these men could carry diseases or could “in an opportune moment take the city [Kotor].”⁴⁴⁰ A letter from 1591, circulating between the merchants of

⁴³⁶ Ortega, *Negotiating Transcultural Relations*, 81.

⁴³⁷ Minchella, “Alterità e vicinanza,” 15.

⁴³⁸ Lovre Katić, “Iz knjiga oporuka splitskog kaptola,” *Starine* 49 (1959): 86–87.

⁴³⁹ Vrandečić, “Islam in Ottoman Dalmatia,” 177.

⁴⁴⁰ ASVe, Collegio, relazioni, b. 65, n. 29, f. 6r, *Relazione di Antonio Molin ritornato di rettore e Provveditore a Cattaro 16 giugno 1637*: “[...]Ricevono l’habitanti di Montenegro gran beneficio dalla città provedendosi in quella di sale et altre cose necessarie, somministrando all’incontro vittuarie et altre mercantie, callano per ciò alli giorni festivi in gran quantità et solevano far il mercato nella città istessa, qual essendo in rigurado di sospetto di sanità, per la vicinanza del mal contagioso, suspesa la pratica, [...] et assegnatovi il luoco proprio fuori della città, per ricevere con li debiti riguardi, et se ben in quei giorni si rforzavano le guardie et non si lasciavano entrar con armi, tuttavia considerato il gran numero loro, col’introduzione di gran quantità di pistole, che per tutto il paese et di poca spesa si fabricano, potendosi facilmente nasconder sotto li pani, ne cade il pericolo, che con felice ardimento, si potesse tentar la sorpresa della città istessa, di che infiniti ne sono li essempii, onde per divertir un tal pericolo e per termine di buon governo, stimarei necessario che la Serenità Vostra espressamente prohibisse il mercato nella fortezza, facendosi fuori alla marina una piazza grande et accomodarvi un tezzone a canto il muro, che confina con la loggia, et costruirvi ancora una gabella per il sale, che saria senza alcun pregiuditio et danno publico, potendosi con l’acrescer l’una o doi gazette il scudo al sale, ricuperar quanto ci havesse speso et

Split and their confidant in Sarajevo, stated that the pasha of Bosnia or the sanjak-bey of Klis might as well decide to take the city, seeing that it is full of his subjects that control the bulk of trade going through it.⁴⁴¹

d'avantaggio in poco tempo. L'istesso si potria far dalla parte del Gordicchio per quelli di Zuppa et altre ville pur di Montenegro, che callano per l'effetto istesso." The first decision to remove Ottoman merchants from the city was taken by the rector and provveditore of Kotor Benedetto Erizzo before his mandate ended in 1577. As Kotor is entirely crammed between the mountain and the sea, Erizzo partially cleared and constructed a new road and a market below the city walls so that the merchants wouldn't enter the town. "[...] il ponte, et strada, che nuovamente ho fatto con l'haver roinato alquante casette, et orti sopra la contrascarpa, per ridur li mercanti fuori della città, potriano far il suo viaggio senza entrare nella fortezza; et così serando anco la porta della fiumara, et portando la gabella de sali sopra la marina (come facilissimamente si potrebbe fare senza spesa alcuna), si venirebbe à levar l'occasione, si à Turchi, come à suditti loro, di entrare nella città, et si romparebbe ogni disegno, che potessero haver Turchi de rubar quella fortezza [...]." *Commissiones et relationes venetae : tomus IV annorum 1572–1590. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak IV. od 1572. do 1590. godine*, ed. Grga Novak (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1964), 210–211. Partially cited in: Güneş İşıksel, "Managing Cohabitation and Conflict: Frontier Diplomacy in the Dalmatian Frontier, 1540–1646," in *State and society in the Balkans before and after establishment of Ottoman rule*, eds. Srđan Rudić, Selim Aslantaş (Belgrade: The Institute of History, Yunus Emre Turkish Cultural Centre, 2017), 268.

⁴⁴¹ "[...] oto veli baša i bezi da bude skala na Splitu, neka počne skala kuriti; kada bude u gradu mnogo Turaka hoće baša i beg Kliški doći u slac da uzmu Split, kada e skala careva, neka e i gra[d] carev, hoće postaviti u gradu carevu kadiu da sudi u gradu i Turkome i latinome i hoće baša da ogradi Turkome mečit [...]. Kako baša i mufetiš opovidit hoće čestitome caru kako vi činite turskim trgovcem muke, hoćete vi da vasa skala kuri, a careve skale zatvoriste, oto vi z[at]voriste Gabelu i Dubrovnik zatvoriste." Trajlić, "Trgovina Bosne," 361.




Fig. 4. 1 Map of Venetian Dalmatia (Hrvatska Enciklopedija, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, https://www.enciklopedija.hr/Ilustracije/Dalmacija_u_doba_mlecana.jpg, accessed 24.6.2022)⁴⁴²

⁴⁴² Legend: Borders around 1420; the (Venetian) territory in 1669; acquired by 1700; acquired by 1723; the Republic of Ragusa.

4.2. Housing the Turk in the *Stato da Mar*



Fig. 4. 2 Map of Venetian Dalmatia with the positions of the bazzane (author Petar Strunje)

All of these preoccupations, so clearly expressed between central, provincial, and local secular and ecclesiastic authorities, resonated in a set of decisions made by the highest authority in the province – the *provveditore generale*. Although a set of legislative instruments regulated contact, architecture and its location within the urban form were singled out as the most efficient means of regulating contact and exchange. In any case, infrastructure as an encompassing and expensive constructed system always needs objective reasons for its existence. As will be explained through a series of examples, initially relaxed and heterogeneous solutions were gradually codified, moving away from the city and showing a greater degree of control and segregation, which can mainly be

observed in the 18th century when the cordon sanitaire was instituted. In general, it was better if the Ottomans stayed out of town, where a *serraglio*, *fondaco*, *bazzana* or *bazzaro* could be established for them.⁴⁴³

From the consolidation of political and commercial relations in the late 16th century, only three major commercial centres arose on the Venetian Adriatic for Ottoman trade: Split, Zadar, and Šibenik, with the addition of Herceg Novi in the 18th century. All of them were on the sea and were also nodes of land-sea movement. Trade was possible in several other towns, but it never surpassed local character, discouraged by higher customs duties and insufficient infrastructure. Of those four, only Split and Herceg Novi (to a lesser degree) were genuine free ports, open to all kinds of large-scale traffic that surpassed regional dimensions. Zadar was almost exclusively a cattle port used to supply Venice and the *Terraferma* with meat, while Šibenik was the leading salt provider for Ottoman Bosnia.

Šibenik was the earliest town that established trade relations with the Ottoman pashadom of Bosnia. The first salt export agreements were signed in 1525. Until the end of the 16th century, it had the most considerable Ottoman commercial presence in the province, so it was the first to institute any restrictions on the Ottoman presence. Already in 1553, the *sindaco inquisitore* Giovanni Battista Giustinian forbade housing the *emin* (“an infidel minister, a natural enemy of Christianity”) within the city, but at the *Madalena* (Mandalina)⁴⁴⁴ where a house was already built for him. The same applied to the caravans.⁴⁴⁵ This was repeated by an anonymous Venetian official some half a century later, who advised that the *lazzaretto* on the Mandalina peninsula (*Punta della Maddalena*)

⁴⁴³ For one of the first plans: ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 62, vol II, f. 44r (1577), *Relazione del Nobel huomo Benetto Erizzo ritornato Rettor, et Provveditor di Cataro*: “Et perche fuori di quella città non vi è stantia alcuna dove si possa alloggiar Turchi, che ogni tratto vengono per servitio publico, et molti altri, che vengono per servitij particolari, li quali per necessit  sono alloggiati nella citt  (cosa, che a giudicio mio st  molto male) per  con ogni riverentia dir  a V[ost]ra Sub[limi]t , che saria molto bene, che la facessi fare qualche luoco fuori della citt  dove si potesse alloggiar ogni sorte di Turco, commettendo, che a modo alcuno non si introducesse, sia chi esser si voglia, se non per quel tenuto, che si avesse a negotiar le cose pubbliche come si fa a Zara, il che sarebbe con maggior securt , et reputation di quella fortezza [...]” Partially cited in: Işıksel, “Managing Cohabitation,” 268–269. The other two examples that Işıksel cites (ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 66, n. 4, f. 18v; b. 72, n. 9, f. 3v) are used out of context because they refer to the Jews of Corf  and the antiepidemic protection in Split.

⁴⁴⁴ Mandalina was a village on the outskirts of Šibenik, on a peninsula across from the city. Today, it is incorporated as a neighbourhood.

⁴⁴⁵ *Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus III annorum 1553–1571*, ed. Šime Ljubi  (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1880), 38, 43.

be modified and expanded for the use of the caravans. He considered that position ideal because it could be controlled – it was in direct view of the city and its fortifications, and the market was divided from the town’s one frequented by citizens, which was a *desirable separation*.⁴⁴⁶ Consequently, the civic lazaretto of Šibenik that existed there since 1467 was repaired sometime at the beginning of the 17th century and repurposed to house the caravans.⁴⁴⁷

However, no known documents confirm that the facilities at Mandalina were ever used, pointing to a location closer to town. This *desirable separation* was instead maintained just outside the city gate in an area known as *Borgo Orti* (Plišac). The *emin* was posted there, while a *tezza* for the merchants was situated nearby.⁴⁴⁸ In 1620 the count and captain Piero Morosini (1617–1620) proposed to build a *serraglio* in *Borgo Orti* for security reasons, which included epidemiological ones in times of suspected epidemic. He was dissatisfied with the current situation consisting of a perimeter separated by a wooden wall which could not be supervised, leaving the many Ottoman subjects *the rulers of Borgo Orti*.⁴⁴⁹ In 1622 a

⁴⁴⁶ BMC, Codice Cicogna, 3112, *Dalmazia Scala di mercanzia*, f. 340r. Pietro Mattheani (?). No date indicated but the ten-page letter can be dated to the first half of the 17th century due to mentioned locations between Ottoman and Venetian control.

⁴⁴⁷ Traljić, “Trgovina Bosne,” 365.

⁴⁴⁸ A contract between Radoje Radnić and Nikola Simenonić was signed in 1606 “fuori delle porte di terra ferma di Sebenico nella casa del signor Zorzi de Andreis al presente habitata per il datiaro del Turcho.” In 1615 this house was mentioned as being close to the “casa de comun, ouer la teza oue capitano i Morlachi.” Kristijan Juran, “Morlaci u Šibeniku između Ciparskoga i Kandijskog rata (1570.–1645.),” *Povijesni prilozi* 49 (2015), 170. Cf. John Tolan, Henry Laurens, Gilles Veinstein, *Europe & the Islamic World: A History*, trans. Jane Marie Todd (Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013), 228. *Tezza* can be understood as a covered space, a loggia, which often included living quarters above or in an annexe. The term will be discussed further.

⁴⁴⁹ July 31 1620, *Commissiones et relationes Venetae: tomus VI annorum 1588–1620. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak VI. od 1588. do 1620. godine*, ed. Grga Novak (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1970), 299. “E come a questo difetto [mancanza di acqua] ho previsto senz’interesse di Vostra Serenità il medesimo haverei fatto d’un altro di grandissima consideratione s’havessi potuto, ma non vi hò veduto rimedio, sendovi in questo necessario l’aiuto di lei ch’è la costruzione d’un seraglio per ridurvi li Morlachi sudditi turcheschi che collà arrivano con vettovaglie, et altre robbe, lo quale partorirà duoi buoni effetti, l’uno da potersi ben guardare in tempo di sospetto di peste, che spesso si fa sentire in paese turchesco, et l’altro per assicurarsi come succedessero romori a i confini, con tener sierati per ostaggi quelli ch’ all’hora si trovassero dentro che nel modo adesso, stando dentro una semplice stangata di quattro legni è impossibile guardarsi bene da mal tant’importante et quello che non è dir minor consideratione in questo essere, restano li sudditi turcheschi patroni del borgo del orti, che nascendoli un giorno pensiero, come sono grossi che segue spesso trovandosene alle volte fino 300 et 400 armati, la maggior parte di arcobusi, com’è scerata la città potrebbero sualeggiar il detto borgo, ò abbruciarlo, e senz’alcun impedimento battersela, consideri Vostra Serenità coll’ordinario della sua infinita prudenza in quai pericoli stano quelli sudditi et quella sua città et pur com’ hò rapresentato et à

more convenient solution was searched for. Count and captain Vittorio Morosini (1620–1622) proposed constructing a more spacious and convenient *serraglio* for the Morlachs and the *Turks* outside the city walls to prevent various inconveniences for the sake of security and to unburden the town’s streets.⁴⁵⁰ It must have been built shortly after Morosini’s proposal because a certain Hacı Islam from nearby Drniš confirmed a contract in 1644 “on the balcony of the *basana*”.⁴⁵¹ That same year the *provveditore generale* Andrea Vendramin (1643–1645) allowed the restoration of the *tezza* on the main gate that served the *Turks* and Morlachs waiting to buy salt at the *fontico*, as requested by the citizens of Šibenik. When the War of Crete broke out in June 1645, trade with the immediate hinterland did not stop and supplying the city became a major preoccupation.⁴⁵² At the same time, for security reasons, foreigners could not be allowed inside the city. Therefore in 1646, the *provveditore generale* Leonardo Foscolo (1645–1650) decided to act on Vendramin’s pre-War decision. The town’s procurers Hijacint Šimunić and Zorzi Barišić were entrusted with restoring the *tezza* for which the military engineer Fra Antonio Leni was employed, at the time fortifying the city.⁴⁵³

The apparently confusing terminology reveals something about the architecture of these structures. The first solution (*stangate*) signifies solely a (wooden) enclosure which might have buildings inside, but a *serraglio* includes both an enclosure and structures inside. The choice of the term is not arbitrary. *Serraglio* (Latin *serraculum*, corrupted with Turkish *saray* – court, palace) means enclosure. During the 16th century, the term was used instead

Vostra Serenità, et all’Eccellentissimo offitio della sanità à far questo seraglio vi entrerebbe di spesa soli 300 ducati in circa [...].”

⁴⁵⁰ Morosini added that in the case of a plague, the merchants could be locked inside, thus sparing the city. The price would be 800 dukats, so it was not a large building. Grga Novak. “Šibenik u razdoblju mletačke vladavine,” 192.

⁴⁵¹ Juran, “Morlaci u Šibeniku,” 170.

⁴⁵² Entirely stopping trade would also mean stopping military operations on both sides, as well as condemning both populations to starvation. On the Venetian side, cities had to be well supplied in case of a siege. In the summer of 1647, Šibenik was besieged by 25 000 Ottoman soldiers. At the same time, large scale cross-continental trade was interrupted, and the *scala di Spalato* was not operational.

⁴⁵³ Državni arhiv u Zadru (State Archives in Zadar, Croatia; henceforth HR-DAZD), *Generalni providur za Dalmaciju i Albaniju (Provveditore generale di Dalmazia ed Albania; henceforth HR-DAZD-1)*, kut. 15 (Leonardo Foscolo, knj. II), f. 254v, Oct. 22, 1646. The other known restoration was done by engineer Frane Zavoreo in 1783, together with the cavalry barracks. HR-DAZD-1, kut. 194 (Paolo Boldù, knj. I), f. 101r–v, May 10, May 16, 1783.

of the word ghetto, meaning “the enclosure of the Jews.”⁴⁵⁴ These urban enclosures had residential structures within. In the Šibenik case, it had a house, or rather a *teza* (*casa over la teza*). *Teza* (sometimes *tezza*) is a large covered space in the open, similar to a loggia but without urban administrative connotations.⁴⁵⁵ However, the term loggia is burdened with its function, while *teza* denotes only the form whose general characteristics are shared between the two. In these cases, even the function was the same. As noted in the introduction, an outer loggia (contrary to the civic one on a square) was used to host those travellers and merchants who waited to be allowed entry to the city or as venues for trade for those who were not willing or able to enter (fig. 4.5, 4.6). When it was used for large-scale trade, merchandise storing, and extended stays, an open porch (or loggia proper) would have a closed superstructure or annexe.⁴⁵⁶ In Šibenik, the *teza* was equated with a house, which could mean that it already had such a superstructure present in the description from the cadastre of 1789.⁴⁵⁷ Considering that it was changed and rebuilt from the first mention, by then it was a stone building with a porch (*sottoportico*) made of four pilasters that held the first floor. The ground floor, completely open to the courtyard, was used as a stable, while the first floor was a single continuous room with four windows. A walled court surrounded the building. Half of the length of the inner wall was encased in a low outer wall, forming a small external court.⁴⁵⁸ There was even a third wall of the same length and height, just a meter away from the last. The same situation can be observed in the Habsburg cadastre of 1825 (parcel 540; fig. 4.3).⁴⁵⁹ This triple-wall can only be explained in comparison with

⁴⁵⁴ Sandra Debenedetti-Stow, “The Etymology of ‘Ghetto’: New Evidence from Rome,” *Jewish History* 6, no.1 (1992).

⁴⁵⁵ Giuseppe Boerio, *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*, (Venice: Giovanni Cecchini, 1856), 64; 747. Boerio equates the word with *fienile*, *capanna*, *tettoia*, or in Venetian ambient *barchessa*, all of which are rural semi-open structures used for storage.

⁴⁵⁶ Such is the case of the Anconitan *loggia dei mercanti* which is also located outside the walls in the port. As mentioned in the introduction, loggias often had a national character, substituting the *fondaco*.

⁴⁵⁷ HR-DAZD-5, *Mletački katastar. Katastarske knjige* (Venetian cadastre. Cadastral books), kut. 36, sv. 1, *Catastico generale della Dalmazia*, 1789, ff. 126v–127r, Giannicolò Nachich Tenente Ingegnere. ASVe, Deputati e aggiunti alla provvision del denaro pubblico (henceforth: DAPDP), b. 990, tomo 2, f. 624r–v. The building is called *bazzana nel Borgo Terra Ferma* and measured as 26x7m, 4,6m high.

⁴⁵⁸ The inner court was 40x9m. The second wall was ca. 20m long, 0,8 high, and 2,4m far from the inner one.

⁴⁵⁹ The entire Austrian cadaster is digitised and available online: <https://maps.arcanum.com/en/map/cadastral/?layers=3%2C4&bbox=1755714.2095909773%2C5416956.817683182%2C1783913.4759409397%2C5427445.682388731> (accessed 27.4.2022). For Dalmatia, the originals can be found in the State archives of Split, Croatia. The earliest photograph of the Šibenik

Split, Zadar, and Sinj, where *teze* were also employed. There a double wall allowed trade negotiations while prohibiting contact. For trade negotiation, the Ottomans would probably exit to the first outer perimeter, while local merchants would stay outside – trading over the two meter-wide walls.⁴⁶⁰ The sanitation office was just outside. These walls were a counter-epidemic measure and were probably the product of stricter regulation in the 18th century, as will be demonstrated on other examples.

bazzana is from 1880 after the building was repurposed as a poorhouse in 1850 (fig. 4.4). A.A., “Fotografija stara više of 140 godina: Znete li priču o šibenskoj ubožnici i zgradi zvanoj ‘badžana’?,” *Sibenski.hr, Slobodna Dalmacija* [internet portal], Feb. 23, 2022. <https://sibenski.slobodnadalmacija.hr/sibenik/kultura/bastina/fotografija-stara-vise-od-140-godina-znate-li-pricu-o-sibenskoj-uboznici-i-zgradi-zvanoj-badzana-1170147> (accessed 27.4.2022).

⁴⁶⁰ This was an often-found practice, but a parallel solution were windows encased in iron bars and grilles.



Fig. 4.3 The cadastral map of Šibenik, 1825 (maps.arcanum.com; number 540; note 459)



Fig. 4.4 The poorhouse (orig. bazzana) of Šibenik (lower right), ca. 1880 (Šibenski.hr; note 459)




Fig. 4. 5 Leo Wehrli, *The small loggia in Trogir (Mala loža)*, 1936 (Zürich, ETH Bibliothek_Dia_247-09449)



Fig. 4. 6 Maestro de Canapost, *Merchants unloading cargo at the loggia in Perpignan*, detail from: *Retable de la Trinité*, Musée Hyacinthe Rigaud, Perpignan, ca. 1489 (https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Perpignan,St_Jacques010,Rigaud3.jpg; accessed 29.6.2022)

Zadar was central to Venetian political and strategic interests. It was primarily established as a port for livestock, providing Venice and its surroundings with roughly a third of its needs for meat.⁴⁶¹ Shortly after 1622, the market and port for imported goods were displaced from the city to Puntamika (Borik), just across the city on the other side of the bay.⁴⁶² This livestock almost entirely came from the Ottoman Empire, led by herders and merchants, prevalently Orthodox Morlachs and Muslims. Due to its importance, Zadar was where the regional variant of the system was instituted, together with the accompanying regulation. These decisions are contemporary to the ones in Venice and the first attempts to regulate cross-border trade in Split. In the second half of the 1570s, the *provveditore generale* Alvise Grimani (1574–?) was ordered by the Senate to forbid entry to the city to all Ottoman officials for which he built certain spaces (*stantie*) in an uninhabited location called *San Marco*, a kilometre outside the city walls.⁴⁶³ Captain Andrea Soranzo advised in 1593 that as few Ottoman subjects as possible should be permitted to the city due to its strategic importance. Reversing the previous decision, only those on diplomatic duty should be allowed entry.⁴⁶⁴ Taking into account these preoccupations, the *provveditore generale*

⁴⁶¹ See Čolak, “Promet stoke”.

⁴⁶² Ibid. 417.

⁴⁶³ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Cristoforo da Canal ritornato di Conte a Zara 1594*: “Raccordo appresso alla Serenità Vostra, che per la reputatione di quella fortezza di tanta consideratione et stima et per l’interesse della spesa, che la Serenità Vostra, per parte espressa dell’eccellentissimo Senato, ordinasse che non s’introducessero per l’avenire personaggi, Zaus né Voivode de Turchi in essa città, ma che si reducesse la stantia che è dentro dal luoco di San Marco, già dall’eccellentissimo signor Proveditor general Grimani per tal effetto fabricata et dedicata, et ciò per quelli rispetti et considerationi che essa col suo prudentissimo giuditio può penetrare, che tal delliberatione sarebbe il scudo delli reggimenti non lassiarne entrare alcuno, oltre che si levarebbe forse l’occasione di venirvi come hora fanno, così frequentemente, già che si vengono introdur nella città et alcune volte nelli proprii palazzi di regimenti, fermandosi le settimane intiere. The same is confirmed in the final relation of the count Alvise Dolfin in 1578: Mi resta à dire, che essendo stà fabricato fuori del forte di Zara un loco che è detto San Marco, per ricever li Morlachi, et Turchi confinanti; acciò non habbino causa di venir nella città [...]” *Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus IV*, ed. Grga Novak, 225.

⁴⁶⁴ Grga Novak, “Presjek kroz povijest grada Zadra,” 53. ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Andrea Soranzo tornato di capitano a Zara*, Aug. 6, 1593: “Et perché Serenissimo Prencipe non senza raggione, anzi con molta prudenza, fu deliberato che li Turchi non potessero entrar ne la città, si per riputatione di quella importantissima sua fortezza, come per altri rispetti che ponno assai bene esser considerati dalla Sublimità Vostra, parmi per scarico mio doverle con ogni riverenza raccordare, quel tanto che anco con mie lettere le ho scritto, cioè che essendo quella città bisognosa di molte cose per lo vivere et particolarmente di biade, sono astretti li soi rappresentanti di permettere che li Turchi et Morlacchi suoi sudditi se ne venghino dentro, acciò col tratto d’esse possino provedere di quelle cose che le sonno necessarie e con tal occasione hanno commodità di poter vendere et forse anco penetrare in certi particolari, che per servitio publico le dovriano esser occulti, essendo impossibile che dentro non venghino

Alvise Priuli (1639–1641) prohibited anybody from housing the *Turks* in Zadar if not in possession of a special permit issued by his office.⁴⁶⁵ This decision from 1639 would resound far in the province, ensuring the marginal position of Ottoman spaces when his successor Giovanni Battista Grimani (1641–1643) expanded the regulation to the entire province of Dalmatia and Albania. He also prohibited transferring the Ottoman merchants to the *sottovento* (the Western Adriatic), offending, and molesting them, while restricting the points of entry to only those places where a customs officer was present.⁴⁶⁶ Contact with the caravans and any trade was forbidden before they were introduced into the *tezzone* assigned to them. To avoid scandal resulting from the *Turks* staying and roaming freely around the cities of the province, they were to be confined to a single edifice that would be guarded and locked at night. While all cities of Dalmatia were to implement the same decision, the *provveditore* appointed Luca Stagneri, a loyal and experienced assistant at the *Porta Terraferma* (main gate) for the entry of *Turks* (“assistente alla Porta Terraferma per l’ingresso de’ Turchi”) with finding a house in Zadar which he would direct (appendix 17). The house would have to be “suitable and comfortable, in which all Turks, and their subjects – the Morlachs, can and must be confined during the night without weapons of any

incognitamente persone anco di consideratione per tale effetto, onde per rimediare a questo notabilissimo disordine, lauderei che la Serenità Vostra facesse accommodare da novo il loco chiamato San Marco, fuori nella spianada della città, dove per l’ordinario se vi tiene anco un poco di guarda et soleva esser il consueto ridotto di Turchi, commettendo che fossero astretti li mercanti di quella città a tener in quel loco di ogni sorte mercantia, sendovi massime le botteghe, come per lo passato è stato osservato, perché con questo mezzo si leverebbe la strada a quelle genti di frequentare così spesso la città, espressamente ordianando a suoi clarissimi rappresentanti, che dentro non lassassero entrare, se non quelli che a posta andassero per trattar seco negotii publici.”

Similar reasoning can be found in 1596, expressed by Soranzo’s successor Lunardo Zulian. Ibid., July 4, 1596; *Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus V annorum 1591–1600. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak V. od 1591. do 1600. godine*, ed. Grga Novak (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1966), 158 .

“Dirò bene, con ogni riverentia, che la introduzione che si è fatta di lassar intrar in quella importantissima fortezza Turchi et Morlachi loro sudditi, è di grandissima consideratione, poichè pochi giorni sono che non s’introducono Turchi et Morlachi drento di essa, li quali se ben non intrano con le loro arme, facendosegli lassar fuori delle porte, non mi par però che sia dignità né reputatione di essa fortezza che vi transitino con tanta libertà, covenendo massime passar due corpi di guardia dalla porta di terraferma. Però lauderei che il loco di San Marco, fuori di essa città, fosse reacomodato atrovandosi le habitationi tutte ruinate et che ivi, per esser stato per il passato a questo destinato, li detti Turchi havessero a contratar con i sudditi di Vostra Serenità, senza dover intrar nella città, per schivar ogni inconveniente che potesse occorer.”

⁴⁶⁵ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 11 (Alvise Priuli, single book), ff. 402v–403r, Feb. 14, 1638 m.v.

⁴⁶⁶ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 12 (Giovanni Battista Grimani, single book), ff. 11r–14v. Aug. 10; Sep. 26, 1641.

sort. A person should be kept and sleep in the house to assist [those inside] and close the gates at the 24th hour [sundown], opening them in the morning.” Stagneri was obliged to notify the *provveditore* of the persons staying there and all that happened every evening. A foreign company of Italians would guard the premises to prevent any proximity, contact, and contraband.⁴⁶⁷ The seclusion of the *Turks* (together with the Orthodox Morlachs) in a single guarded house, which was locked at night and had a custodian, is a direct reference to the Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi*, as the *scala di Spalato* had a different management structure. This solution was continued in 1673, when Lorenzo Moresini, another *assistente alla Porta Terraferma*, was selected for that duty,⁴⁶⁸ replaced in 1705 by Francesco Corona.⁴⁶⁹




Fig. 4. 7 Giovanni Battista Lodoli, *Cargador of Zadar*, 1754 (Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 198)

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., ff. 682v–683r, July 13, 1643. This house might have been in the *Calle dei Turchi* (today *Zore Dalmatinske*), a convenient position close to the commercial and political centres of the city, but further away from churches and military infrastructure, being located at the westernmost, somewhat marginal part of the city. This type of arrangement was needed because Ottoman herders and merchants had their representatives who negotiated each trade. In 1709 these were Ahmedaga Ćurčić, Ibrahimaga Hassan Spahi, and Matija Sojić. These three could be employed as trade agents and representatives, if the merchants wished so. Čolak, “Promet stoke,” 420–421; Šime Peričić notes that after the War of Cyprus 15–20 *Turks* and *Morlachs* could be found within the city. “Prinosi povijesti Zadra XVII. i XVIII. stoljeća,” *Zadarska smotra* 4–5 (1993): 71.

⁴⁶⁸ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 37 (Pietro Civran, knj. II), f. 5v, Mar. 30, 1673.

⁴⁶⁹ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 70 (Giustin da Riva, knj. II), ff. 2v–4r, July 22, 1705. Each decision contains a copy of the previous one, confirming the continuity. Only the one of 1705 states that the merchants did not go through quarantine, and if any one of them would show any symptoms, he was to be transferred to the lazaretto of San Marco. Due to Venetian dependence on this trade, the *provveditori* were not willing to close the *scala* even during epidemics and negotiated with the Ottoman officials and trade representatives on numerous occasions to improve their position. Čolak, “Promet stoke,” 420–422.




Fig. 4. 8 Napoleone Francesco Eraut, Zara (Cargador marked with an asterisk * on the left), 1682 (BNM, Ms.It.IV.28, *Racolta delle piante d'alquante delle più considerabili et forti piazze dello Stato tanto di terra ferma quanto da mar della Serenissima Repubblica di Venetia*, c. 39r)

The same house existed in 1752; by then the argument changed from one of social segregation to that of sanitary control (appendix 23). The assistant at the Porta Terraferma for the entry of Turks became the health supervisor (“soprastante di sanità al Posto di Terraferma”, Antonio Panaggioti at the time), signifying the new epidemiological basis for segregation. However, this new overlaying epidemiological prospect affected nothing in terms of regulation after going through quarantine. The main problem was still recognised in the *Turks* wandering around the city unrestricted, especially at night, which could cause problems for the citizens and the *Turks* themselves. Similarly to the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, the custodian was obliged to stay in the single house where the *Turks* would be housed. Their weapons would be taken, the house would be locked at night, and the custodian would notify the city captain each evening of those housed within. He needed to be courteous, guard their belongings, help and provision them for which the guests would pay daily rent (meaning that the usual length of stay was measured in days).⁴⁷⁰

If the Ottoman presence within the city walls was not necessary, it was avoided. There were only two places outside the city where Ottoman subjects (only Muslims and Orthodox Morlachs are mentioned) were housed and where trade was possible: *San Marco* and the *cargador* of Puntamika (fig. 4.7, 4.8; close to Voštarnica – *Ceraria*) with its nearby *bazzana*. In 1678 even the Ottoman *emin* was displaced out of the city to the position known as *San Marco*. There a walled encampment with certain spaces (*teze*) was built.⁴⁷¹ Intending to stop smuggling and unregulated contact, the government implemented the decision forbidding trading with the Ottomans anywhere within the district of Zadar (the entire coastal northern Dalmatia) outside the perimeter of *San Marco*.⁴⁷²

⁴⁷⁰ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 135 (Giovanni Maria Balbi, knj. II), ff. 52r–53r.

⁴⁷¹ “Si va rimettendo in diverse città il negotio di lane, formaggi, miele, pellami et simili, che dal paese Turchesco s’estrangono, et a Zara prende sempre miglior corso quello de manzi d’Ongaria per questa città. Come però in cadaun luoco esistono competenti ricoveri per la gente che conduce le mercantie e vettovaglie, così si rende necessario aggionger alla predetta città di Zara, nel sito di San Marco, alquante *teze* o altri simili comodi, senza quali non può ben esser fatto il servitio. Et a questo passo dirò che dovrebbe l’Emin essattore de datii Turcheschi tenersi alloggiato fuori della città, come da per tutto si pratica, per molti considerabili riguardi, che possono dalla publica maturità esser a bastanza compresi.” ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 67, Aug. 24, 1678, *Relazione di Girolamo Grimani tornato Provveditore generale in Dalmazia e Albania*. In terms of Ottoman trade, the location was first mentioned in 1610. Traljić, “Zadar i turska pozadina,” 217; Roman Jelić, *Zdravstvo u Zadru i njegovu području* (Zadar: Narodni list, 1978), 22.

⁴⁷² Peričić, “Prinosi povijesti Zadra,” 68.

That same building was later repurposed into a lazaretto – a place of total isolation. The anonymous plan and prospect of the new *Lazzaretti di San Marco* rebuilt and expanded in 1782 (fig. 4.9), the cadaster of 1789 – which differentiates the older from the newer part, and the comparative material allow us to reconstruct the previous building.⁴⁷³ The *Lazzaretto Vecchio*, repurposed in 1782 as the cavalry barracks, was 13 m long, 5,2 wide, and 5,3 high. It had two floors with a stable below and two latrines under the staircase that led above. The first floor was a single large room with a fireplace. The measurements correspond to the stable in the upper left (fig. 4.9, n. 14, 22), which was subsequently divided from the rest of the complex. The cadaster also notes that the two floors rooms for the guards (n. 7, 20) were only restored in 1782, while just the offices (6, 21) were added then. Seeing that the atrium (between 4 and 5) and the guard house (2) in the lower left were part of the *clean* part of the lazaretto that divided the outer world from that inside, the two outer walls (*stangate*) are superfluous and cannot be found on any contemporary lazaretto. However, the *bazzana* of Split had them, while the one in Šibenik also had a third one. The outer perimeter was used by local merchants, and the inner one contained the suspected Ottoman ones, with trade being conducted through a grille. Therefore, the two outer walls, the stable, and the guard's rooms (n. 7, 14, 20, 22) are part of the mercantile complex (with a *teza*, or *bazzana*) that predated the 1782 lazaretto.

⁴⁷³ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1 (*Catastico Dalmazia*, 1789), f. 46r, *Paolo Tironi ing.* Tironi differentiates between the *Lazzaretto Vecchio* and *Nuovo*, although they are on the same cadastral parcel n. 39. The drawing confirms that the lazaretto was *rifabbricato*, meaning that at least a part of the earlier structure was kept.




Fig. 4.9 Lazaretto of Zadar, after 1782 (Museo Correr, Cl. XLIVb, n. 0638)

The cattle port was located in Voštarnica (*Ceraria*), just across from the peninsula and on the other side of the port in the small bay of Vrulja (fig. 4.8, 4.9). There a large cattle pen (*serraglio*) was constructed connected to a pier with a drawbridge (*pontile*) to ease animal embarkation (the entire complex was called *cargador*, the area as *Orto del Barcagno*). The first construction at that place was possibly undertaken shortly after 1587 when the first *emin* was placed in Zadar to regulate the cattle trade. However, a new, expanded complex was built in 1729 and reconstructed in 1771.⁴⁷⁴ At Borik (*Puntamica*), a *bazzana* existed up to 1666, when it was destroyed.⁴⁷⁵ It might have been rebuilt because in 1765 the Turks quarantined around there damaged the house of Ivan Ivanić close to the church of the

⁴⁷⁴ Traljić, "Trgovina Bosne," 366–367; Tomislav Raukar et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom 1409.–1797.* (Zadar, Filozofski fakultet, 1987), 543, Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 198. The 1729 state is recorded on the 1754 plan of engineer Giovanni Battista Lodoli, the brother of the theoretician Carlo (fig. 4.8).

⁴⁷⁵ Carlo Federico Bianchi, *Fasti di Zara: religioso-politico-civili dall'anno 1184 av. cr. sino all'anno 1888 dell'era volgare* (Zadar, G. Woditzka, 1888), 98.

Madonna dell'Olivetto.⁴⁷⁶ In any case, a *bazzana* closer to the *cargador* would be more convenient than the two kilometres far *San Marco*, but the lack of documents makes it impossible to make such a claim.

The small town of Trogir, between Split and Šibenik, deserves mention as a minor endpoint of Ottoman trade. Described in 1789, the *bazzana* of Trogir was a ground-floor structure with an attic “che serve per contumacianti, e cavalli” – that is, it was a quarantine at the time. Next to it was the sanitation office with rooms for the guard.⁴⁷⁷ While the construction date of the *bazzana* is unknown, an enclosure (*stangata*) existed in 1609 when it was advised that due to the recent epidemic of 1607–1608, all Turks and Morlachs should be kept inside at all times – implying they usually did not do so.⁴⁷⁸ It was located just on the other side of the bridge from the Landward gate,⁴⁷⁹ so the *bazzana* and the health office correspond to buildings number 1041 and 1042 in the Habsburg cadastre of 1830.⁴⁸⁰

Split became the node of Ottoman-Venetian trade in the 1580s with the establishment of the *scala di Spalato*, for a time hosting a more prominent Ottoman presence than any other European Christian city. Two parallel systems were implemented for Ottoman trade. While the *scala di Spalato* located in the port was an intercontinental hub and will be elaborated on in detail,⁴⁸¹ there was a separate solution for local trade. While contemplating the *scala's* position in 1577, Fabio da Canal, the *provveditore* of the cavalry, proposed

⁴⁷⁶ Jelić, *Zdravstvo u Zadru*, 21.

⁴⁷⁷ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1 (*Catastico, Dalmazia*, 1789), f. 101v, *Francesco Cicavo tenente ingegnere*. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 557r. The *bazzana* was 18,5x7,7m large, 4,5 high.

⁴⁷⁸ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Alvise Morosini ritornato di Conte a Traù*. June 20, 1609: “Havrei da dir alcune cose in proposito delle mercantie condotte da Turchi e Moralchi a quella città, che patiscono contagio, che in tempo che non si sentono moti sogliono passar senza le debite cautioni di peste et credo saria buona provisione che fossero obligati star in ogni tempo alli luochi delle stangate et li mercanti ricever sempre le robbe pericolose con le debite cautioni, essendone uno molto comodo a Traù, fabricato a spese publiche.”

⁴⁷⁹ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Marco Molin ritornato di Conte e capitano di Traù*. “[...] alle stangate, dove si riducono i sudditi Turcheschi di là dal ponte all'incontro di dette porte [di Terraferma].”

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 64. On the plan of Trogir from 1757 made by engineer Giovanni Francesco Rossini the *bazzana* can be identified as the only building in front of the Landward gate. ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 415, fz. 602, disegno 1 (unreproduced).

⁴⁸¹ Not excluding that those traders passing through it could do their bussiness in Split also, but it was not their final market.

positioning the central customs office outside the main city gate (*Porta Pistora*).⁴⁸² It was apparently in the vicinity of the *emin* and certain Morlach camps which suggest that some grouping of Ottoman subjects in front of the city gate existed as early as 1577. After a great plague hit Split and the province in 1607, Andrea Renier, the former count of Split (1600–1602), was appointed *provveditore alla sanità* to suppress the epidemic and ensure that appropriate rules were observed at the lazaretto of the *scala*. After his term ended in 1610, he confirmed that the *Turks* had a house in front of the main city gate (*Porta Pistora*) where they traded in foodstuff and other goods, as they had in Trogir and Šibenik. It was in a terrible state and required restoration.⁴⁸³ Renier claimed that this was not so much for the convenience of the merchants but for the city itself so the gates would not have to be opened during night and other inconvenient times. The plague being over, the *provveditore alla sanità* saw the Ottoman subjects as a security question, not an epidemic one. In his final relation of 1614, count Marino Mudazzo (1611–1613) stated he had problems with the local guards at the *scala*, who frequented the *stangade* in which Turks and Morlachs brought grain and other food. For Mudazzo, the main problem was that the guards and the merchants shared the same language and dress, so they mingled and could not be easily distinguished. To remedy this *scandal*, he proposed the introduction of Italian guards.⁴⁸⁴

⁴⁸² Viktor Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 224–225; ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar. fz. 69. “La doanna poi vorei che fosse nel borgho di fuori della terra et loramenti de murlachi et locho di lemene [l’emine] che sarrà alla porta del borgho che sta sempre apperta giorno et notte che fa solum il segno di un arco et non si haverebbe à dubitare di cosa alcuna et saranno sicuri da uschochi per essere diffesi dalla citta [...]” The letter is undated, but inserted with Daniele Rodriga’s 1577 supplication and several other decisions and opinions made before March of the same year. Therefore it should be dated to the beginning of 1577. Conveniently, the street leading to the *Porta Pistora* is called *Bosanska* – Bosnian.

⁴⁸³ *Commissiones et relationes Venetae: tomus VI*, ed. Grga Novak, 165, Relation of Andrea Renier, the count of Split and *provveditore di sanità*, 1610. “Al loco chiamato della Pistora che è una delle porte della città per dove vengono dal paese turchesco: et Turchi et Polizzani et altri con vituarie: vi è una caseta di quella comunità: la qual si atrova in pessimo stato, et ha bisogno di esser ristaurata et acomodata: et perche cio non puo essere fatto dalla sudetta comunità povera et esausta di danaro et di entrata, hora torneria molto à prepostio: per comodo di quelli, che concorono a questa scala: non tanto per mercantie quanto per il comodo della città, come li ho detto: che cio fosse fatto da Vostra Serenità a cio che quando occorre, che li mercanti, che da paesi lontani capitano, ivi di note: et con tempi cativi: et molte volte, che sono serate le porte: per non haver occasione di aprirle, et masime a Turchi; potesero ritrovare quel allogiamento dove se li tiene anco coi guardiani; il che sarebbe conforme a quello che si usa a Sebenico, et a Traù: dove sono doi simile case, per questo effetto aponto: il che si fara con poca spesa.”

⁴⁸⁴ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, *Relazione di Marin Mudazzo ritornato di Conte e capitano a Spalato e Provveditore alla Sanità 26 giugno 1614*.

Whatever building existed was destroyed when the broader position in front of *porta Pistora* was fortified in 1630 in preparation for the long Cretan War (1645–1669), when the entire city was encircled in bastion fortifications. The *provveditore generale* Pietro Civran (1673–1675) thus ordered the construction of a new *tezzone* in 1674,⁴⁸⁵ and it shows already on the city plan of Giorgio Calergi in 1675 (fig. 4.10).⁴⁸⁶ Subsequently, it is named the *stangade della sanità* on the plan of Napolione Francesco Eraut from 1682 (4.11, marked T).⁴⁸⁷ Stefano Buccò in 1692 calls the building simply *teson* (fig. 4.12),⁴⁸⁸ while for Giuseppe Juster in 1708 it is *contumacia*.⁴⁸⁹ All three draw a rectangular structure surrounded by a paling fence (dotted on plans).



Fig. 4. 10 Giorgio Calergi, *Spalato*, detail, 1675 (Duplančić, *Splitske zidine*, fig. 27)

⁴⁸⁵ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 37 (Pietro Civran, knj. II), f. 148v, Aug. 28, 1674, “Erezione d’un Tezzone in Spalato per ricovero de’ Morlacchi e Turchi. Stabilita la Pace hebbero causa questi fed[elissi]mi abitanti di procurar con tutti i possibili mezzi il proprio [?] comodo, e respiro, che conoscendo [illegible] nell’ubertà, crederono poterla assai bene promuovere coll’erectio[n] d’un Tezzone fuori à questa Porta Pistora acciò li Turchi e loro sudditi confinanti allettati dal ricovero et altri comodi che per tal caso ricevono concoressero tanto più volentieri con le necessarie proviggioni e vittovaglie.”

⁴⁸⁶ Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 69.

⁴⁸⁷ Biblioteca nazionale Marciana, Venice, Ms.It.IV.28, *Racolta delle piante d’alquante delle più considerabili et forti piazze dello Stato tanto di terra ferma quanto da mar della Serenissima Republica di Venetia*, c. 48r. Cf. Snježana Perojević, “Nova saznanja o splitskom lazaretu iz nacrtà Napoliona Erauta,” *Kulturna baština* 33 (2006).

⁴⁸⁸ Arhiv Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, *Istorijska zbirka, Zaostavština Jovana Tomića*, 8711/XII-45. Cf. Arsen Fuplančić, *Splitske zidine u 17. i 18. stoljeću* (Zagreb: Uprava za zaštitu kulturne baštine, 2007), 26.

⁴⁸⁹ Duško Kečkemet, “Plan i veduta Splita iz početka osmanaestoga stoljeća” *Kulturna baština* 11–12 (1981). Kečkemet published a plan and a view from the *Kriegsarchiv* in Vienna signed by Giuseppe Juster, 1708. Exact copies exist in the Museo Correr (Cl. XLIVb, n. 0789) where they are unsigned and undated.




Fig. 4. 11 Napoleone Francesco Eraut, *Spalato*, detail (*Porta Pistora* marked E, *bazzana* T, *scala* M), 1682 (BNM, Ms.It.IV.28, c. 48r).




Fig. 4. 12 Stefano Buccò, *Spalato*, 1692 (Arhiv Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, Istorijaska zbirka, Zaostavština Jovana Tomića, 8711/XII-45)




Fig. 4. 13 Detail with the *scala di Spalato*

Although the building aimed to keep the *Turks* out of the city and provide some distance from the populace, the Venetian Health Office (*Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità*) abolished it with the outbreak of the plague of 1731 and the institution of the cordon sanitaire, claiming it was a venue for *monstrous mixing* instead of being a place that supplied the city.⁴⁹⁰ Every trade going to the city was redirected to either the lazaretto or the border.

In 1762 a new plague broke out in Bosnia, so the *provveditore generale* Pietro Michiel (1762–1765) immediately decided to stricthen sanitary and border control, build trade enclosures (*stangate*) on border crossings, and restore the *bazzana* of Split, which collapsed since it was abandoned (fig. 4.14).⁴⁹¹ Engineer Antonio Moser de Filseck made the project, proposed in design and writing, with an attached expense sheet.⁴⁹² The building was almost

⁴⁹⁰ HR-DAZD-01, kut. 107 (Zorzi Grimani, knj. II), f. 702r–v, Sept. 25, 1732. For the institution of the cordon sanitaire see the next subchapter.

⁴⁹¹ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 455, Dec. 5, 1762. The restoration was requested by the Split Board of Health who mentioned that it collapsed recently due to excessive rain. Their letter is inserted as supplement A, Nov. 2, 1762.

⁴⁹² Ibid., Supplement B and C, Nov. 24, 1762. Supplement B: *Copia di Relazione del Capitan Ingegnere Moser a S. E. Pietro Michiel Provveditor General in Dalmazia, et Albania in data di Spalato 24. Novembre 1762.* “In obbedienza a sempre venerati comandi di V.E. ingiuntimi con lettera Publica segnata li 12. del corrente riguardo al ristauo e rificazione di questa Bazzana, mi sono trasferito sopra luogo per rilevare il bisogno della stessa: Ritrovai la medesima intieramente distrutta, e solo le vestigie del suo Recinto, et ancora questo affatto incapace per servirsene, di modo che conviene primieralmente abbattere quel residuo, e far il suo impianto di nuovo: Così pure si ritrova nel medesimo essere cadente, e troppo angusto il Casello della Sanità ivi contiguo, che serve per ricovero del Deputato, e Guardiani, onde ancora questo occorre che sia rifatto di nuovo con renderlo nel tempo stesso più capace: Circa poi alle doppie Stangade, che chiuder devono sudeta Bazzana, queste al presente sono formate da colonne di pietra impiantate di tratto in tratto per formar e stabilire il circondario, e sopra li quali vengono appoggiati travi per la segregazione delle persone, et impedire la comunicazione; ma molto più opportuno, secondo il mio umilissimo pensamento per la sicurezza riguardo alla Sanità, sarebbe e col progresso del tempo altrettanto vantaggioso per risparmio Publico, se a cambio del legname, e necessaria ferramenta, che in tale maniera in molta copia occorre, e rimane esposto a moltissimi inconvenienti, et in conseguenza ad un continuo dispendio, si formasse il sudeto Circondario delle Stangade con un Muro, l’interno in altezza di piedi tre e mezzo, e l’esterno piedi tre, come dall’annesso Disegno d’avviso V.E. rileverà, il quale unito al Computo di quanto occorre di materiale e spese umilissimamente soggetto a quelle sovrana disposizioni, che V.E. crederà più opportuno. Grazie”

The engineer is signed only as *Capitane Ingegnere Moser de Filseck*. In 1765 three engineers with the surname Moser are mentioned in the province: Sigismondo, Giovanni Cristoforo, and our captain Moser. This captain is Antonio, who in May 1762 also made a plan of Split as part of the report on Jesuit houses in town, so the *bazzana* reconstruction seems to have brought him to Split. Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 227. Duško Kečkemet, “Zaštita od epidemija u Splitu i okolici u prošlosti,” in *Sanitarni kordon nekad i danas, Zbornik radova Simpozija održanog u povodu 250. obljetnice Sanitarnog kordona*, ed. Janko Vodopija (Zagreb: Zbor liječnika Hrvatske, 1978) published the plan, but did not date or attribute it, ignoring the expense sheet in which it is found.

completely ruined, and Moser demolished the remaining walls, using only the foundations and constructing a new façade. The previous perimeter walls were made of wooden boards set on stone columns, but Moser proposed building a solid stone wall.




Fig. 4. 14 Antonio Moser de Filseck, *Reconstruction project of the bazzana of Split, 1762* (ASVe, *Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità*, b. 455).

The cadastre of 1789 provides a detailed description of this large structure and how it looked after engineer Moser reconstructed it (not changing the spatial disposition). It is called the “Bazzana di riserva negl’incontri di Mal Contagioso” which means that the building operated as a restricted bourse, dealing in forward contracts during epidemics. The commodity, its quantity, and price would be agreed upon, but it would be supplied in the future, after being cleared by customs and after quarantine.⁴⁹³ More than this immediate exchange, the *bazzana* was a venue for financial speculation and dealing in future contracts. The merchants would speculate on the quantity and price of each good and make contracts for future trade. This economic aspect gave the *bazzana* its name. In South-Slavic languages, in whose territories these buildings are present, they are known as *badžana*. This is a loan word from Ottoman, as *bac* means customs duties, while *hane* is a building, house. Thus *bazzana* literally means a customs house. Over time, the public health argument became more pronounced and intermingled with that of commercial control and social segregation, which resulted in the almost complete isolation of these structures from the outside. That is why the *bazzana* in Split had a double wall surrounding the inner and the outer courtyard. The inner courtyard was exclusively for the Ottoman merchants and was surrounded by a tall wall. However, Moser predicted two wrought iron gates (*restelli*) and kept a previous southern opening obstructed with bars through which business could be negotiated.⁴⁹⁴ They had two drawers (*cantonali*) that could be closed and locked, and through which goods could be exchanged.⁴⁹⁵ The commercial character is further confirmed by the three stone containers (*pille*) used to measure grain. These can be seen in the drawing on the inner wall and had bars on the outside.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹³ Food and money (metal) were not considered dangerous so they were free of quarantine, but the wrapping had to be removed, they had to be spread and thoroughly controlled.

⁴⁹⁴ Compare with the solution in Sinj found below.

⁴⁹⁵ ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 477r-v. I would imagine them as those small drawers in prison cell doors (a so-called food-pass).

⁴⁹⁶ “Esiste ancora in questo circondario [...] tre Pille di Pietra di Quatra, mezza Quatra, e Quartariol per misurare le Biave.” HR-DAZD-1, kut. 36, sv. 1 (*Catastico, Dalmazia*, 1789), f. 91r, Antonio Luigi Galli ingegnere. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, ff. 477r-480r. Cf. Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 70. Duplančić also found an 1804 inventory mentioning two toilets on the first floor. He establishes that the building was destroyed before 1826, falling out of use in 1808. The cadaster measures that the *bazzana* was almost 7m tall to the gutter, 25 long, and 8,7 wide, within the inner enclosure 34,8x18,8m, with a wall 1,7m tall. The outer enclosure was 41x26m, with a meter-tall wall.

The two-floor *bazzana* stood within a double enclosure. The stable comprised the entire ground floor and was open to the court through two arches. Wooden stairs led to the first floor, a continuous room with a single central window to the court positioned between two additional dormers (roof windows – *luminali*). It had a fireplace in the middle and a wooden toilet on the farther side.⁴⁹⁷ A ground-floor structure for the guards and the official stood outside the fenced area.⁴⁹⁸

As in Šibenik, the *bazzana* of Split had the form of a loggia and functions as a commercial enclave of Muslim (*Turchi*) and Orthodox (*Morlachi*) Ottoman merchants. Contrary to other European loggias (built for other Europeans) in which some segregation of foreign merchants was only a consequence of separate living, for Dalmatia, segregation was the norm, strictly regulated to cement the social and religious order, commercial control, military security, and (over time) public health. The argument of security from the *Turks* is heavily accentuated and different from the one in Venice, where security for the *Turks* was one of the commonly used arguments. As is already observed, the argument for public health rose in importance during the 17th century, becoming central only in the 18th when a true border with a cordon sanitaire was implemented. Accordingly, the *Turks* were moved out of the city walls, keeping their presence to a minimum only within Zadar and Split. The *tezza*, *loggia*, or a simple house became encircled by a wall (*stangade*, *serraglio*), thus producing a space of controlled business and segregated living. Over time, these building forms became united under the term *bazzana* and spread throughout the countryside during the 18th century (see chapter 4.4).

⁴⁹⁷ ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 478r. The toilet had wooden tubes leading the sewage on the ground. In comparison, the outer structures had no toilets.

⁴⁹⁸ It was 2,8x5,9m large, 3,1 tall, and divided in two rooms.

4.3. The *scala di Spalato* ⁴⁹⁹

Having seen the general treatment of Ottoman Muslims in the *Stato da Mar*, we should turn to the node of commercial (and any other) contact. The town of Split hosted the *scala di Spalato* – the main trade port of the Ottoman Balkans and a great infrastructural undertaking marked by port and road building, construction of customs offices, houses for Ottoman officials, warehouses, a *fondaco*, a sequence of lazarettos, and finally guard houses and fortifications. It was the product of a series of bilateral negotiations starting from 1577, marking a new revival of Venetian trade and a shift in Ottoman-Venetian diplomatic and economic relations. Its most flourishing period was until the Cretan War (1645–1669), but the system continued functioning throughout the existence of the Republic, with the positioning of Split as the economic centre of the wider supranational region being felt well into the present day. The Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi* was undoubtedly the consequence of the establishment of the *scala di Spalato*. The building complex, referred to as the *scala* proper, comprised eight sections built in four consecutive construction phases (fig. 4.18) between 1588 and 1631. At the time of its construction, Split was a town on the immediate border, situated some 15 kilometres from the *de jure* capital of the Klis *sanjak* – the provincial administrative unit of the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, the building complex comprised the complete Venetian border crossing system. From east to west, quarantine was done in the four lazaretto courtyards (fig. 4.18, n. 5–8), followed by a narrow courtyard of the prior (director of the *scala*, n. 4). From there proceeded the *clean* part comprised of the *dogana* (n. 1) with Ottoman and Venetian customs offices and warehouses. Further to the west was the *dogana nuova*, operating as a *fondaco* (n. 2), with a northern annexe serving the same purpose (n. 3). While outlying the entire complex, this case study will concentrate on the semi-segregated spaces of the *dogana* and the *fondaco*, reconstructing and positioning them within the wider Venetian system of housing Muslims.

⁴⁹⁹ Material for the following chapter has been published in the author's monograph: Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*.



Fig. 4. 15 Louis François Cassas, *Spalato with the scala*, 1802 (Joseph Lavallée; Louis François Cassas, *Voyage pittoresque et historique de l'Istrie et de la Dalmatie*, 1802, table 34)




Fig. 4. 16 Snježana Perojević, *Reconstructions of the scala di Spalato*, 2002 (“Izgradnja lazareta u Splitu,” 130)




Fig. 4. 17 Giovanni Battista Camozzini, *Plan of the scala di Spalato*, 1728 (Muzej hvarske baštine, *Fond Bučić*, 1. (18. st.) Spisi mletačkog inženjera G. B. Camozzinja, 43)




Fig. 4. 18 *The chronological and functional scheme* (Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*, fig. 14)

4.3.1. Daniel Rodriga: *inventor della scala di Spalato*

Through the example of Francesco Lettino, we saw the example of a commercial and intercultural broker who, in tune with the times, chose the appropriate moment to petition the Venetian government to institute (and monopolise) the *Fondaco dei Turchi*. Venice's new *fondaco* might have been the brainchild of a single individual, but the times were changing in the entire Adriatic region. Like Lettino, Daniel Rodriga wanted to tap into the growing Ottoman-Venetian trade. However, Rodriga had grander ambitions – to direct the bulk of that trade.

The story of Rodriga begins much earlier. He was born Daniel Rodriguez in Bragança (Portugal) in 1523 to a family of baptised crypto-Jews (*Marranos*).⁵⁰⁰ All Muslims and Jews in Spain (1492) and Portugal (1497) were forced to either convert or emigrate. The situation became untenable after the Jewish massacre of Lisbon (1506, among others) and the institution of the Spanish (1478) and the Portuguese Inquisition (1536) that targeted new converts. Furthermore, if one would even genuinely convert, blood-purity laws (*limpieza de sangre*) perpetuated discrimination. In both countries, intense persecution toward the *Moriscos* (crypto-Muslims) and the *Marranos* lasted throughout the century. Many of the Iberian Jewry decided to emigrate, and a large part went to the relatively more tolerant Ottoman Empire and other Muslim lands. Some were attracted to certain Italian cities by economic privileges. One of those families was the Rodriguez. Daniel and his brothers Jacopo and Pietro were to be found in 1549 in Ancona, where they organised a trading company that connected the city with the Ottoman port in Narenta (known as Gabela near Čapljina, Herzegovina).⁵⁰¹ This started his career in Ottoman-Italian commerce, which would mark his entire life. In 1573 he was appointed consul of the Ponentine (Iberian) Jews of Venice after it was decided he would represent the *Serenissima*

⁵⁰⁰ Aron di Leone Leoni; António Manuel Lopes Andrade, “Daniel Rodriga: um dos grandes protagonistas das Nações Portuguesas do mediterrâneo,” *Revista Portuguesa de História* 38 (2006). *Marrano* – Spanish for pig. A term used for baptised Jews concerning the practice of publicly eating pork to demonstrate their belonging to the Catholic faith.

⁵⁰¹ At Narenta he became the representative of the Jewish merchants. Paci, *La scala di Spalato*, 49.

on a diplomatic mission to Skopje (Macedonia).⁵⁰² He also made friends among Ottoman officials, so later that year he acted as the representative of Hassan Pasha Predojević (ca. 1530–1593), then sanjak-bey of Herzegovina (pasha of Bosnia from 1591). It seems he already started lobbying for the establishment of a trade port in Split because the sanjak-bey of Klis Ali bey Sokollu (*Sokolović*, 1573–1576) wrote to the Doge Alvise Mocenigo (1570–1577) that the *scala di Spalato* should be opened now that the war was over.⁵⁰³ Daniel Rodriga was able to utilise his connections on both sides, and in 1577 he proposed to the Venetian Senate to open in Split a free port for trade with the Ottoman Empire that would – benefiting from his friendship with the Ottoman officials – surpass all others (appendix 8).⁵⁰⁴ In return for benefiting the town’s and the Republic’s coffers, he asked for freedom of transit, safety guarantees for traders, and trade privileges for the Sephardim he would represent as consul. Furthermore, he requested a location to construct a lazaretto. He would profit from that trade from a construction fee paid by the traders over a five-year term. The Senate sent the proposal to the *Cinque Savi*, who agreed.⁵⁰⁵ Representatives of the Split City Council Pietro Cipci and Pietro Tartaglia endorsed the project, saying that the city will become safer and its populace richer.⁵⁰⁶ On 28 October 1577, the Senate accepted Rodriga’s petition.⁵⁰⁷ However, a group of senators led by Leonardo Donà (b. 1536, doge 1606–1612) and Vincenzo Morosini (1511–1588) delayed the implementation of the decision until 1580, when it was finally confirmed.⁵⁰⁸ In the meantime, a series of negotiations started with the local officials. The *Cinque Savi* sent Alvise Contarini – a special *provveditore alla mercanzia* to the province, who inquired with Fabio da Canal (the chief cavalry commander in Dalmatia during the Cyprus War) and Giovanni Battista Calbo (count of Split 1557–1560, Šibenik 1567–1569, Pula 1580–1582) who backed the project. The location was decided on by Marco Corner (count of Split 1575–1578), while Alvise

⁵⁰² ASVe, V Savi, 2. S., b. 63, *Ebrei ponentini: Università*, Jan. 16, 1572 m.v.

⁵⁰³ ASVe, Lettere e scritture turchesche, b. 3; fz. 3 (237 III: 11–12); Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 191.

⁵⁰⁴ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 69, Jan. 13, 1576 m.v.; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 204–205.

⁵⁰⁵ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Feb., 9, 1576 m.v.

⁵⁰⁶ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 69, undated (attached to Rodriga’s petition); Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 212.

⁵⁰⁷ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 69; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 216; Paci, *La scala di Spalato*, 53.

⁵⁰⁸ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Secreta, reg. 82, June 25, 1580; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 219–220.

Loredan (count 1578–1580) noted the potential opposition that could arise locally. Loredan stated that some civic elements might oppose the significant Jewish presence and capital. On this, he was wrong, but his next observation held true. Seeing that the project would be an immense undertaking, he held that individual capital simply would not be sufficient to complete the building – and without it, there would be no traffic.⁵⁰⁹ What happened is that in 1581 Rodriga invested 600 ducats in the construction, paying in advance to the local master builder Vicko (Vincenzo) Bugardelo and an unnamed *proto* from Zadar who made the project. The foundations were laid in the sea by land reclamation, and while the construction of the southern wall was ongoing, it cracked. Rodriga sued, but Bugardelo died during litigation, and his heirs could not refund the remaining 170 ducats (out of the 374 Rodriga invested into construction).⁵¹⁰ Left without much choice, Rodriga liquidated his assets in Split and went to the port of Narenta, asking the Republic for a refund because the traffic had already started going through Split.⁵¹¹ On the advice of Alvise Loredan, the *Cinque Savi* approved this, taking possession of Rodriga’s unfinished *dogana*.⁵¹² Rodriga’s engagement did not end here. A large degree of reciprocity and negotiation on the Ottoman part was required – guarantees needed to be made, and bridges, roads, and caravanserais built. This effort ensured Rodriga a place as a diplomat.⁵¹³ In fact, Rodriga was a close friend of the *defterdar* (finance minister) of Bosnia Memiş bey (d. 1585),⁵¹⁴ while we saw earlier that Ali bey Sokollu – the sanjak-bey of Klis, requested the project. Ali bey was the younger brother of Gazi Ferhad Pasha Sokollu – the previous sanjak-bey of Klis (1566–1573), sanjak-bey Bosnia (1573–1580) and the first beylerbey of Bosnia (1580–1588) and Budin (Hungary, 1588–1590). Both were cousins of the Grand Vizier Mehmet Pasha Sokollu (1565–1579). Indeed, his reorientation of economic policy positioned Venice as the preferred trading partner. In an undated letter sent sometime between 1573 and 1576,

⁵⁰⁹ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, 1580 (no precise date). Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 221–223.

⁵¹⁰ Cvito Fisković, “Umjetnički obrt u Splitu 15.–16. stoljeća,” in *Zbornik Marka Marulića 1450.–1950.*, ed. Josip Badalić (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1950), 143; Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 225–226.

⁵¹¹ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 87, Nov. 7, 1582; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 228–230.

⁵¹² ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 87, Nov. 13, 1582; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 230.

⁵¹³ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, June 13, 1583; Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 231.

⁵¹⁴ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, June 13, 1583; ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 87, Oct. 28, 1582. Cf. Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez,” 225–226; 231.

Mehmet Pasha wrote to the Doge Alvise Mocenigo (1570–1577) that he strictly forbade any Ottoman merchant to trade in Ancona and other places under his enemies, but exclusively in Venice.⁵¹⁵ When Ali bey sent his letter in 1573, the entire Empire from Split to Constantinople was in the hands of the same family in all relevant instances of power. Thus, it was impossible that Ali bey acted independently. The same Sokollu administrators are remembered for their impressive infrastructural and urbanisation efforts in their native Bosnia and the rest of the Balkans.⁵¹⁶ On Rodriga's asking and their behest, Memiş bey ordered the construction of roads leading to Split.⁵¹⁷ Roads and bridges in the hinterland required constant negotiation, and Rodriga and other local merchants and noblemen were often employed. The Sublime Porte, the highest organ of the Ottoman government, officially acknowledged the project only in 1590.⁵¹⁸ The Sephardi Jews and their Levantine and Ponentine connections proved to be the link that allowed the Spalato enterprise to surpass the competition. Therefore, Rodriga insisted that his community be allowed settlement in Split and the Venetian *Ghetto Vecchio*, along with trade privileges, which were granted.⁵¹⁹ Furthermore, in Split, the system was more liberal than in Venice. The Jews were not constrained to a ghetto; they could engage in any craft and deal in any merchandise, while they still could not own real estate. At the same time, Rodriga was allowed to open a bank there to finance trade. If in Spain “the state could do without the

⁵¹⁵ “[...] habbiamo [...] proibito che alcuno mercante suddito della potentissima Imperial Maestà non habbi ardire di portar mercantie in Ancona, ovvero altre parti di nostri nemici, ma solamente debbi portarle à gli amici di noi sinceramente amati, cioè a Venezia.” Only the Italian translation is preserved. The only date given is August 7 in Constantinople. However, the letter must have been made after the War of Cyprus ended in March 1573 and before the Doge committed suicide in June 1577. ASVe, Lettere e scritture turchesche, b. 3; fz. 3, ff. 41r–43v.

⁵¹⁶ See Hamdija Kreševljaković, *Hanovi i karavansaraji u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Naučno društvo, 1957); Ekrem Hakkî Ayverdi, *Avrupa'da Osmanlı mimari eserleri*, vol. 1 (Istanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1977); Gülru Necipoğlu, “Connectivity, Mobility, and Mediterranean ‘Portable Archaeology’: Pashas from the Dalmatian Hinterland as Cultural Mediators,” in *Dalmatia and Mediterranean: Portable Archeology and the Poetics of Influence*, ed. Alina Payne (Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

⁵¹⁷ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, fasc. 1, June 16, 1589.

⁵¹⁸ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 414, May 12, 1590. Cf. Viktor Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez (nastavak),” 408.

⁵¹⁹ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 104, June 20, 1589; copy under the same date in: V Savi, 2. s., b. 63; approval: July 27, 1589; settlement: V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, June 20, 1590 – copy of the Senate decision; V Savi, 1. s., b. 492, Mar. 14, 1592. Cf. Duško Kečkemet, *Židovi u povijeti Splita* (Split: Jevrejska općina, 1971), 46–49; Ravid, “The First Charter”; Calabi, *Venice and its Jews*, 39.

Jews, both in the bureaucratic apparatus and in the management of the estate,”⁵²⁰ in Venice it could not – and the Levantine connection largely depended on them. The Venetian rabbi Simone Luzzatto (1583–1663), in his arguments about the social and economic benefits of the Jewish minority in Venice, argued that it was better that the traffic through the *scala di Spalato* was in the hands of loyal domestic Jews than disloyal foreign Turks; when Venetians found it increasingly difficult to personally do business in the Ottoman Empire.⁵²¹

⁵²⁰ Joseph Pérez, *Los judíos en España*, (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2009), 169.

⁵²¹ Simone Luzzatto, *Discorso circa il stato de gl'Hebrei et in particular dimoranti nell'inclita città di Venetia*, (Venice: Gioanne Calleoni, 1638), f. 17r–v.

4.3.2. The building process

Having acquired sufficient Ottoman guarantees, the Senate decided on June 4, 1588, to construct the customs house (*dogana*) on the same spot where Rodriga started his building. New designs were sent from the office of the *Cinque Savi* with an advance of 1500 ducats (out of a total 3000).⁵²² While a new project was made, almost ten times more expensive than Rodriga's one, it is difficult to ascertain how it referred to his one, made by the civic *proto* of Zadar seven years earlier. Earlier foundations were insufficient and were strengthened, so the construction was steadily proceeding by the end of September 1588.⁵²³ While the count of Split was in charge of supervising construction, the whole project was a central government commission. Its every aspect was controlled from Venice, from where most of the material was sent.⁵²⁴ The *Cinque Savi* decided that the Zadar civic *proto* was to take over the construction as the supervising engineer.⁵²⁵ Documents do not name him and mention him *ex nihilo*, which might point to his acquaintance with the project – this *proto* possibly being the same one who made the project for Rodriga in 1581. Although the *scala* was officially opened for traffic in August 1592, at the beginning of the next year, the Senate designated another 4000 ducats for its completion.⁵²⁶ Starting from 1592 the documents start mentioning the lazaretto next to the *dogana*. The *dogana* itself needed expanding; the cistern and tower were still being built, while land reclamation efforts were started to its west, in a section of the port. Therefore, Bartolomeo Galese – *proto* of the *Savi ed esecutori alle acque* and another *cavacanal* (technician for canal digging and other hydraulic work) were sent from Venice in 1593 to survey the construction site with the

⁵²² ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, June 4, June 13, June 24, 1588.

⁵²³ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Sept. 27, 1588 – copy of the report to the *Collegio*.

⁵²⁴ This would seem counterproductive and overly expensive but apparently the construction market in Split in those years was poorly developed. The shipping notes can be found in ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 492; 2. s., b. 162. A part was translated into Croatian by Viktor Morpurgo, “Daniel Rodriguez (nastavak)”. The fact that the project is of Venetian provenance is pointed out by the building material. Brick was used in this first phase, while the regional tradition exclusively uses quality stone which is abundant.

⁵²⁵ ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 492, July 23, 1590.

⁵²⁶ ASVe, V Savi, 2. serie, b. 162, Feb. 18, 1592 m.v. The function of the prior of the lazaretto and supervisor of the *dogana* was instituted in 1593. Marco Barisano served this function until 1603 when Lorenzo Nascimben from Venice replaced him. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, July 12, 1603.

design in hand (appendix 9). The *cavacanalè* and Galese were to inspect the port, its depths, piers, and breakwaters and make a generalised plan with particular emphasis on the cost estimate. Galese was also ordered to check the lazaretto and the *dogana*, the built part and the construction plot, comparing it to the design and checking the quality of the construction.⁵²⁷ He was to report on the expert workers and the building-material market in the province.⁵²⁸ The design comprised both the built and the unbuilt part, which points out that both courtyard sections were part of the same project.⁵²⁹ This is further confirmed by the lack of distinct construction phases, the financial plan in which the customs duties finance subsequent construction, the functional and spatial coherence between the two spaces and their typological similarity. The *Dogana* in this plan can be confirmed as the new western courtyard (fig. 4.18; 2), while the lazaretto is the smaller, eastern one (4.18; 1).⁵³⁰ However, the purpose-built lazaretto is several years older and was used as a customs office until the next section was finished, whose construction it financed. Until then, merchants did quarantine only in the Venetian *Lazzaretto Nuovo*. This less-than-perfect solution and the near completion of the next section (*dogana Nuova*) is confirmed in 1600 by the count and captain Lunardo Bollani (1597–1600), who described the next building:

The *scala* is so well established and such a good undertaking that I think no incident other than war can disrupt it. It is very much more convenient and secure than the one in Dubrovnik while also being cheaper. The merchants at the customs office [*dogana*] not only have very good and comfortable lodging, being pampered and well treated, but also have a safe journey aboard the merchant galley accompanied by other armed boats, while paying lesser transport rates and being about half closer [to Venice, than from Dubrovnik]. Some holdbacks can be caused by long waiting times at the *dogana*, sometimes two months

⁵²⁷ “Trovate in disegno tutta la doana et lazaretto con li debite misure, et distantie, cosi di quello che è fabricato come del loco, che si ha da fabricare con quello più particolarità che saprete, et si come vi habbiamo anco discorco a bocca, et si vi consegna il disegno per maggior vostra instruttione.” ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 492, f. 195r.

⁵²⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 492, Mar. 17, 1593; Bartolomeo Galese was an engineer at the office of the *Savi ed esecutori alle acque*. Elena Svalduz, “Al servizio del magistrato. I protti alle acque nel corso del primo secolo d'attività,” in *Architetto sia l'ingegnere che discorre: Ingegneri, architetti e protti nell'età della Repubblica*, eds. Giuliana Mazzi, Stefano Zaggia (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 2004), 266.

⁵²⁹ The *conte* received a wooden model already before with the details in writing as stated in ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Mar. 21, 1595 in *Pregadi*.

⁵³⁰ After the entire complex of the *scala* was finished in 1631, the smaller courtyard became the *dogana* with Venetian and Ottoman customs offices, postal services and public warehouses, the apartment for the Ottoman *emin*, and several rooms and warehouses for merchants.

or more, until the galley arrives, without going through quarantine which is then done in Venice. This makes the merchants so ill-satisfied, causing them much loss of money and business that at times they go through Dubrovnik. So it would be good if quarantine was done there [in Split], as I suggested, and was done before.

The new *dogana* complex is beautiful, with many comfortable rooms, 24 on the first floor and as many warehouses on the ground floors of the building's three sides. On the fourth, there is a vaulted stable for the lodging of Morlachs with their horses, and above is a very spacious vaulted space where merchants can also lodge and hold their merchandise. Furthermore, there is a strong and good tower on the angle above the port to guard and defend this *dogana*.⁵³¹

Bollani confirms that the new building was a *fondaco* – *dogana*, while the old *dogana* became the *lazzaretto*. It was insufficient, and many of the merchants were not quarantined. Based on his report, the Senate approved an additional 2000 ducats.⁵³² By 1607, the cistern was still lacking, as was the tower's roof.⁵³³

⁵³¹ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, Apr. 3, 1600, *Relazione di Lunardo Bollani conte e capitano di Spalato*. “[...] Mi resta dirle di quella scala e della fabrica della doana, la qual scala è talmente stabilita et così buono inviamiento, che per mia opinione niun altro accidente potrà romperla e disturbarla, se non la guerra, percioche è assai più commoda e sicura di quella de Ragusi e di manco spesa, havendo li mercanti in quella doana non solamente bonissimi et commodi alloggiamenti, con esser appresso acarezati et ben trattati, ma anco il viaggio sicuro con la galea di mercantia, accompagnata da altre galee et da barche armate, pagando anco manco nolo e avanzando quasi la metà del viaggio. È vero che una cosa potria causar qualche disviamento, che è la lunga stalia che li mercanti fanno in essa doana, talvolta de dui mesi e più, fin che arriva la galea, senza che li corri contumacia, la qual li viene fatta far poi qui in Venetia. Di che restano così mal sodisfatti, essendo di molto danno, spesa et interesse loro, che alle volte sono stati delli mercanti che hanno preso la volta de Ragusi. Onde saria bene, si come essendo a quel reggimento più volte con lettere ho riverentemente ricordato alla Serenità Vostra et anco alli clarissimi Signori cinque savi, che le contumacie si facessero de li, come prima si facevano.

La fabrica di quella nova doana è bellissima, con molte stanze commode, le quali sono al numero de 24 in solaro et altrettanti magazeni a pe piano in tre facciate e nella quarta vi è la cavarzaria [?] fatta in volto, per alloggiar sotto li Murlachi con li cavalli che conducono le mercantia, et nel luogo di sopra sora [?] il volto, che è assai spazioso, po[ss]o]nno alloggiar anco delli mercanti et tenirvi delle mercantie. Vi è poi una forte e bella torreta nel canton della fabrica sopra il porto, per guardia e difesa di essa doana. La qual fabrica è stata fatta tutta sotto il regimento mio, da un pezzo di muro della prima facciata in poi, che trovai alla mia venuta alto da terra circa un passo.

Tutto il resto ho fatto io insieme con due cavationi del porto, per commodità della galea, la qual hora arriva per caricar et discaricar le mercantie fin sotto il muro della doana, et per commodità anco de altri vasselli. La qual opera è stata grande et fatta con prestezza in assai manco tempo di quello fu fatta la fabrica del lazaretto vecchio, assai minore [...].”

⁵³² ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, June 12, 1600 in Pregadi.

⁵³³ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Aug. 12, 1607 in Pregadi. The same was repeated several times before: Ibid., Dec. 18, 1602; Nov. 26, 1605. In parallel, significant construction efforts were undertaken in the port.

4.3.3. The plague of 1607, subsequent modifications, and expansion

In March 1607, plague struck Split, spreading from the house of the merchant Polleni who probably brought it from Sarajevo.⁵³⁴ However, the tightly packed lazaretto was the hardest hit. By 17 March, 57 people died there, equal to the number of deceased in the entire city. Giambattista Micheli was appointed the extraordinary *provveditore alla sanità* of Split with the particular task of strictly separating the *scala* from the rest of the town.⁵³⁵ Ottavio dall'Oglio wrote to the Senate in 1609 pointing out that the traffic, previously coming from all parts of the Balkans, Hungary, Walachia, Transylvania, Moldavia, Anatolia, and even Persia, had declined in favour of Florentine traffic over Dubrovnik. The plague was not the main reason, but the lacking infrastructure was. The old lazaretto needed to be expanded and modified, the harbour excavated, and the piers finished. A serious problem in his eyes was the lack of sufficient water supply because the *Turks* were accustomed to such facilities in their lands. His letter confirmed the petition signed by the merchants, which positions him as a mediator – their representative who was also a Venetian official.⁵³⁶ Based on his opinion, the *Cinque Savi* agreed in full, stating that there is a lack of space because the smaller section was used as a lazaretto. The bigger one was used for customs duties and goods control, the accommodation of people and goods after quarantine and on their return from Venice. They concluded that both places should be used for quarantine. A new *fondaco* (literally called *magazzini*) was to be made by extending the new *dogana* towards the city wall. Situated on the Riva (called *Stradone*), the new building would be 23 Venetian paces long and five wide (40 x 8.7m). A project and a wooden model were commissioned by the *Cinque Savi* in Venice and confirmed on the *Collegio* for the expense

⁵³⁴ Grga Novak, *Povijest Splita*, vol. 2 (Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1957), 131.

⁵³⁵ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, June 1, 1607.

⁵³⁶ “[...] dico però che stimerei ottimo rimedio, poiche è piaciuto a sua divina M[ae]tà liberar affato la città di Spalato della peste, rimediar agl'incomodi, che patiscono essi mercanti per strettezza di Lazaretti, quelli ingrandire, finire il Lazaretto vecchio, accomodar il pozzo, dar ordine che le contumacie vengano fatte nelli Lazaretti a Spalato, sicome si è fatto per il passato, far finir il molo, far cavar il porto, non essendo possibile che li Mercanti turchi gionti a Spalato da paesi lontanissimi non trovando quelle commodità di acqua, di alloggiamenti, che è solito trovarsi per tutte le parti del Mondo possino continuar essa Scala [...]” ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 178, Feb. 8, 1608 m.v.

of 4000 ducats.⁵³⁷ The day after, the Senate decreed that the new *provveditore generale* Marc' Antonio Venier needed to start the construction as soon as possible, according to directions and designs sent to him by the *Cinque Savi* made in consultation with the count of Split and local experts. However, modifications of the project were still possible, and Venier was to write an opinion on the expansion. The new expansion would still be made, but the question was how to expand the quarantine section. According to his statement, a wooden model of the entire complex would be commissioned by the *Cinque Savi* and sent back to the count, who would direct the works.⁵³⁸ Negotiations were done nine months later, and the *Cinque Savi* decided that the new *fondaco* on the Riva should be, like other similar spaces in Split, separated between Muslims, Jews, and Christians housed there on their return from Venice.⁵³⁹ The new *dogana* was to be divided with a wall in the middle. Its western part was to accommodate merchants on their way to Venice after quarantine. All openings towards the courtyard were to be closed and new ones made towards the sea.⁵⁴⁰ Soon the Senate confirmed the project and sent the means and directions to the *provveditore generale*, but also to Ottavio dall'Oglio for inspection.⁵⁴¹ Dall'Oglio was surely notified so he would convince the traders to return. However, problems arose soon after the groundbreaking. The *provveditore* Venier laid the foundations but had insolvable problems supplying the buildings with fresh water. Since both older buildings were built on reclaimed land, the cisterns produced brackish and otherwise dirty water. They tried laying pipes from the nearby town fountain, but this solution failed.⁵⁴² Water supply presented a

⁵³⁷ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 178, Feb. 18, 1608 m.v. Half a year earlier the *Cinque Savi* discussed expanding the lazaretto towards the east by filling up the shallows but decided it was overly costly. They also discussed changing the function between the two courtyards, but this would bring the lazaretto closer to the port and the city so it was deemed inconvenient. It was only decided that new rooms would be added in the lazaretto and a new house for the *emin* built somewhere on outside the *scala* and the *dogana*, because he complained earlier. ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 178, June 4, 1608.

⁵³⁸ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 272, Feb. 19, 1608 m.v., copy in ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162.

⁵³⁹ It is not known if the Muslims were separated further among themselves. In any case, there was sufficient space, and the Bosnians made up a significant majority.

⁵⁴⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 143, f. 163r, Nov. 28, 1609.

⁵⁴¹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. serie, b. 162, Dec. 7, 1609 in Pregadi.

⁵⁴² ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 272, fz. 424, Mar. 10, 1610. The *provveditore* Marc' Antonio Venier testifies that two well-diggers (*pozzari*) were present in Split and were trying to find a solution. The count and *provveditore alla sanità* also encouraged this solution knowing well that the water was not potable because *per beverar li cavalli [...], lavar merce de Turchi et se medesimi come è suo costume [...]*. *Commissiones et relations venetae: tomus VI*, ed. Grga Novak, 167.

constant problem, and the *Turks* complained on several occasions.⁵⁴³ While dall'Oglio only pointed out this problem as one of many: together with the port, the long waiting, and taxes, for the *Cinque Savi* it was a central problem because it was *a very great need* of the merchants. They were willing to suffer expense time after time to provide water “adequate for their services: not only for drinking but for the use of their baths” (appendix 10).⁵⁴⁴ Although the *fondaco-dogana* was a semi-segregated space locked only at night, the lack of an internal water supply would make segregation difficult if not pointless. The relatively larger Muslim consumption of water would mean merchants and servants would constantly go in and out, complicating movement control and providing a venue for intermingling at the public fountain, always a focal point of social life. This would negate the nature of a segregated space. All segregated (prison, lazaretto, leper colony, mental asylums) and semi-segregated spaces (hospital, ghetto, *fondaco*, monastery) aim to internally provide all relevant services to limit external exposure – the need to go outside. Those who segregate in all instances claim that segregation is not just for the good of those outside but those who are segregated. Therefore if legitimate segregation was to be maintained, those inside needed to be provided for. In the case of Ottoman Muslims who stayed at these places on a short-term basis, everything needed to be arranged by the *Cinque Savi* as the patron.⁵⁴⁵ The *Savi* established a connection between the provisions established in Split and the Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi*, saying that they provided everything to the Muslim merchants so that more would come and benefit the economy. For their security and protection (and the honour of God), the Senate decreed in 1588 (but did not implement in full) the establishment of a *fondaco* for all Muslims (*Monsulmani*) in Split – a place of their own

⁵⁴³ Besides the dall'Oglio case, there is: ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 142, f. 102r. The quoted petitions are all from the documentation of the Senate. The letters and petitions (*memoriali*) to the *Cinque Savi* are not preserved, only the responses referenced below.

⁵⁴⁴ ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 142, ff. 78r–79r, July 11, 1608. Also ff. 100v–104v, Jan 4, 1608 m.v. The *Savi* made a distinction in water use between Muslims and others, saying that water is needed by everyone, but an absolute necessity for the *Turks* (f. 102r).

⁵⁴⁵ Unlike the ghetto which was privately owned and where the Jews lived permanently with a limited degree of self-management.

that would be cloistered to avoid inconveniences of cohabitation while providing for their needs (appendix 11).⁵⁴⁶

After the local populace complained of the dangers that lurk from the lazaretto,⁵⁴⁷ the Senate sent to Split a *provveditore straordinario di sanità* Andrea Renier tasked with controlling and regulating the sanitary measures, which he would do in the “33 Rules for the Lazaretto of Split” (appendix 12).⁵⁴⁸

⁵⁴⁶ “[...] un luoco proprio, e clausurato nel qual possa, et debba stanciare li Monsulmani con le sue mercantie.” ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 142, ff. 100v–104v (104r), Jan. 4, 1608 m.v.

⁵⁴⁷ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Jan. 20, 1609 m.v.

⁵⁴⁸ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, July 10, 1610 in Pregadi. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Aug. 1, 1610.

4.3.4. Construction of a lazaretto

During the plague of 1607, it became apparent that the present solution was lacking. The building expansion and modification only remedied the situation to a degree. In case of an epidemic in the city or the lazaretto, the other was supposed to be spared. In 1607, although the plague started in the city, the cramped lazaretto had an even larger mortality rate. Finally convinced by the *Cinque Savi*, the Senate decided in 1614 to build a new courtyard section to the east “not only for better quarantine but also for the satisfaction of the merchants.”⁵⁴⁹ The succeeding *provveditore generale* and the *provveditore alla sanità* in Dalmatia Marin Mudazzo (count of Split 1611–1613) were to determine the exact building plot that had to be on the shore, close to the old lazaretto but not necessarily in sequence. Despite higher costs, they again decided to expand the building in direct sequence by filling in the foundations in the shallows.⁵⁵⁰ As was customary, the *provveditore generale* needed to start construction and ensure that it could continue uninterrupted under the municipal count. The Venetian engineer Costantino Cappi was ordered to transfer to Split, where he was to stay until the completion of the construction.⁵⁵¹ He made a project in August 1614, but his cost estimate was not accepted, so a Venetian noble was sent to justify the expenses.⁵⁵² It seems it was finally accepted (or minimally corrected) because construction started in the same month and the ceilings in the narrow prior’s courtyard were already being finished by October (fig. 4.18; 4).⁵⁵³ The construction intensified from April 1615, under the *proto* engineer Scipione Fredi di Marrano,⁵⁵⁴ and a certain regional *head engineer*

⁵⁴⁹ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, May 1, 1614 in Pregadi. They particularly advised that the new building had to have spacious warehouses to deposit large quantities of wool.

⁵⁵⁰ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, Aug. 9, 1614 in Pregadi.

⁵⁵¹ Costantino Cappi is an unknown engineer. His career ended in 1623 in Muggia (Northern Istria), where he got involved in a series of fights and scandals while reconstructing the town walls. Matteo Chiarot, “L’idra dalle temerarie teste: Venezia e il contrabbando del sale istriano fra Cinque e Seicento” (Master’s thesis, Università Ca’ Foscari, Venice, 2014/2015), unpaginated. Not being of interest for his research, Chiarot writes the engineer’s surname as Copi, Capi, and Coppi.

⁵⁵² ASVe, V Savi, 2. S., b. 162, Aug. 12, 1614 in Pregadi.

⁵⁵³ HR-DAZD-16, *Općina Split (Civitas et districtus Spalati)*, kut. 317, sv. 347, f. 17r.

⁵⁵⁴ HR-DAZD-16, kut. 317, sv. 347, Oct. 26, 1615. Fredi started his career in 1593 on the fortress of Palmanova where he was the supervising engineer on the construction of one of the bastions. In Split, he is

Camilli (?), who inspected the site and made minor corrections to the project.⁵⁵⁵ Fredi gathered a team of more than a hundred local masons, woodworkers, other craftsmen, workers, and suppliers from the entire region.⁵⁵⁶ On 14 March 1616, the construction was arriving at its finish, so engineer Cappi was ordered to make a model of the finished project.⁵⁵⁷ The construction of the new section in a bit more than a year (by mid-1616) was confirmed by the new count Marino Garzoni (1616–1619), who found it finished when he took office.⁵⁵⁸ However, the water supply again presented a problem, so the regional public engineer Cesare Malacreda (b. 1561) was sent from Zadar to remedy the problem, which was done according to his plans 1621–1622.⁵⁵⁹ The same issue (probably in another courtyard) arose again in 1622, and Scipione Fredi came from Zadar.⁵⁶⁰ From 1623, engineer Agostino Alberti was active in Dalmatia, where he was “recognising the best location for the new *lazzaretti* of Spalato”.⁵⁶¹ This can be connected to an internal architectural competition carried out by the *provveditore generale* on behalf of the *Cinque Savi* for a project that would double the lazaretto size (appendix 16).⁵⁶² The *Savi* received three projects. Nicola Candido (*Nikola Kandid*)⁵⁶³ and Scipione Fredi proposed to move

first mentioned in 1613 as the *proto* of the port excavation. In 1622 he was employed in the excavation of the port of Zadar. Antonio Manno, “Il governo del cantiere: Istituzioni, patrizi, soldati, tecnici e operai durante la costruzione di Palmanova,” *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed arti: Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti*, vol. 151, no. 4 (1992): 1083–1084. Peričić, “Prinosi povijesti Zadra,” 70.

⁵⁵⁵ Grga Novak, *Povijest Splita*, vol. 2 (Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1961), 434. This information only appears in this second edition of Novak’s book.

⁵⁵⁶ The *Libbro della fabbrica* is kept under: HR-DAZD-16, kut. 317, sv. 347.

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, f. 41r.

⁵⁵⁸ *Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus VI*, ed. Grga Novak, 285–289. Final relation of the count of Split Garzoni read on the *Collegio*, Dec. 19, 1619.

⁵⁵⁹ HR-DAZD-16, kut. 317, out of fascicle, 1620, f. 45r. Cf. Perojević, “Izgradnja lazareta,” 129. Cesare Malacreda was an engineer put in charge of surveying the fortresses in 1618. He was the son of the more famous architect Francesco Malacreda from Verona. Giuseppe Cadorin, *Pareri di XV architetti e notizie storiche intorno al palazzo ducale di Venezia* (Venice: Pietro Milesi, 1858), 66–69.

⁵⁶⁰ HR-DAZD-16, kut. 317, sv. 344, f. 55r; kut. 320/a, sv. 358, f. 55r, 1622. Two putealia (wellheads) were made, suggesting that two wells were worked on. Fredi also did a minor reconstruction of the piers and opened a portal of the *dogana* to one of the piers.

⁵⁶¹ Darka Bilić, “I protagonisti dell’edilizia militare in Dalmazia nei secoli XVII e XVIII,” in *L’architettura militare di Venezia in Terraferma e in Adriatico fra XVI e XVII secolo*, ed. Francesco Paolo Fiore (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2014). Conference proceedings (Palmanova, Nov. 8–10, 2013), 360.

⁵⁶² ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 146, ff. 97r–98r, Mar. 26, 1624. On June 28, 1624 (ff. 123v–125r), Ottavio dall’Oglio was already pressuring the *Savi* to hurry up with the construction.

⁵⁶³ Nicola Candido (Croatised as Kandid due to the family still existing), was an engineer from Hvar (*Lesina*). The Senate employed him in 1625 to survey the fortifications and make an expansion project. Cf. Arsen Duplančić, *Splitske zidine*, 9.

away from the main corpus to avoid expensive land reclamation: one to the northeast on the terrain of the nearby Dominican monastery; the other further to the east connecting the new section to the old one with two bridges. Notwithstanding elevated costs, Alberti's proposal of building in the direct sequence was accepted on the advice of Marcantonio Velutello – the prior of the *scala di Spalato* (1616–1629) and former Venetian dragoman in Dalmatia. While being the most practical, Alberti's was the only project to solve the water supply problem by chiselling a cistern out of solid rock.⁵⁶⁴ Construction of the new expansion in three courtyard sections lasted exactly from 1 March 1625, to 4 August 1631, according to the *Libro della fabbrica* kept in the State Archives in Zadar.⁵⁶⁵ Agostino Alberti was constantly present on the construction site, again directed under Scipione Fredi as *proto*.

⁵⁶⁴ Velutello was consulted in 1636 on management issues in the *Fondaco dei Turchi*: ASVe, V Savi, 1. s., b. 151, ff. 1r–3v, Oct. 6, 1636.

⁵⁶⁵ HR-DAZD-16, kut. 323, sv. 359, *Giornale del Libro doppio della fabbrica del Lazzaretto novissimo di Spalato*. Only a short outline will be presented in this thesis, for a monograph see Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*. All unfinished parts (such as the paving, towers, separation walls) and deficiencies were corrected in 1639. HR-DAZD-16, kut. 317, sv. 349, f. 113r, June 18, 1639.

4.3.5. Reconstruction of the complex

Nothing remains of the building today except its buried foundations, having been slowly repurposed and removed until World War II when it was damaged in an Allied bombing raid and subsequently completely demolished to remove any trace of Fascist Italy's prison housed there during the occupation (1941–1943).⁵⁶⁶ However, it was a building of prime importance for the *Serenissima*, so an abundance of visual and written sources allows a precise reconstruction. The earliest are city plans and views, which show it summarily but are useful to position the *scala* toward the port and the city (fig. 4.10–4.12). The first ground plan, rather an organisational sketch, was made by the engineer Giuseppe d'Andrés in 1714.⁵⁶⁷ Giovanni Battista Camozzini made the first reliable plan in 1728 as part of a reconstruction project he led (fig. 4.17).⁵⁶⁸ The plan was not accompanied by a legend but instead described in a separate letter, concentrated on those parts Camozzini worked on.⁵⁶⁹ It can be compared with a sketch made three years later during a plague epidemic that precisely numbers the spaces and their functions in each courtyard and floor.⁵⁷⁰ This can be further confirmed with the first elaborate ground plan, made by the provincial engineer Giovanni Cristoforo Moser de Filseck in 1778, which unfortunately does not show the westernmost section – taken over by the *provveditore generale* for his court.⁵⁷¹ If any doubt was left on the elevation, it was partially presented by Giovanni Battista Giovannizio in 1787.⁵⁷² Ground and first floor plans, a roof plan, and a cross-section were made in 1814 by the engineer Wolter Raughmann as part of a survey of the sanitary facilities in the Kingdom

⁵⁶⁶ Cvito Fisković, "Splitski lazaret," in *Četiri priloga historiji grada Splita XVII i XVIII stoljeća* (Split: Muzej grada Splita, 1953), 13–15. The building was repurposed during the Austrian administration, based on the preparatory plan of the local architect Vicko Andrić in 1817, and the subsequent project by Frane Zavoreo in 1820. On the prison and its destruction see Duško Kečkemet, *Kulturna i umjetnička baština u Dalmaciji, izabrani radovi*, vol. 1 (Split: Marjan tisak, 2004), 361–362.

⁵⁶⁷ Duško Kečkemet, "Prilog opisu i povijesti splitskog lazareta," *Pomorski zbornik* 13 (1975): 379.

⁵⁶⁸ Joško Kovačić, "Mjernik i graditelj Giovanni Battista Camozzini," *Kulturna baština* 24–25 (1994): 93.

⁵⁶⁹ Muzej hvarske baštine, *Fond Bučić*, kut. 1 (18. st.), *Spisi mletačkog inženjera G. B. Camozzinija*, 43, unpaginated, May 29 – August 31, 1728.

⁵⁷⁰ Duško Kečkemet, "Zaštita od epidemija u Splitu," unattributed, 1731. ASVe, *Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità*, b. 417, unpaginated.

⁵⁷¹ Duško Kečkemet, "Prilog opisu i povijesti splitskog lazareta," note 35; Arsen Duplančić, "Neobjavljeni nacrti," 165; Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 83.

⁵⁷² Arsen Duplančić, "Prilog poznavanju luke i pomorstva Splita," 69.

of Dalmatia for the Second Austrian administration (1813–1918).⁵⁷³ The latest are the city views and romantic depictions of the *scala* proper, photographed or drawn, which may be used to conclude the internal and external *look* of the building and the presumptive message conveyed by its architectural language (fig. 4.15, 4.19, 4.21).

These visual sources should be used in tandem with two systematic surveys of the *scala*. The first is a description, courtyard by courtyard, floor by floor, made by the prior Andrea Marcobruni (1719–1723; 1731–1735) in 1719 (appendix 19).⁵⁷⁴ Marcobruni does not mention the westernmost section because it was not part of the lazaretto or the customs building, used by that time for government offices, warehouses and less and less as a *fondaco*. It was, thankfully, described sufficiently in the year of its completion by count Leonardo Bollani. Finally, the inventory comprised in 1751 by the prior Bernado Bazzioli (1751–1755) and the city treasurer Carlo Antonio Passetti will show the furnishing.⁵⁷⁵

The *scala di Spalato* comprised eight sections from west to east built in four construction phases (fig. 4.18). The westernmost, largest courtyard section took the name *Generalato* because it housed the *provveditore generale*, his court, offices, barracks, and military depots at least partially from 1641 when it shows under that name (fig. 4.18, n. 2).⁵⁷⁶ Originally called *dogana nuova*, it had 24 smaller warehouses around the courtyard and the same number of rooms above, with the northern wing holding a large vaulted stable and one continuous space above. A square tower stood on the southwest corner. Originally, testified by Bollani and other sources, it was intended as a *fondaco*, for customs offices, warehouses, and apartments for the *emin* and the prior.⁵⁷⁷ As an annexe to the north, a three-floor building was made after the plague of 1607 to serve as the *fondaco* for those

⁵⁷³ The designs are accompanied by a very detailed legend in German. It shows that most of the complex was repurposed. First published: Arsen Duplančić, “Neobjavljeni nacrti”; attributed: Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*.

⁵⁷⁴ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 452, June 22, 1719.

⁵⁷⁵ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 391, Nov. 18, 1751.

⁵⁷⁶ However, it did not occupy the entire courtyard at least before 1728 when Camozzini locates the government offices in the northwest section and the Riva extension. As a *terminus post quem non*, Moser de Filseck in 1778 does not consider it part of the complex anymore.

⁵⁷⁷ “[...] sino al 1704 i Priori alloggiavano nel primo Recinto, molto ampio e ricco di stanze, dove si alloggiavano anche Turchi che uscivano dalle Contumacie o ritornavano da Venezia. Gli ultimi due Priori, non si sa perché furono levati di lì.” ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 452, June 22, 1719.

returning from Venice (n. 3). It had four warehouses on the ground floor – each sectioned in two, and four large apartments above with probably the same number in the attic.

The oldest courtyard section (second from the west; n. 1) was used as the Ottoman and Venetian customs office (before 1600 and again after 1631), living quarters for the Ottoman *emin*, *fondaco* for merchants and their merchandise after quarantine, and as a place where the *vivandier* lived – the person who supplied those in quarantine. It was the place where Rodriga started building. Large arcaded warehouses surrounded the courtyard. The *emin*, his living quarters and offices, the Ottoman postal service, and warehouses for their state affairs comprised the entire north wing. The southern side had a single large space used as the Venetian customs office and no floor above. Single large warehouses were on the east and west wings, which got their upper floor in 1606, 1608, and during the 18th century. On the southeast, there was a polygonal tower, three levels high.

A corridor, with the chief guard's apartment above, led to the priory – a narrow courtyard with the Venetian state warehouse on the ground floor and the apartment and office of the prior above on the south side. Another warehouse with the church of Saint Rocco above was on the northern side (n. 4). This section was divided with a high wall from the next one – the first quarantine courtyard (n. 5; also called *San Domenico* because of the nearby monastery). It was sectioned in two with a corridor that allowed the prior undisturbed access to the fifth, entry courtyard (n. 6). Each of the courtyard sections had five spacious warehouses (each 45 m² ca.) and a stable, with six same-sized rooms above that could be reached through a porch. The warehouses were built to decontaminate wool, so each was open with a large door and a pair of windows. On the east, it had two canopies (*tezze*), while on the west two locutories (*parlatoi*) allowed for conversation and business with the outside world through a grille without direct contact. The fifth section (n. 6) was called *dogana sporca* – the dirty customs. It was also called the courtyard of the caravans because caravans entered the lazaretto there. It could hold 300 horses, and a large vaulted and arcaded stable comprised the entire south wing, above which there were seven rooms. On the other side, there were six warehouses (24 m²) with the same disposition of rooms above. This court section was isolated from the others because most merchants would spend a night there and then return, leaving a man or two to go through quarantine with the

merchandise and finish business in Split and Venice. Therefore, it had its locutory towards the preceding section. The sixth section (n. 7) was called *cavana* (Venetian for boat shelter or covered embarkation point). Indeed, its southern side contained a covered pool of seawater used to submerge and decontaminate wax. The courtyard had a small freshwater pond for desalinating the wax and a grid for drying it. A warehouse with two rooms above was on the north wing. The seventh and last section (n. 8) was longitudinally divided with a wall, so the two courtyards were called *San Pietro da Terra* and *San Pietro da Mar*, according to the nearby church. During the War of Crete, the government decided to encircle Split in a modern system of bastion forts. Therefore, the northeasternmost part of the *scala* was demolished shortly before 1666 to respect the circular form of the star-fort and was rebuilt before 1668. In its original form, each section of the last courtyard had five warehouses (46 m² ca. each). The rooms were uniform and accessible via a porch. Each courtyard had a canopy (also called *tezza*) to the east and a well.

Marcobruni separately dealt with the water supply. There were four wells. The one in the *Generalato* was supplied with rainwater and was usable. The one in the customs courtyard drew water from an underground source and was salty and unusable. *San Pietro da Terra* and *San Pietro da Mar* each had a well, but only the former provided potable water.

The inventory of 1751 provides a glimpse into the interior fitting. It is concerned chiefly with locks, doors, and windows, ensuring that each space could be locked and ventilated. It mentions that most rooms were paved with bricks (*pietra cotta*) and had a fireplace. Furthermore, it locates the toilets (*luogo comun*) under the stairs in each courtyard.⁵⁷⁸

⁵⁷⁸ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 391, Nov. 18, 1751.



Fig. 4. 19 Giuseppe Juster, *View of Split from the West*, 1708 (Museo Correr, Cl. XLIVb, n. 0795)



Fig. 4. 20 *Detail*

4.3.6. The typology of a *fondaco*

Our classification of buildings stems from their everyday use. We expect to find a certain form in a hospital, a monastery, a department store, or a warehouse. This easy classification closely connected with function is a product of centuries of evolution. The codification of architectural form owes a great deal to architectural theory and education formalised in the Early Modern Era. Customs houses, *fondachi*, lazarettos, state warehouses, and *bazzane* are all architecture of control and isolation that as a wider category also encompasses prisons, mental asylums, monasteries, forts, arsenals, etc. Although the degree of their isolation and the applied architectural solutions broadly vary, they share their large size and internal orientation. In all cases, their form signifies division from the outside world, closure, security, and inaccessibility.

On the *scala di Spalato* two solutions can be found: the two western centrally oriented courtyard complexes and the three eastern longitudinal ones. The central ones have building wings on all sides while sharing a sea façade flanked with two corner towers, while the longitudinal courts have wings on two opposite north-south sides, with corner towers only on the furthestmost eastern façade. The main dividing point was the plague of 1607, which showed that the two-courtyard solution was deficient, and after minor modifications, new longitudinal sections were built after 1614. In the preserved correspondence between the *Cinque Savi*, the Senate, the *provveditore generale* and the count of Split, it seems that before 1607 the two courtyard sections were considered to be the complete project, realised as it was conceived. The financial plan was such that the smaller section was completed first to finance the rest of the construction, which was Rodriga's intention from the start.⁵⁷⁹ Rodriga asked for the right to construct a lazaretto, which would however be used as a customs office until further funds were procured. Even if it were not stated explicitly, it is doubtful that his initial investment of 374 ducats would

⁵⁷⁹ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 69, Jan. 13, 1576 m.v.; Collegio, Relazioni, b. 72, 1580 *Relazione di Alvise Loredan conte e capitano di Spalato*. For a partial Croatian translation see Morpurgo, "Daniel Rodriguez," 204–205.

allow for anything more than a building of modest proportions.⁵⁸⁰ The Venetian administrators kept this financial scheme when in 1588 construction started in earnest. The building is interchangeably called lazaretto and *dogana* in the first documents. However, when Bartolomeo Galese arrived in 1593 with the design of the lazaretto and the *dogana*, that “which is built and is yet to be built”, the *dogana* is clearly the *dogana nuova* mentioned by count Lunardo Bolani in 1600, as opposed to the old lazaretto. It is also logical that the new section was larger and built closer to the port and the city. It had to house people and goods going to and returning from Venice, state warehouses and food for the lazaretto, the prior and his offices, the Ottoman *emin* and the customs offices. It had to be near the port to facilitate goods manipulation while it could be closer to the city as there was no immediate epidemiological danger. While the basic outline of the ground floor plan clearly stems from the same model and was most probably drafted together in 1588 (less probably by Rodriga in 1581),⁵⁸¹ the disposition of spaces and the elevation were not the same. The eastern courtyard section had wing-long warehouses open to the courtyard through a continuous arcade and originally had no exterior windows and upper floors,⁵⁸² which were only partially added in 1606, 1608, and through the 18th century (fig. 4.22).⁵⁸³ This solution, although not ideal due to the small surface area of the courtyard, would allow for disinfection via ventilation as the most important disinfectant of the time. The next section, in contrast, had much smaller, segmented, uniform, and closed warehouses with rooms above on all sides. It had small high-positioned exterior windows and a portal directly to the city. There was no porch, and the rooms were interconnected, making internal isolation of sick individuals impossible. Therefore, it could not have been imagined as a lazaretto but was much more reminiscent of the Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi*. All in

⁵⁸⁰ ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 87, Nov. 7, 1582.

⁵⁸¹ Except the financial scheme and the same architectural model, this is indicated by the lack of distinct construction phases and the joint façade flanked by two towers.

⁵⁸² A similar open warehouse is the *tezon grande* (large warehouse), built in 1561 and still standing on the island of the *Lazzaretto Nuovo*. Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals*, 68–69.

⁵⁸³ On the request of the count of Split and the *Cinque Savi*, the Senate allocated the construction funds for four new rooms on 9 August 1608. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162. Certain new rooms are mentioned in 4 June 1608. ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar, fz. 178. The partial upper floor was finished by 1610, when Andrea Renier, the count of Split and the *provveditore alla sanità*, said that he built some upper floor rooms. *Comissiones et relations Venetae: tomus VI*, ed. Grga Novak, *Relatione del nobil huomo signor Andrea Rhenier, proveditor alla sanità ritornato da Spalato*, Sept. 24, 1610, p. 164. The aerial photograph (fig. 4.22) from 1926 shows that most of the northern and southern wings never got their first floor.

all, both courtyard sections stem from the same typological tradition – that of the North Italian lazaretto, with only the new *dogana* being somewhat modified. A series of analogies confirm this. In 1588 the office of the *Cinque Savi* commissioned two further projects: the almost identical lazarettos on the Ionian islands of Corfù (fig. 4.23) and Zante, whose construction ran parallel to that of Split. In both cases, the single square perimeter has quarantine wings comprising the two opposite sides, while the church and the administrative building comprise a third of the width of the other axis. High walls and two diagonally placed towers give it a fort-like appearance. This character of a *fortified cloister*, while part of the same tradition, points out that the lazarettos on the Ionian Islands and that of Split share a common ancestor. All Italian lazarettos evolved in the 15th century from monastic and military architecture, in which most improvised plague hospitals were housed. Forts, barracks and monasteries had objective architectural qualities that made them ideal for this task. They were on the urban outskirts, sufficiently isolated by their location, high walls, and a limited number of external openings, which allowed for control of movement. They were large enough, with many standardised shared and private spaces. Cloisters and courtyards allowed for internal orientation of the building, illumination and ventilation and increased capacity if needed. Furthermore, they provided separate infrastructure from the city, such as water supply and sewage. A church or a chapel was always present to satisfy spiritual needs and provide the possibility of divine intercession to stop the plague. Contemporaries often described lazarettos (in the meaning of plague hospitals) as pious sanctuaries, monastic gardens, but also castles.⁵⁸⁴ *Lazzaretto Vecchio* (1423) and *Nuovo* (1468) took over a monastery, as did the lazaretto di San Bartolomeo of Brescia (c. 1438, rebuilt 1479–1480).⁵⁸⁵ The building of the lazarettos of Salò near Brescia (1484–1551), Milano (1488–1513), and Bergamo (1504–1583) further codified this

⁵⁸⁴ Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals*, 46; 54–61; 71. Hospitals, which exist for a significantly longer period than the lazaretto, directly took the form of the monastic cloister. The designation of the lazaretto as a castle is reminiscent in the descriptive term *baluardo di sanità* (bulwark; bastion of health) – often found when speaking about these structures. The term *recinto* used for lazaretto courtyards is a loan word from military terminology. Cf. Vincenzo Martines, “La trasformazione strategica dei lazaretti: da baluardi di sanità a fortificazioni militari,” in *Rotte mediterranee e baluardi di sanità*, ed. Nelli Elena Vanzan Marchini, (Milan: Skira, 2004). Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 2004).

⁵⁸⁵ Similar examples can be found in Naples, Messina, Dubrovnik, and just about anywhere. Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals*, 21; 61–66.

monastic ambient. All of these examples are large enclosed courtyards (*recinto*) surrounded by a porch, having a church, and separate basic infrastructure.

As the *scala di Spalato* was a significant government investment directed from Venice, its archetype should be searched for in that cultural environment and architectural tradition. The two Venetian lazarettos could hardly have been used as a convincing model, lacking a clear architectural idea, having been modified, demolished, rebuilt, and repurposed numerous times. More so, their island location guaranteed isolation, while the fort-like elements in Split, Corfù, and Zante demonstrate a different architectural concept. Jane Stevens already traced the ideal origin of the towers and walls of the Corfù lazaretto to Verona as an archetype where fort characteristics were first codified and became prevalent in all lazarettos of the Venetian *Stato da Mar*.⁵⁸⁶ The *Lazzaretto di San Pancrazio* of Verona (1549–1551; 1591–1628; fig. 4.25–4.28) was the first monumental lazaretto that added fortification elements to the basic cloister form. Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574) attributed it to Michele Sanmicheli (1484–1559).⁵⁸⁷ The complex was constructed in two main phases. After the first phase, only a smaller tract towards the Adrige was realised, consisting of a three-sided portico with uniform rooms (fig. 4.27). The courtyard was divided in two with a high wall, while a second wall closed the fourth side. The outer perimeter consisted of high walls with small high-positioned windows in each room. Two towers flanked the façade while crenulation could be found throughout the roof (fig. 4.24, 4.25). A moat surrounded the building. However, neither of these elements had any

⁵⁸⁶ Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals*, note 140. Stevens does not propose Verona as a model that was followed, just illustrative of an evolved Venetian tradition of the *fortified cloister*. For the Venetian lazarettos in Greece see Katerina Konstantinidou, *Lazzaretti veneziani in Grecia* (Padua: Elzeviro, 2015).

⁵⁸⁷ Giorgio Vasari, *Lives of the painters, sculptors and architects*, vol. 2 (London: Everyman's Library, 1996), 406. Lionello Puppi is a modern proponent of this attribution, re-established in the monograph *Michele Sanmicheli: architetto di Verona* (Padua: Marsilio, 1971), 102–106. Paul Davies, David Hemsoll, *Michele Sanmicheli*, (Milan: Electa, 2004), 51; 114–125, bring forth a series of personal, political, and chronological circumstances to prove this attribution, discussing that Sanmicheli designed the lazaretto in 1540–1541 on the asking of the Verona city council. He would have been the most obvious choice, because he was in Verona at the time and, conveniently, his regular patrons Giovanni Francesco Bevilacqua and Raimondo della Torre made up 2/3 of the board in charge of the project. However, they marginalise the long and disrupted construction phases, and concentrate their comparative analysis on the chapel, which was constructed in the 17th century (probably on Sanmicheli's plans, but confirmation is still lacking). For two dedicated analyses of the lazaretto itself see: Lia Camerlengo "Il lazaretto a San Pancrazio e l'ospedale della Misericordia in Bra: le forme dell'architettura," in *L'ospedale e la città: cinquecento anni d'arte a Verona*, ed. Alessandro Pastore et al. (Verona: Cierre Edizioni, 1996); Stevens Crawshaw, *Plague Hospitals*, 73–75.

defensive or guard functions. Towers were used as apartments for the well-off,⁵⁸⁸ while the crenulation hid the chimneys. The moat (supplied by the Adige) was narrow and shallow, so it was easily traversable. It was used as a sewage channel for the kitchen sinks and toilets found in each room. Even if it would have been more practical, it was never covered.⁵⁸⁹ This two-part building was the solution that could be seen before 1591 when the second phase significantly expanded the perimeter, adding two further towers, a central chapel, and dividing the courtyard into four sections.

A further example can be found in Genoa, where a lazaretto in the suburbs of *Foce* was built from 1522 to 1532 (fig. 4.29). A two-floor building with a portico on the ground floor surrounded the two courtyards on two sides, while on the fourth, the double wall with two corner towers made the sea façade.⁵⁹⁰

Both Genoa and Verona testify to a subgenre that found its way into an architectural treatise. The lazaretto as an architectural type cannot be found in contemporary Italian architectural theory. Still, the Italian-educated German engineer, architect, and theorist Joseph Furttenbach (1591–1667) in his treatise *Architectura civilis* (1628) proposed three lazaretto plans. On one, he adds towers to a basic cloister form; on another (proposed for the city of Ulm; fig. 4.30) he adds four bastions. However, these are redundant because a low bastion without ramparts and on a rectangular building has no practical use, especially not on the secure Danube.⁵⁹¹ This solution could not stem from the German tradition, where a *Pesthaus* is much more open and welcoming than the Mediterranean *lazzaretto*, being

⁵⁸⁸ The guards and other administrators rarely entered, staying in the service buildings in the vicinity. On the drawings of the lazaretto of Verona made by Adriano Cristofali in 1754 it is observed that they were reconstructed and expanded to be more comfortable (fig. 4.27, note H).

⁵⁸⁹ The older lazaretto of Milan had a moat, but it was wide which allowed the rooms to have large outer windows. A moat and two towers are present two centuries later on the lazaretto of Herceg Novi (1732) which can be compared to the Ionian lazarettos. The moat had the same function, while the towers were only an aesthetic choice. They are not taller than the rest of the building, nor do they have windows, so could not have been used for anything other than storing (fig. 4.24).

⁵⁹⁰ Anna Dagnino, “Lazzaretto di Genova,” in *Rotte mediterranee*, Elena Vanzan Marchini; Giovanni Assereto, »Per La Comune Salvezza dal Morbo Contagioso« I controlli di sanità nella Repubblica di Genova (Novi Ligure: Città del silenzio, 2011), 68–69. The lazaretto was heavily remade in the 18th century.

⁵⁹¹ Dieter Jetter, “Zur Typologie des Pesthauses,” *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 47, no. 3 (September 1963).

primarily a pious and charitable institution. Thus Furttenbach modernises the Italian concept, signifying with a bastion the *baluardo di sanità*.

When there is no clear defensive function, these fortification elements only serve to monumentalise the building.⁵⁹² As Quim Bonastra stated in one of the rare works on lazaretto typology, all the lazarettos of the Venetian *Stato da Mar* share the form of a fortified cloister with all its symbolic meaning.⁵⁹³ By using the symbolic language of fortification, these lazarettos conveyed the message of inaccessibility, safety, strength, and seriousness. It signified that these buildings were separated from the outer world, that those outside were safe from epidemics and those inside from theft. While the second courtyard in Split was not built as a lazaretto, the same form was convenient because a *fondaco-dogana* needs to convey the same message. Furthermore, it is convenient. Being large-scale architecture of isolation, a modified lazaretto form could provide enough space for lodging, movement control, residential and commercial segregation, while providing security and separate infrastructure to those inside. The only difference is disinfection via ventilation, so a portico was not necessary, warehouses could be smaller, rooms interconnected, and windows opened on the exterior. When the new longitudinal sections to the east were built from 1614 to 1631, they were again part of the same tradition but more resembling the evolution shown on the Ionian Islands and in Dubrovnik (Ploče). While still embodying the old fortification characteristics, they had wings only on two sides, porches and open warehouses more convenient for air circulation.

By modifying the lazaretto as the form of total isolation, the *dogana-fondaco* of the *scala di Spalato* (more than the *Fondaco dei Turchi*) illustrates the forms of residential and commercial segregation the Venetian government deemed necessary for the Muslims (and foreign Jews in this case). Its location was also convenient for the same goal. It was outside the city but at the centre of commercial and logistic activity. Furthermore, it was just next to the lazaretto proper, which was just outside the old port gate, ensuring minimal unnecessary movement. In the 18th century, the *provveditore generale* took over the

⁵⁹² This is an age-old visual tactic that can be clearly observed on the Diocletian's palace in Split on which the towers were accessible from the outside.

⁵⁹³ Quim Bonastra, "Recintos sanitarios y espacios de control. Un estudio morfológico de la arquitectura cuarentenaria," *Dynamis* 30 (2010): 23–25.

westernmost section. While merchants could still sojourn in the oldest section – which became the customs office, the regulation was somewhat relaxed, and a regulated hostelry was established in the house of Frane Marković somewhere in the city.⁵⁹⁴ In Split, as in Venice, segregation went hand in hand with separate infrastructure, central of which is water and sewage deemed by the *Cinque Savi* as *differentia specifica* of Muslim housing culture. This opinion, while the Venetian part might have overemphasised it, would be confirmed in correspondences with the merchants themselves. Although sufficient wells were included in the original project, they were imperfect, so the merchants complained, again positioning water supply as a central architectural problem of these structures.



Fig. 4. 21 Giuseppe Santini, *View of Split* – detail, 1666. (Muzej grada Splita, *Zbirka crteža*, inv. br. 6316_6)

⁵⁹⁴ ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 163, f. 22r, 1719. Not unlike Francesco Lettino and Ottavio dall'Oglio, Frane Marković was deemed sufficiently loyal while being a mediator that understood the Muslims' customs and language. He was a trade agent and consul for the Christian and Muslim Bosnians who acted together in these matters while the Jews had their own representation. Ethnicity aside, in all cases the consul was a Slavic-speaking resident of Split. This tradition can unofficially be traced to Ottavio dall'Oglio who started his career as the Bosnian agent of the Split noble Alviž Papalić (*Alvise Papali*) and the Venetian trade consul in Bosnia. At the beginning of the 17th century he represented the Ottoman Muslim merchants on several occasions. The office was officially established in the second decade of the 17th century, when Marko Kavanjin (*Marco Cavagnini*) was elected consul. His correspondence in Croatian and Italian that spanned areas from Asia Minor to the Netherlands is preserved in the City Museum of Split. A survey was published by Ćiro Čičin Šain, "Pisma Marka Kavanjina". On the consuls see Traljić, "Trgovina Bosne," 344.




Fig. 4. 22 Putnički ured Split; studio Balkan-Mentor Beograd, *Split* - detail, 1926 (author's collection)



Fig. 4. 25 *Birds-eye view of the lazaretto in Verona, 1930 (Gatti, Negri, Ruffo, *L'utopia della rovina. Il lazaretto di Verona*, p. 26)*




Fig. 4. 26 Elements and plan of the lazaretto in Verona (Langenskiöld, Michele Sanmicheli: the architect of Verona, 1938, p. 95)




Fig. 4. 27 Ground plan of the lazaretto in Verona – detail, between 1551 and 1591 (Gatti, Negri, Ruffo, L'utopia della rovina. Il lazaretto di Verona, p. 34)




Fig. 4. 28 Adriano Cristofali, Lazaretto of Verona and its surroundings, 1754 (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 8, dis. 2a)




Fig. 4. 29 Alessandro Baratta, *Birds-eye view of the lazzaretto alle Foce*, detail from *La Famosissima e Nobilissima Città di Genova*, 1637 (gallica.bnf.fr / Bibliothèque nationale de France)




Fig. 4. 30 Joseph Furtenbach, *Lazzaretto oder Brechhaus*, 1639 (Jetter, "Zur Typologie des Pesthauses," p. 295)

4.4. *Bazzana, stangade, bazzaro*: cordon sanitaire and forms of increased segregation in the 18th century




Fig. 4. 31 Francesco Melchiori, *Map of the cordon sanitaire on the Ottoman-Venetian border in central Dalmatia, 1731* (Kusin, ed., *Dalmatinska zagora nepoznata zemlja*, p. 216)

The expansion of Venetian territories in Dalmatia in 1699 (*acquisto nuovo*) and 1718 (*acquisto nuovissimo*) pushed the border to the interior (present Croatian–Bosnian border) and it became less porous, thanks to both the Venetian measures and geographic barriers. Venice conquered the province from the Ottoman Empire, whose modes of foreigner hospitality and mercantile mobility with its infrastructure were still spread throughout the region. However, the *Serenissima* decided to ignore them completely. Instead, the former Venetian system of mercantile contact present in the old territories was revised and expanded with the institution of guardhouses, customs offices, border market fairs (*bazzari*), fenced markets (*stangate*), and the *bazzane*. In all cases, trade was conducted under surveillance, usually in fenced areas and/or through grilles without physical contact due to financial, social, and epidemiological reasons.⁵⁹⁵ The following short overview will

⁵⁹⁵ Traljić, “Trgovina Bosne,” 341; 345.

explore the various architectural solutions used for housing Ottoman traders in the Venetian province of Dalmatia and Albania, mainly in the hinterland, villages and small towns.

While all researchers agree that the cordon sanitaire was implemented after 1718,⁵⁹⁶ its permanent institution can be traced to the plague of 1731 (fig. 4.31), which spread from Bosnia into Venetian Dalmatia uninterrupted because of the openness of the border; “the blind trust between the two border populations.”⁵⁹⁷ The *provveditore* Giacomo Grimani (1732–1735) proposed halting trade altogether, but the government refused, opting in September 1732 for the institution of the cordon sanitaire. Each walled city got a board of health, caravans were to be escorted, nobody was to contact them until they reached the lazarettos on the coast, and they were confined to caravan stations along the way.⁵⁹⁸ It was the brainchild of Simone Contarini, the *provveditore alla sanità* in the province, which he proposed in a series of letters between 1731 and 1732.⁵⁹⁹ His main preoccupation was the caravan route to Split, ordering an enclosure (*stangate*) built on the central border crossing of Bili Brig where caravans could be gathered and victuaries sold with less danger of contagion.⁶⁰⁰ In the same letter, he proposed locations in Klis and Sinj for shelter and enclosure (*ricovero e recinto*) where people, goods, and horses could be lodged on their voyage. These are the first caravan stations built in the province (fig. 4.31–4.35).

Contarini explicitly stated that the walls and enclosures were not there to prohibit communication between Dalmatian and Ottoman merchants, but to make it impossible to carry out goods that have not been through quarantine. Lastly, he said that the enclosures (*recinto, o sia ricovero*) in Sinj and Klis should be identical. They were built according to

⁵⁹⁶ Slukan Altić, “Povijest sanitarnih kordona,” 56. Roman Jelić, Ivan Zoranić, “Dalmatinsko-bosanski sanitarni kordon,” in *Sanitarni kordon nekad i danas*, ed. Janko Vodopija (Zagreb: Zbor liječnika Hrvatske; Zavod za zaštitu zdravlja grada Zagreba, 1978), 34 [conference proceedings (Zadar, 1978)].

⁵⁹⁷ “Non avrebbe mai potuta supporsi la cieca confidenza, in cui viveva con li confinanti Tenute Ottomane la Dalmazia per quello sia a riguardi di sanità, se l’ultima fatale sua contaminazione non avesse dato motivo di rilevarla appieno.” Čolak, *Promet stoke*, 444 established the same chronology on the basis of a document from the Venetian State Archives, but the same one can be found in HR-DAZD-01, kut. 107 (Zorzi Grimani, knj. II), ff. 696r–707r. The part that regulates caravans from f. 701v onwards. Čolak’s subject was cattle trade, so his epidemiological findings remained unconsulted.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid. Copies of the decision of Sept. 25, 1732 can be found in: HR-DAZD-01, kut. 107 (Zorzi Grimani knj. II), under the mentioned date. They were expanded specifically for the Castel Nuovo and the area of the *Bocche di Cattaro* on June 1, 1735.

⁵⁹⁹ ASVe, *Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità*, b. 417.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid, n. 21, Feb. 9, 1731 m.v.

the project of engineer Francesco Melchiori who proposed two identical structures based on a single design and expense sheet (fig. 4.32).⁶⁰¹ Low cost, simplicity, and functionalism were the goals, so the buildings were nothing more than wide, rustic loggias resting on two rows of pillars and a wall, open to the wide court (ideally 20x20m) divided from the area with a high wall. People shared the space with their mules and horses but slept on a raised wooden surface (*Pagiolato*) for minimal comfort. Conveniently, both enclosures were built around a stream, so drinking and sanitation could be provided inside to people and animals (fig. 4.33, 4.35).⁶⁰² Contarini confirmed the completion of these structures already in mid-May.⁶⁰³ In parallel, he established the rules to be observed on the caravan route from Livno to Split. The *Turks* would be escorted by a guard of Italians who would play the trumpets to notify the populace to lock themselves in their houses, closing all doors and windows. The guards were obliged to lock the caravan stations at nightfall and were forbidden to talk with the *Turks*.⁶⁰⁴ Although Melchiori used the same general form for both buildings, the realised projects differed somewhat from the proposed one, mostly in Sinj (fig. 4.35). It was essential to stop the epidemic while continuing trade (and staying within budget), so

⁶⁰¹ Kečkemet (“Zaštita od epidemija u Splitu”) published just the drawings, leaving them anonymous, not precisely dated and contextualised. For a studious approach on the *bazzane* of Split and the wider region see Duplančić, “Splitska bazana”, mostly based on the same 1789 cadaster and 19th-century sources.

⁶⁰² ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 417, n. 2, sent with the Contarini letter on Feb. 9. “Illustrissimi et Eccellentissimi Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla Sanità Havendosi da fare un Tezone à Clissa, capace per cento Cavalli circa, con li suoi uomini, e Balle di Mercanzie, nel Sito marcato alla presenza di V[ostre] E[ccellenze], che è migliore di quei Contorni, non solo per esser sotto l’occhio della Piazza, mà anco per attrovarsi più alla rimota del vento, discosto dall’habitato di quei Borghi, vicino al Sasso per la Fabrica d’esso, com’anco all’Acqua, per bere, e volendo à provisionale e basso, non però coperto di Falascho, mà di Simble, ò siano Tegole di legno forte, sarrà neccessario di far preparar il Matteriale à tempo, il quale sarrà qui sott’espreso, per farvi poi metter mano, con le Maestranze, come parimente verrà specificato. L’unito Foglio, che umilmente presento all’ E.V. ne dimostra, colla Pianta la sua Figura ristretta al possibile, e dal Prospetto, e Profilo risulta il resto, che può servir di lume sufficiente ad un Capo d’opera, per farlo eseguire. Vi formo l’Allogio (bench’ angusto) per la Guardia, contiguo alla Porta, ò sia Ingresso del Cortile, che propongo chiudersi di Muro all’asciutto, e di aggiongo con Pagiolato dà un lato del Tezone, come rimarca il Profilo, che giudico indispensabile, à riposo de Mercanti, che callano con le Caravane, e per collocarvi nella Notte fuori del Calpestio de Cavalli qualche Balla di Merci più preziose, il che di poco augumenterà la spesa, che già ci è necessaria al rimanente della Mole. Tutti li Muri che del Tezone, e del suo Circondario sarranno di Maceria, e si farranno solamente in Calcina li Pilastri, che nel dissegno sono tinti di Rosso” [follows the expense sheet].

⁶⁰³ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 417, n. 36, May 15, 1732.

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, n.1, May 15, 1732.

Melchiori must have prepared the project hastily.⁶⁰⁵ His solution still functioned as a loggia, but the architectural form is radically reduced from its urban counterparts, resulting in little more than a rural shelter.

At Klis, his realised building (fig. 4.33) corresponds to the one surveyed in the cadastre of 1789, with minor changes to the enclosure. The *bazzana*, by then also called lazaretto (“o sia Lazzaretto eretto per le Turche Caravane”) was at the site called Peruča.⁶⁰⁶ It was a perimeter partially surrounded by a wall, while on the remaining sides mount Greben and a chasm prevented entry. The inner building was a single space, as Melchiori drew it. A guardhouse was outside – the only element extended before 1746.⁶⁰⁷ The complex was reconstructed (*rifacimento*) by engineer Giovanni Cristoforo Moser de Filseck in 1779, but the forms remained unchanged.⁶⁰⁸

The Venetians conquered Klis from the Ottomans in 1648 during the Cretan War, incorporating it in 1669. It quickly became a small urban centre of crucial strategic importance. Its fortress was known as the key of Dalmatia (*chiave di Dalmazia*) as it secured the most convenient mountain pass toward the central Dalmatian basin with Split in its centre. Therefore, all caravan traffic went through it. A house for the caravans existed before 1732, and it was noted in 1789 as the old *bazzana*. Located on Megdan (*Meidano*) just beneath the fortress and above the town, it was repurposed for the soldiers' quarters (*quartier*).⁶⁰⁹ It was a single ground-floor space,⁶¹⁰ next to the sanitation office constructed

⁶⁰⁵ The materials and techniques confirm this. The location and its materials were used to the maximum: rough stone, wooden plates instead of roof tiles, dry stone technique of non-structural elements, and the use of geographical features as barriers.

⁶⁰⁶ It is the building number 488 in the Austrian cadastre of 1831, a ruin by that time. Today only a ruined part of the outer wall remains.

⁶⁰⁷ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1 (*Catastico, Dalmazia, 1789*), 118r–v, Anton Luigi Galli Alfier Ingegnere. I do not bring the heights because the engineers, Galli especially, seem to have measured them by eye or not at all, providing dubious results (the outer wall would be 12 meters high, which is impossible considering it was a dry stone wall). The perimeter was 19,8x58,4m; the inner building (*bazzana* proper) 14,7x10,4.

⁶⁰⁸ Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 232. Moser also reconstructed the *bazzana* of Sinj, while repairing those in Knin, Drniš, Ostrovica, and Benkovac.

⁶⁰⁹ As we have seen on the *scala di Spalato* and will be demonstrated on most examples of the *bazzane*, it was possible to reutilise these buildings as secure isolated spaces, such as prisons, barracks, or true lazarettos with only minor modifications. In Klis the military aspect was accentuated, while on other examples (Makarska, Imotski) the mercantile aspect would be singled out.

⁶¹⁰ 13x6m large and 2,4 high. The note on the margin signed by the *provveditore* confirms that the building was given in 1780 to the local commander Antonio Morali and his heirs on the condition that they expand

in 1764, on the (then) only convenient road to Split. This allows it to be recognised on the 1831 Habsburg cadastre under the number 486 (fig. 4.34).⁶¹¹




Fig. 4. 32 Francesco Melchiori, *Project for a bazzana in Klis*, 1732 (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 417, dis. 2)

and raise it. The state kept the right to requisite it in case of an epidemic. HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, f. 118r. Cf. Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 68.

⁶¹¹ A private stone house exists on the spot covering roughly the same surface. The building technique, treatment of stone, and window form suggest it was built before the 19th century, but its rustic forms and many modifications do not allow specific conclusions.




Fig. 4. 33 Francesco Melchiori, *Bazzana of Klis*, 1732
(ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanit\u00e0, b. 417, dis. 3)




Fig. 4. 34 Klis on the Austrian cadaster map, 1731 (maps.arcanum.com; accessed 20.3.2022; old bazzana in the left square, new one in the right one)

In Sinj – probably the most developed urban centre in the hinterland, Francesco Melchiori built the first *bazzana* in 1732 (fig. 4.36) at a place today known as *Bazana*. The central building (*teza*) like in Klis, rested on a series of pilasters resembling a loggia, but it was larger and L-shaped. It was in a triangular courtyard surrounded by a double wooden fence between which the Goručica stream was artificially conducted. There was a back door to the stream in the first fence. This moat would have been unusable as a source of drinking water for people, so a new well was dug out just outside, behind the guardhouse. The aspect of contactless trade was further emphasised with the implementation of a turning machine (*falcon tornante*; fig. 4.37). Some repairs were made in 1740 when the local Mate Budimir was confirmed caretaker (*custode*) at the request of the merchants represented by a certain Jusuf Begović (a Muslim name) and the *emin* of Spalato.⁶¹² He opened a tavern for the merchants nearby, which they frequented when there was no danger of epidemics. This was considered scandalous, and the *provveditore* Girolamo Maria Balbi (1751–1753) had to intervene, forbidding the sale of edibles in the vicinity.⁶¹³ Although the form of the perimeter was changed into an exact square sometime before, the central building kept its original form by 1745, testified on the plan of Sinj by Faustino Brascuglia (fig. 4.37).⁶¹⁴ The same held true in 1749 when we find out that the building was divided into a closed room for people and a *porch* for goods and horses (possibly already from 1740). However, it was in a terrible state, so it was repaired in 1751 “that it may serve as a lazaretto” and again in 1775.⁶¹⁵ Already in 1779, Giovanni Cristoforo Moser de Filseck made a project for a complete reconstruction, which was never realised. Instead, a new *bazzana* was constructed in another location (fig. 4.38).⁶¹⁶ The cadastre of 1789 says that the old *bazzana*

⁶¹² HR-DAZD-1, kut. 114 (Marin Antonio Cavalli, knj. 1), f. 195r–v, Dec. 20, 1740. Confirmed again: kut. 121 (Girolamo Querini, knj. 1), f. 116r, Aug. 19, 1744. On the basis of the first document Josip Ante Soldo, *Sinjska krajina u 17. i 18. stoljeću*, vol. 2 (Sinj: Matica hrvatska, 2011), 170 [first edition: 1997] claims that *provveditore* Cavalli built the house and the wall, but Cavalli said he only restored them to be more convenient for the merchants. It is likely that the enclosure was rebuilt in a square form then, as it shows as such on the *Atlante* of Faustino Brascuglia in 1745 (fig. 4.38).

⁶¹³ Soldo, *Sinjska krajina*, 170–171.

⁶¹⁴ Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Venice, It. VI, 195 (=10054). Faustino Brascuglia, *Atlante della Dalmazia*, 1745.

⁶¹⁵ Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 64; 66; Soldo, *Sinjska krajina u 17. i 18. stoljeću*, vol. 2, 62. The same applied to the *bazzana* of Klis.

⁶¹⁶ Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 232; 355. Bilić mentions that Moser made a project that year according to a mention in another letter but a project for Sinj and Benkovac was actually developed shortly after Oct. 15, 1775,

was abandoned, with the new one built in 1782 so it must have been Moser's. It was simply an open perimeter enclosed in a wall.⁶¹⁷ The wall had two windows encased in iron bars on each side of the single gate. A barrier (*barriera di muro*), sort of an open atrium enclosing the two windows, existed at the entrance, so it must have been used for trade. Within the perimeter (*recinto*), only a single small house was built in 1788 for the public postal couriers.⁶¹⁸ It contained a stable in one space and rooms in the other furnished with the *tavolazzi*, a secure closet (for the letters), and a fireplace.⁶¹⁹ Outside stood small sentries on each corner, a guardhouse, a munitions warehouse, and several other edifices.⁶²⁰ Finally, in Austrian times, the building became the barracks of a larger military complex.




Fig. 4. 35 Faustino Brascuglia, *Plan of Sinj*, 1745 (*Atlante della Dalmazia*, BNM, It.VI.195, c. 23)

when the *provveditore* ordered engineer brigadier Moser to take care of their restoration after they had been damaged in a storm. HR-DAZD-1, kut. 192 (Giacomo Gradenigo, knj. I), ff. 153v–155v, n. 71.

⁶¹⁷ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, f. 110v, Anton Luigi Galli. The measurements of the old enclosure were 25x25m, while the inner building was 12x6m large, and 2m high. The perimeter wall of the new *bazzana* was 67,8x53,8m, 3,5m tall.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid. The atrium measures 6x8,3m within a 3m high wall, while the house was 8,7x4m, 2m high.

⁶¹⁹ ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 545r-v.

⁶²⁰ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, ff. 109v–110r, Anton Luigi Galli Afler Ingegnere. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, ff. 544v–545r. Cf. Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 66; Soldo, *Sinjska krajina*, 71.




Fig. 4. 36 Francesco Melchiori, *Bazzana of Sinj*, 1732 (ASVe, Senato, Deliberazioni, Sanità, fz. 3)




Fig. 4. 37
 Detail – falcon tornante (H)



Fig. 4. 38 Camillo de Braglie, *Plan of Sinj* – detail with the *bazzana*, 1817 (Vulić, Vulić, *Zgrada na Štaliji u Sinju*, p. 22)

The anti-epidemic aspect of the *bazzana* should not be overemphasised. When there was no contagion, people entered and exited (during the day), there were scenes of drunken *scandals*, litigations, negotiations, discussions, fights, trade, and payments.⁶²¹ As Simone Contarini stated, they could not prevent communication between people, but they could prevent smuggling, unsupervised contact, and excessive closeness, thus perpetuating old arguments to a stricter degree.

While the ones in Sinj and Klis were on the crucial caravan route, *bazzane* were dotted all along the countryside on the routes to the coastal towns, a day's ride from each other (fig. 4.2). At certain places, they were used for trade (the double-wall indicates this) while at others they were simply caravan stations on the way to the coastal cities.⁶²²

Zemunik (*Zemonico*), just outside of Zadar, had a *bazzana* restored in 1782 by Alessandro Ganassa.⁶²³ The ground floor was divided in two, with a large stable in the first part and a *tavolazzo* and a fireplace in the second, lodging section. A guard house was situated in front.⁶²⁴

⁶²¹ Soldo, *Sinjska krajina*, 189–190.

⁶²² As can already be concluded, the cadaster of 1789 was heavily consulted. However, it was made in the late days of the *Serenissima*, and only encompassed the northern Dalmatian districts, so it contains nothing on the region south of Split – Klis – Sinj. While some additional *bazzane* were ubicated in the southern regions, this thesis is not a complete survey.

⁶²³ Bilić (*Inženjeri*, 90) claims without reference that Ganassa built it, but the cadaster says it was only repaired then.

⁶²⁴ It was 12x5,3m wide, 2m high. HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, f. 49r–v, Francesco Cicavo *tenente ingegnere*.

Benkovac (*Bencovazzo*) is a small agricultural town on the route to Zadar. The *bazzana* there, the only surviving such structure (fig. 4.39),⁶²⁵ was constructed in 1766 by engineer Antonio Piovesana (fig. 4.34, 4.41) when an older one, made in drywall (*alla rustica*) collapsed.⁶²⁶ It had a longitudinal tripartite division. The first section contained an atrium (a), storage space (b), and rooms for the guards (c). The second space (d) was a stable for 12 horses, while the last (e) was for the merchants. It contained a fireplace – that is, a kitchen (g), and had the *tavolazzi* on the two outer sides (f). A toilet (i) was a small annexe of the building behind the fireplace. There was an attic used in case of need. Windows were positioned high, out of reach and enclosed in grilles. The building is still there, albeit in a derelict state, located next to Castle Benković. The attic was fully accommodated with a window on the façade. A dedicatory inscription stands above the entrance, simply reading the year 1766 and the initials A. R. P. in *capitalis quadrata*.

⁶²⁵ The building is in private hands, partially demolished and used as an inner garden. The small front section of the building is still standing in two floors and is used as a storage space.

⁶²⁶ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 427, fz. 617, n. 49, July 20, 1766. Cited in Bilić *Inženjeri*, 64–65. This conclusive project and decision was predated by another one: PTM, b. 612, fz. 423, n. 9, Apr. 22, 1766. Francesco Cicavo *tenente ingegnere* measured the building as 19x9,4m, 2,9m high. HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, ff. 51v–52r.



Fig. 4. 39 The bazzana of Benkovac (photo: Petar Strunje)




Fig. 4. 40 Antonio Piovesana, Bazzana in Benkovac, 1766 (ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 423, fz. 612)




Fig. 4. 41 Antonio Piovesana, *Bazzana in Benkovac*, 1766 (ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 427, fz. 617)

The solution used by Piovesana, but also present in Zemunik, Ostrovica, Knin (and possibly other places) is of the cavalry barracks, that is, the many stations spread across the countryside that increased cavalry mobility and operative range (fig. 4.42, 4.43).⁶²⁷ This solution was very convenient for caravan traffic because it too provided secure short-term lodging spaces for people and animals.⁶²⁸ While the connection is evident from examples of cavalry barracks in the region, a direct link can be established via an 18th-century project for a *bazzana* with an associated guard house (fig. 4.44–4.47).⁶²⁹





Fig. 4. 42 Antonio Ferro, *Cavalry station at Dicmo*, 1795 (Bilić, *Inženjeri*, p. 178)

⁶²⁷ The inventory of 1789 (ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, f. 253r) says that the building was repurposed as a cavalry barracks shortly before. From the material description, it seems nothing significant was changed.


⁶²⁸ Caravans usually number more animals than people.

⁶²⁹ ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni, b. 11, 20a–d. The *Disegni* collection is extrapolated from written documents so it is impossible to properly contextualise, date, and attribute the drawings. However, this project is almost identical to the one of the cavalry barracks proposed by engineer Antonio Ferro in 1795 for the village of Dicmo next to Sinj (fig. 4.42), and Ferro might have reused either one of the projects, depending which one is older. On the Dicmo project see Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 178. Strikingly enough, the other project for the cavalry barracks of Han near Sinj was proposed in 1775 by Giuseppe Ferro – his uncle or father (fig. 4.43). *Ibid.*, 179. The similarity between the projects is not only due to relation, as both engineers stem from the same military school in Verona that educated the Venetian engineers and whose director up to 1766 was another Ferro – Francesco. *Ibid.*, 176.

Progetto di un Quartiere di Cavalleria da stabilirsi
ad Ham nel Territorio di Sign.



Scala di Passi Veneti N. 5.



Spiegazione.

- A. Corpo di Guardia all'Ingresso, ed alla Stalla.
 - B. Stalla di 12. Poste.
 - C. Luogo per tenervi del Fieno a portata per li casi di stratempi.
 - D. Scala che conduce all' Appartamento superiore.
 - E. Cucina.
 - F. Alloggio de' Soldati.
 - G. Stanza per il Capoposto.
 - H. Spazio di fronte al Quartiere per comodo del medi, nel cui lato vi si impianteranno degli anelli di ferro, o di pietra per legarvi li Cavalli, onde pulirli.
- Il Profillo è lo stesso che quello dell' altro Progetto di Cossovo, essendo il co-
parto a voto con Plache.

Giuseppe Ferro Cap. Inge.

Fig. 4. 43 Giuseppe Ferro, Cavalry station in Han (Sinj), 1775 (Bilić, Inženjeri, p. 179)




Fig. 4. 44 Antonio Ferro (?), *Soldiers' quarters (for the bazzana guard and caravan escort ?)*, second half of the 18th century (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni, b. 11, dis. 20a)



Fig. 4. 45 Antonio Ferro (?), *Soldiers' quarters (for the bazzana guard and caravan escort ?)*, second half of the 18th century (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, Disegni, b. 11, dis. 20b)




Fig. 4. 46 Antonio Ferro (?), *Bazzana for 40 horses*, second half of the 18th century (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraproveditori alla sanità, Disegni, b. 11, dis. 20c)



Fig. 4. 47 Antonio Ferro (?), *Bazzana for 40 horses*, second half of the 18th century (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraproveditori alla sanità, Disegni, b. 11, dis. 20d)

Obrovac (*Obrovazzo*), a small port town northeast of Zadar, got its first *bazzana* in 1727. It was a wooden structure built by the engineer Francesco Melchiori.⁶³⁰ By 1789 it was a building situated in the port outside the walls, surrounded by an enclosure within a low wall. It was a ground-floor structure with an external loggia standing on four pilasters.⁶³¹ Similar was the *bazzana* of Knin (a key fortress and border town acquired in 1688), also within a courtyard surrounded by a paling fence (*palificata*). It was located in front of the northern city gate towards the border with Bosnia (*Porta Cornaro*). While it is unknown when it was built, the *bazzana* was restored in 1755.⁶³² As was usual, it had an outer building for the guard on two floors. The ground-floor *bazzana* itself had eight posts for horses in the first hall and a second large room with the *tavolazzi* (22 individual divided *tavoloni*) and a fireplace.

The *bazzana* of the nearby town of Drniš on the road to Šibenik and Zadar was restored in 1768. It was made by adapting two buildings on the crossing of the Trzbalićevac stream which was then surrounded by a high wall forming an irregular court. The building consisted of a large ground-floor stable open to the court and an adjacent two-floor tower entered from the stable.⁶³³

The *bazzana* of Ostrovica (*Ostrovizza*), a small village between Drniš and Zadar, was a ground-floor structure comprised of a sequence of spaces: a room for the guards, a stable, and a room for the *Turks* furnished only with a fireplace and a *tavolazzo*.⁶³⁴

⁶³⁰ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 98 (Pietro Vendramin, knj. II), f. 125v, June 25, 1727. It was built in the same time and form as the one in Skradin. While a wooden construction is somewhat unusual for the region that almost exclusively builds in stone, it is the only material mentioned in the dispatch.

⁶³¹ The building measured 11x6,4m, being 2,4m high. The loggia was measured as 4m long. The enclosure was 42x14m, with a meter-high wall. HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, f. 54r–v. Francesco Cicavo *tenente ingegnere*. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 258r.

⁶³² It was 11,5x6,2m large, 4,5m high in the highest part; 2,8m on the sides. The courtyard was 23x21m, with the fence 2,5m tall. Ibid., ff. 71v–72r, Giannicolò Nachich (*Nakić*) *tenente ingegnere*. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, ff. 332r–334v.

⁶³³ The stable was 23,7x8,7m, 6m high. The adjacent tower was 8,3x6,2m, 6,3m high. The courtyard measured 33,4x24m, with walls ranging from 2,8 to 3,8m in height. Ibid., f. 73r–v, Giannicolò Nachich *tenente ingegnere*. Except the irregular dimensions, the fact that it was adapted is shown in the inventory (ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, f. 348r) which notes the deficiencies of the planks that blocked parts of the otherwise stone external wall.

⁶³⁴ There was no wall in this small, sparsely-populated village, so the single building measured 27,8x9,4x3,5m. Ibid., f. 131r, Giannicolò Nachich *tenente ingegnere*. ASVe, DAPDP, b. 990, tomo 2, ff. 639r–641r.

Way on the southern shores, the *bazzana* in the small port town of Makarska (*Macarsca*) was built shortly after 1735 (the town was conquered in 1684), following the advice of *provveditore generale* Zorzi Grimani (1732–1735).⁶³⁵ The town grew by 1782, so it was decided that Francesco Gironci, the public surveyor, should choose a new location with the local Board of Health.⁶³⁶ This new building was located in the present-day square of *Žbare*,⁶³⁷ also known as *Pazar* (Bazaar) parallel to the *Pjaca* (*Piazza*) in front of the nearby cathedral that served as the local, everyday marketplace.⁶³⁸ Makarska is an end-destination on the coast where salt and other local products were exchanged for victuaries, so the merchants would return to Imotski and then Bosnia.

The *bazzana* in the small border town of Imotski existed already in 1725 (the Venetians conquered the town in 1718).⁶³⁹ It can be identified on the 1774 birds-eye view of the city made by Pietro Corir (fig. 4.48, 4.49) as a ground-floor structure within a court, resembling the *bazzana* of Split with its two wide arches.⁶⁴⁰ It was a trade hub located just in the liminal zone of the city centre, as a secondary market in the vicinity of the local one. It was built on an old Islamic religious complex made of a mosque with a minaret and a religious school (*medrese*) that was largely demolished after the Venetian conquest.⁶⁴¹ Although the

⁶³⁵ ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 69, Oct. 7, 1735, *Relazione di Zorzi Grimani al successore Dolfin*. The building was located somewhere northwest of the cathedral by Cvito Fisković, “Spomenici grada Makarske,” in *Makarski zbornik: zbornik znanstvenog savjetovanja o Makarskoj i Makarskom primorju 28–30. rujna 1969.*, ed. Jakša Ravlić (Makarska: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1970), 257. The present retirement home established as a poorhouse in the second half of the 18th century on the old town gate at the end of Kalelarga street is said to be *at the bazzana*.

⁶³⁶ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 197 (Paolo Boldù, knj. IV), ff. 78r–79r, Aug. 23, 1782.

⁶³⁷ The fish market that is there today is of a later date. The term *zbara* must derive from *sbarra* – barrier, bar. A toponym under the same name exists in nearby Vrgorac – a town on the border with Bosnia where a similar building must have existed but clear confirmation is lacking.

⁶³⁸ Cf. Petar Kaer, *Makarska i Primorje* (Rijeka: Tiskarski i umjetnički zavod “Miriam”, 1914), 98. Marinko Tomasović, *Uklesani i urezani simboli na arhitekturi Makarske i njenog rubnog područja* (Makarska: Gradski muzej Makarska, 2019), 85. I wish to thank Marinko Tomasović, the director of the city museum of Makarska, for providing me with additional information.

⁶³⁹ Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 64; note 18. A second one was built on the outskirts in 1746 by engineer Antonio Ferrari. Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 89.

⁶⁴⁰ The view is kept in the Franciscan monastery of Imotski. The *bazzana* can be seen on the Habsburg cadastre of 1825 under parcel number 338 (fig. 4.50).

⁶⁴¹ The complex is shown on the map of 1717 by engineer Antonio Moser de Filseck under the letter G (ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 384, fz. 559, dis. 2). Certain parts of the old walls still exist, built into the surrounding houses. I wish to thank Branimir Leko, the director of the Museum of Imotski, for providing the illustrations and explanations.

bazzana was demolished in 1913,⁶⁴² the area is still known under the name *Bazana*. As Imotski is located on the border, such a location was needed for undisturbed trade. It also allowed for overnight stays so the merchants could proceed to Split or Makarska in the morning.

⁶⁴² A parking lot stands on the spot. It is interesting that even after the Austro-Hungarian Empire abolished the cordon sanitaire in 1871, the building still remained the commercial centre, especially active for cattle trade with Bosnia.



Fig. 4. 48 Pietro Corir, *Imoschi*, 1774 (Franciscan monastery of Imotski)



Fig. 4. 49 Detail (the bazzana is in the lower-right corner).



Fig. 4. 50 Austrian cadaster, *Imotski*, 1835 – parcel 338 (maps.arcanum.com; accessed 21.4.2022)

However, the *bazzana* was not the preferred form for direct trade on the border. Various enclosures and fenced markets were used for that, known as *stangade* (*stangate*), *resteli*, or simply *Bazzaro* (*Pazar*).⁶⁴³ There was no need for lodging and greater exclusion of foreigners when the same foreigners would return home after a few hours. Besides, those places were sparsely populated, so only those with trade in mind would frequent them.

Kotor (*Cattaro* deep in the *Bocche di Cattaro*, Venetian Albania, today Montenegro) was just on the border, less than half an hour on a horse. Therefore, a different solution was used – that of the *stangate*, located outside the town gate at a place called *Pazzaro*. During the Cretan War (1645–1669; fig. 4.51, 4.52), they consisted of a simple wide bench – a counter so that trade could be made without human touch. Rebuilt in 1787, they were remade into a type of covered loggia built on stone pilasters (7x8.7m). Outwardly they had wooden walls with openings covered in iron grids that could be easily moved and replaced. This made it a kiosk-like solution. They also had two movable wooden gutters (*gorne*) used to sell grain. I would probably be poured inside, reaching the buyer at the other end without direct contact.⁶⁴⁴

⁶⁴³ Traljić, “Trgovina Bosne,” 345; Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 63.

⁶⁴⁴ HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 2 (*Catastico di Albania*, 1788), f. 11r, Giovanni Leonardo Gaettini *capitane ingegnere*. The cadastre of Venetian Albania that reached Zadar was incomplete. The complete one remained in Kotor and has been published by Gligor Stanojević, “Popis građevina Boke Kotorske iz 1788. godine,” *Spomenik SANU* 127 (1986).

Whether the first or not, *stangate* were built by Marco Querini, the *provveditore straordinario* of Albania (1740–1742). He was having problems with the Montenegrins (*popolo altero e feroce*) of the immediate hinterland so, using the pretext of public health, he banned them from the city and confined them to the *stangate*. ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 65, July 13, 1742.

“Ho perciò loro di primo incontro rissolutamente vietato il libero accesso, che si usurpavano entrando armati nella città e in numero superiore ai dovuti riguardi di una gelosa custodia, e sotto pretesto della importante materia di salute, ch’esclude ogni replica, li ho confinati alle Stangate fatte erigere a tal oggetto fuori dalla città.”



Fig. 4. 51 Cattaro, (BNM, Ms.It.VII.200 *Carte topografiche, piante di città e fortezze, disegni di battaglie della guerra di Candia (1645–1669).*




Fig. 4. 52 *Detail*
(*stangate* numbered
50)

Kaštela (*Sette Castelli*) between Split and Trogir had both solutions that evolved over time. The *provveditore generale* Pietro Valier (1678–1680) decreed in 1678 that an enclosure (*stangate*) be fenced off between Kaštel Lukšić (*Vitturi*) and Stari (*Vecchio*), west of the fortified villa Rušinac on a stream. The enclosure was kept locked during the night, and during the day, it could be entered up until noon, signalled by a flag raised on a central pole. A supervisor (*soprastante*) regulated it, keeping an office outside. The building was restored in 1731 during the plague epidemic, and a roof was added to a part of the structure. During the Napoleonic administration of Dalmatia (1806–1814), the enclosure was called *stallia*, from the verb *stallare*, signifying delay, quarantine.⁶⁴⁵ *Štalija* is a local regionalism borrowed from Venetian that means prohibition of movement, quarantine for animals. There must have been no permanent structure on the site because the Habsburg cadastre of 1831 observed no building there. The *stangate* were built at a time when Kaštela were close to the border. The same solution would not work when the border was pushed further inland. A permanent *bazzana* was built in 1743 between Kaštel Gomilica (*Abbadessa*) and Sućurac (*Suciuraz; San Giorgio*) on the orders of the *provveditore generale* Girolamo Querini (1741–1744) “for the sake of public health”.⁶⁴⁶

⁶⁴⁵ Duplančić, “Splitska bazana,” 64; Vjeko Omašić, *Povijest Kaštela* (Split: Logos, 1986), 201; 262.

⁶⁴⁶ An undated older one was abandoned. Ibid.; HR-DAZD-1, kut. 124 (Girolamo Querini, knj. IV), f. 232r, Dec. 14, 1743.

4.4.1. Skradin

Located just nine kilometres east of Šibenik in a navigable bay formed by the river Krka, Skradin is a small town on the crossroads of north-south and east-west traffic routes (fig. 4.2). While the town predates the Romans, its urban continuity was interrupted when it was destroyed in the Cretan and Morean wars. When Venice incorporated it in 1699, it founded a new settlement with new institutions, only nominally re-establishing the old ones.⁶⁴⁷ Not just being on the road to Zadar, Šibenik, and Split, Skradin quickly became a minor commercial centre in its own right with a solid presence of local merchants. Therefore the town presents a stimulating case study that will demonstrate the significance and the evolution of the 18th-century *bazzana* from the first simple solutions to the mature project of Frane Zavoreo who proposed the most mature solution to the problem of segregated lodging and trading. In 1727, engineer Francesco Melchiori was ordered to build a wooden *bazzana*.⁶⁴⁸ It was repaired in 1766 by Giuseppe Albergotti and Ilija Đurić, as requested by the merchants and at their expense.⁶⁴⁹ However, when *provveditore* Pietro Michiel (1762–1765) allowed the abovementioned repairs in 1765, he commented that the town had expanded, and the *bazzana* became surrounded by residences. *Provveditore* Alvise Foscari (1778–1780) confirmed this when he surveyed the town with the local Board of Health. They proposed a new location in the middle of the field (fig. 4.53; location C), or if not there, then at the nearby micro-location called Tomin greb (fig. 4.53, D).⁶⁵⁰ Nothing was done before July 1782 when the *provveditore* Paolo Boldù (1780–1783) ordered the Skradin Board of Health and engineer Zavoreo to choose the best location. According to his input, it needed to be a spacious secure building not too close to town but convenient for

⁶⁴⁷ The housing stock is almost entirely from the 18th and 19th centuries.

⁶⁴⁸ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 98 (Pietro Vendramin, knj. II), f. 125v, June 25, 1727. Josip Ante Soldo, “Skradin pod Venecijom,” *Radovi Zavoda HAZU u Zadru* 33 (1991): 161.

⁶⁴⁹ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 167 (Antonio Venier, knj. III), f. 99r, Aug. 10, 1766. Soldo, “Skradin pod Venecijom,” 162.

⁶⁵⁰ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 190 (Alvise Foscari, knj. I), f. 57v, Sept. 10, 1779. The decision argues that the building should be outside populated area for the sake of public health, but still within walking distance. *Provveditore* Michiel’s previous comment is quoted in this decision.

the local merchants (who would finance it).⁶⁵¹ A month later, they agreed on the location (location C), and it was decided that Zavoreo should start making the project.⁶⁵² Until the new building was completed, the houses of Nikola Simonić served as the temporary solution (location B).⁶⁵³ The proposal was finished in January next year when the local merchants expressed satisfaction with Zavoreo's claim that the building would be able to hold 300–400 horses.⁶⁵⁴ Construction started in June 1783 under the supervision of *proto* Scotti,⁶⁵⁵ proceeding well until February 1787 when the local Board of Health halted it.⁶⁵⁶ Excessive winter rain flooded the field, while the new building obstructed water drainage to the canals, producing a stagnant swamp (not for the first time). This atmosphere of *miasma* was considered the principal source of epidemic diseases at the time, so the *bazzana* negated its principal reason for existence. It was hastily demolished. In May, eight local merchants requested that the same building be erected in a different location because the current provisional solution was inadequate, resulting in less frequent caravans and the loss of traffic.⁶⁵⁷ The *provveditore generale* Angelo Memo (1787–1789) immediately ordered Frane Zavoreo to translocate the same project to the second location proposed in 1779.⁶⁵⁸ Twenty days later, Zavoreo produced the requested drawings – one of the modified projects (fig. 4.54) and the other of the relevant locations (fig. 4.53). However, this second translocation never came to fruition, and the Simonić solution remained used well into the 19th century.⁶⁵⁹

⁶⁵¹ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 197 (Paolo Boldù, knj. IV), ff. 67v–69r, July 28, 1782. 33 local merchants confirmed that they would cover the cost on the condition that the old *bazzana* was sold for reimbursement. When they were shown Zavoreo's concept, they asked for the building to be enlarged by a half. State Archives in Šibenik – *Državni arhiv u Šibeniku* (HR-DAŠI-1), kut. 67, fasc. *Nuova bazzana* (ex 87), Sept. 11, 1782.

⁶⁵² HR-DAZD-1, kut. 197 (Paolo Boldù, knj. IV), f. 78r, Aug. 22, 1782; ff. 84v–85r, Sept. 1, 1782.

⁶⁵³ HR-DAŠI-1, kut. 67, fasc. *Nuova bazzana* (ex 87), Sept. 14, 1782.

⁶⁵⁴ At the same time, they wanted their financial obligations toward the project precisely established in writing. HR-DAZD-1, kut. 197 (Paolo Boldù, knj. IV), ff. 128r–v, Jan. 12, 1782 m.v.

⁶⁵⁵ HR-DAŠI-1, kut. 67, fasc. *Nuova bazzana* (ex 87), June 27, 1783. Excavation of the foundations started at the beginning of August. This 1787 translocation is mentioned by Darka Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 90 as a completely new project, publishing the two drawings brought here.

⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, Feb. 26, 1786 m.v.; Mar. 2; Mar. 3, 1787. Cf. Šime Peričić, "Prilog poznavanju brodarstva i pomorske trgovine šibenske regije u XVIII stoljeću," *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 7, no. 1 (1975): 204; Soldo, "Skrađin pod Venecijom," 162.

⁶⁵⁷ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 203, (Angelo Memo, knj. I), ff. 94r–95r, May 27, 1787.

⁶⁵⁸ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 204, (Angelo Memo, knj. II), f. 69r–v, June 6, 1787.

⁶⁵⁹ The *old bazzana* in the cadastre of 1789 was comprised of two houses inside a walled off court (43,5x22,6m), with a second outer wall. A guardhouse and a sanitation office were outside. This

Zavoreo's project was the most mature solution out of all the surveyed projects. It was a tripartite ground-floor structure that opens with a semi-public space.⁶⁶⁰ The health office (fig. 4.54; letter D) and the guardroom (E) were approached from the outside. They also had a window to the atrium (C – *stangate; spazio per le persone che commerciano di riserva*) separated into two parts by a low wall (B) into an outer section for the local merchants and an inner one for the Ottomans. The following section started with a wide hallway with communal rooms on both sides (H), furnished with a fireplace and two rows of sleeping boards (M – *tavolatti*). The rooms only had windows toward the inner courtyard (I) surrounded by a portico (K – *tezzoni*) that would be used as a stable and additional storage space. It would have a separate entrance for the animals (L – *porta che conduce all'acqua*), providing a back exit to the nearby stream which he also proposed to regulate. Conceptually, Zavoreo started with the idea of a cavalry barracks like many before him, but he developed it further to provide maximum division of the merchants from the animals, as well as the exterior, through a series of transitive spaces such as hallways and atriums. More so, inner comfort, insolation, and sufficient air circulation were provided with high ceilings and a large central court. The typical cavalry barracks only had a sequence of interconnected inner spaces, often with rooms above, which would present discomfort in terms of noise and stench. In any case, the elongated and closed stables would be inconvenient for 300–400 horses. By calling the portico a *tezzone*, Zavoreo demonstrated the knowledge of the loggia-type *bazzana*, having worked in 1783 on the one in Šibenik, from where he originated. From that *bazzana* type, he takes the *stangate* – the double-wall used for non-contact commerce, but he simplifies it into a rational, controllable space. The project, albeit unrealised, is the final evolution and rationalisation of the disparate *bazzane* traditions.

corresponds to the situation in 1787. HR-DAZD-5, kut. 36, sv. 1, f. 130r–v. The Austrian administration reorganised the Venetian system making some of the *bazzane* lazarettos – places of quarantine and complete isolation. The Skradin *bazzana* is noted as such in the cadastre of 1827 (maps.arcanum.com). Peričić, “Prilog poznavanju brodarstva,” 205; Soldo, “Skradin pod Venecijom,” 162 argue that Zavoreo's project was completed in 1787 because that year a board of merchants was instituted for the maintenance of the *bazzana*, but the board maintained the Simonić estate.

⁶⁶⁰ The measurements were 27,8x40m, 5,5m high.




Fig. 4. 53 Frane Zavoreo, *Map of Skradin, 1787* (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanita, b. 24, dis. 23a)




Fig. 4. 54 Frane Zavoreo, *Project for the bazzana of Skradin*, 1787 (ASVe, Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, b. 24, dis. 23b)

4.5. Herceg Novi: a new *scala di mercanzia* modeled after Split

Venice captured Herceg Novi during the Morean War (1684–1699), establishing a free port immediately in 1700 on the model of Split, directly connecting to the Ragusan caravan road from which it diverted a part of the traffic.⁶⁶¹ The town was well-positioned towards its Bosnian and Montenegrin hinterland and controlled the entrance to the long bay of the *Bocche di Cattaro*. The Republic immediately started a swift *renovatio urbis*: repopulating the town, conducting a cadastral survey, modernising fortifications, constructing ports, churches, and public palaces, while renovating the existing infrastructure. Two projects were specifically tied to the town's role as the new commercial node: the lazaretto, and the house for the *emin* and the incoming merchants. As in Split, it was of immense importance that the merchants go through quarantine before entering the *Golfo di Venezia*.

The first lazaretto was hastily assembled in 1700 by engineer Giust'Emilio Alberghetti out of a pre-existing house beneath the monastery of Saint Anthony (fig. 4.55, n. 16), but it soon proved inconvenient.⁶⁶² According to Ilija Lalošević, the Venetian concept of a port competitive to Dubrovnik required the construction of a representative lazaretto similar to the one in Split.⁶⁶³ However, a more objective reason was the unstable terrain prone to landslides, which made the building dangerous.⁶⁶⁴ After some discussions and one failed project, the present structure with a small port was constructed 1727–1732 in the nearby valley of Meljine, according to Giovanni Battista Camozzini's project (fig. 4.57).⁶⁶⁵ In

⁶⁶¹ Secret negotiations on its establishment were conducted immediately after the First Morean War between Ivan Petar Markić (*Giovanni Pietro Marchi*, 1663–1733), a Pan-Slavic intellectual from Split who represented the *Serenissima*, and the pasha of Bosnia. ASVe, V Savi, 2. s., b. 162, ff. 24v–32r, *ultimo Ottobre* 1699. Cf. Strunje, *Splitski lazaret*. On the *scala di Castelnuovo* see Gligor Stanojević, “Novska skela u XVIII vijeku,” *Spomenik SANU* 127 (1986).

⁶⁶² Datation: Tomo Krstov Popović, *Herceg-Novi: Istorijske bilješke*, vol. 1 (Herceg Novi: Orjen, 1924) 99. Attribution: Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 84, according to Roberto Gaggio, “Tecnici ed ingegneri dell’Arsenale di Venezia – Sigismondo, Orazio, Hust’Emilio Alberhetti, 1660–1720” (Master’s thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1979–1980), 41, 80.

⁶⁶³ Ilija Lalošević, “Mletački lazareti Boke Kotorske,” *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 59 (2017): 179.

⁶⁶⁴ Guido Candiani, “Sanità e controllo mercantile alle Bocche di Cattaro: Il lazzaretto di Castelnuovo, 1700–1797,” *Mediterranea – ricerche storiche* 48 (2020): 40.

⁶⁶⁵ *Ibid.*; Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 84–88.

Split, a large *fondaco* was necessary due to several reasons. First and foremost, the quantity of traffic was large, and the city developed into a proper commercial centre, so merchants and their agents would stay for prolonged periods negotiating business. Moreover, piracy was rampant until at least the mid-17th century, so two armed state galleys transported goods from Split, significantly prolonging the waiting times. On the other hand, the *scala di Castelnuovo* never surpassed its regional significance. Private ships transported the merchandise directly from the lazaretto, so there was no need for any separate lodging other than a few rooms there while waiting for boarding.

However, trade nevertheless brought an increased number of Ottoman merchants and an *emin* to the town. Accommodating the *emin* and convincing him to stay was a matter of prime importance because the Ottoman Empire would not allow trade without their customs official to collect duties. In this context of international relations, the *emin*'s house was first mentioned by *provveditore generale* Sebastiano Vendramin (1729–1732).⁶⁶⁶ He said that the previous *emin* had left some time ago (probably when the old lazaretto was abandoned), and they were having problems procuring a new one, so trade stopped. If an *emin* would not come, then a *defterdar* (chief provincial financial minister) would not make a general inspection and issue a *firman* (decree) allowing trade. For one, a lack of sufficient mercantile infrastructure such as the lazaretto caused this. The previous *emin*'s house was located on the border, above the caravan road, and this somewhat worked when the lazaretto was on that side of the town. Now that the lazaretto was being constructed on the other side of town (two kilometres from it), the old house was too far, besides being dilapidated. He proposed that rooms within the lazaretto were assigned to the *emin*, supposedly in the (open) prior's section, like in Split. A two-floor house for the *emin* was finally built just outside the lazaretto.⁶⁶⁷ Still, land-sea traffic was not that often, and quarantine periods were known in advance, so his presence was much more needed in town, where his existence would be much more comfortable. Thankfully, all caravans going to the lazaretto had to pass the city, so that they could be controlled from there. However, providing permanent residence within an important fortress to an Ottoman

⁶⁶⁶ HR-DAZD-1, kut. 105 (Sebastiano Vendramin, knj. V), n. 30, ff. 52v–54r, July 10, 1730.

⁶⁶⁷ Stanojević, "Popis građevina Boke Kotorske," 153.

official, a Muslim therewith, would be a break with tradition well established in all other towns. In 1740 and on the instructions of the Senate, the *provveditore straordinario a Cattaro ed Albania*⁶⁶⁸ Marco Querini (1740–1742) decided to build him a house on the square in front of the town gate, employing the public engineer in the province Nicolò Rigo (appendix 21; fig. 4.58).⁶⁶⁹ The *emin*'s quarters were only a part of an expansive permanent venue for trade with the Ottomans and their lodging, suitable for an aspiring commercial centre. The simple wooden double fence of the *stangate* that existed there from at least 1708 (fig. 4.55) was demolished, and in its place, a two-floor house with a ground-floor loggia was built, partially within a large walled courtyard.⁶⁷⁰ The general disposition of the house alternated between open and closed spaces with an arcade throughout the façade, completely or partially open. This relative openness of the façade, together with the use of the Tuscan order, immediately evokes the form of a mercantile loggia, conveying the message of the function. And indeed, it was one. Caravans would gather there on their way to the lazaretto or return from Venice,⁶⁷¹ stay a few days negotiating business and selling a part of their wares, and go on their way. Individual merchants would come with food and other *non-contagious* merchandise,⁶⁷² besides the Ottoman customs officer who lived and worked there. However, the openness stops there. It might have been a venue for commercial exchange, but its architectural form also divided those inside from the outer world, aiming to prevent contraband, epidemics, and social contact. A high wall separated the courtyard, restricting trade to the low (one meter) but two-meter wide counter (fig. 4.58, letter X), controlled from the guardroom (D) in front of the entrance (H). The building was separated in two, with the eastern part used by the *emin* (E, III) having a separate external staircase (Y); and the western part for the use of the merchants. The loggia (A – *teza*) had

⁶⁶⁸ An official of medium rank, below the Dalmatian *provveditore* in Zadar and above the town counts and rectors of Venetian Albania.

⁶⁶⁹ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 478, fz. 682, n. 42, June 26, 1741; n. 46, Sept. 22, 1741, and the attachment with the expense sheet. Cf. Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 243; Candiani, “Sanità e controllo mercantile alle Bocche di Cattaro,” 43–44. Candiani does not differentiate between this project and the hydraulic works in the lazaretto, also done by Rigo at the same time. Giovanni Battista Camozzini built an aqueduct already in 1730 that supplied the fountain, a pool for washing wax (*cavana*), and two baths in the towers, but it was inefficient.

⁶⁷⁰ According to Rigo's drawing, the house was 35m long, 11 wide, while the walled court was 18x20 meters.

⁶⁷¹ *Strada che mena al lazaretto* can be seen in the upper right.

⁶⁷² Have in mind the almost complete Dalmatian dependence on Ottoman food imports. These buildings were the primary supply centres.

an open (A) and semi-closed part (C) with wide benches (B) for rest and goods deposit. No external windows were made on the ground floor. The merchants' first floor (II) was divided into four rooms connected by a hallway. The attic was accommodated only on the *emin*'s side,⁶⁷³ but was probably planned if traffic increased, as in the *Fondaco dei Turchi*. The central preoccupation of the project was the water and sewage system. An aqueduct was built specifically for the use of the *emin* and the Muslims.⁶⁷⁴ It entered the house (F) supplying the three wash basins – one in the *emin*'s bathroom (E – *loco di servizio*), the other two in the closed part of the loggia (C).⁶⁷⁵ A separate drain (M) was installed for surplus water in case of heavy rain. From the last wash basin, an artificial slope (an elbow) was formed to divide the potable from the sewage water.⁶⁷⁶ The pressure created by that slope, and the one just before the house, ensured that the five toilets on each floor (K) and the courtyard (I) were sufficiently flushed. Two access shafts (Z) were available for maintenance purposes. Querini confirmed the building's completion by August 1741, noting that the works were led personally by the engineer Rigo and a certain *proto* Giacomo da Ragusa.⁶⁷⁷ The building was described in the Albanian cadastre of 1788 as the public *bazzana*, which stated it was built in 1740 (when construction started), and repaired in 1788.⁶⁷⁸ To contextualise it, no other public building in the Republic is known to have used the same sanitation system, and aqueducts were solely used to supply the public fountains.

⁶⁷³ Note the staircase and the window.

⁶⁷⁴ “Acquedotto formato ad uso dell’Emino, e de Turchi alla Teza.” Note that Rigo writes that the house is an *abitazione de Mercanti foresti* – foreigners, while the aqueduct is for the Turks. While the town had two Ottoman aqueducts, it seems they were abandoned, as this one was described by Querini (appendix 21) as new, *very expensive*.

⁶⁷⁵ “Ingresso d’aqua condotta, che passando dalla casa dell’Emino v`a nell’altro loco Terreno ad uso della Teza, indi cade nel scolo de 4 comodi. K.”

⁶⁷⁶ Visible in the Q – L profile.

⁶⁷⁷ ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 478, fz. 682, n. 46, Sept. 22, 1741.

⁶⁷⁸ Boris Ilijanić, *Herceg Novi: Grad i graditeljsko nasljeđe* (Herceg Novi: Ilibo design architect, 2015), 234–235. Cf. Stanojević, “Popis građevina Boke kotorske,” 144. The repairs must have been made according to a project made by engineer Giovanni Leonardo Gaettini. Bilić, *Inženjeri*, 183.

In essence, Rigo's building combines the functions of a *fondaco*, a customs house, and a *bazzana*. While most *bazzane* show some regard for Muslim hygienic-religious customs, they were nonetheless primarily supply centres and caravan stations providing minimal comfort for a stay that was rarely longer than a day or two. But Herceg Novi was an aspiring commercial centre modelled after Split, so a solution appropriate for those aspirations needed to be found. It was economically decided to unite the functions of the *bazzana*, a customs office, the *emin's* residence,⁶⁷⁹ and a *fondaco*, providing for short and long-term lodging, local and international traffic, and (contactless) trade. Considering that most of these foreign merchants would be Muslim,⁶⁸⁰ Rigo's project puts a heavy emphasis on water and sewage systems, again recognised as the main distinction with the Ottoman housing culture. More than any other example, by giving the building a classical appearance, Rigo positions it within the Western visual paradigm as part of the *renovatio urbis* conducted by the Most Serene Republic in her new holding.⁶⁸¹

⁶⁷⁹ In Šibenik and Zadar the *emin's* residence was just outside the *stangate* surrounding the *bazzana*, while in Split it was on the *scala*, within walking distance of the *bazzana* at *Porta Pistora*.

⁶⁸⁰ Herceg Novi was a Slavic-speaking Orthodox town, so it was impossible to differentiate and segregate other Christian populations from the Ottoman hinterland to whom the border was much more porous. Unless they went to Venice or convened in large caravans, they bypassed the system altogether. This problem is mentioned throughout the writings of the *provveditori generali*.

⁶⁸¹ Note the dedicatory inscription of the façade on Rigo's design. The contents are not known as the building was demolished, and the town market was built on the spot in the early 20th century. Unlike in Split, Sinj, and Klis where the military and isolation aspects prevailed in future use, here the mercantile aspect prevailed same as in Imotski and Makarska. I wish to thank Herceg Novi architect Srđan Marlović for the discussion on the subject.




Fig. 4. 55 Giuseppe Juster (?), Castelnuovo, 1709 (?) (Museo Civico Correr, CI XLIVb n0478)



Fig. 4. 56 Detail, n. 13 – stangade

Fig. 4. 57 Giovanni Battista Camozzini, *Project for the lazaretto of Herceg Novi, 1730* (ASVe, Provveditori alle fortezze, ex b. 82, dis. 88)



5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

5.1. Prevalent solutions between Venice and the *Stato da Mar*

Herceg Novi served as an illustrative concluding case study. Even in the late days of the Republic, the project elaborated the main preoccupations of the system used for hosting Ottoman subjects, probably more closely than anywhere else. Under the guise of anti-epidemic segregation,⁶⁸² complete division was achieved, and Muslims with other Ottoman subjects were enclosed within the *stangate*. However, this *stangate* – enclosure, and the building it enclosed, were furnished with all the commodities of Muslim life, at least from the Venetian point of view. These provisions varied between buildings used for shorter stays (*bazzane*) and those for longer ones (*fondachi*). The arguments for the seclusion of the *Turks* varied while always being based on socio-religious and later epidemic division from the local populace. In the *Stato da Mar*, safety *from the Turks* was emphasised, while in Venice, safety *for* them was prevalent, the same as it was for the Jews confined to the Ghetto. The safety *from the Turks* got a completely new meaning with the institution of the cordon sanitaire in the *Stato da Mar* and the double-wall *bazzane* that spread afterwards. The result was near-complete separation that ideally (realistically less so) also included other Ottoman populations besides Muslims (especially the Jews who made up a large percentage of Levantine merchants). In all cases, these structures were an attempt to control the highly porous Venetian-Ottoman border. This control evolved over time and also included the perpetuation of the religious and cultural division in the inner territories of the Republic, such as the city of Venice. As a result, the functions were multiple. The buildings were venues for trade while preventing socio-religious contact. On a large scale, they provided short and long-term and all the necessary comforts, while in the 18th century also

⁶⁸² Remember Querini prohibiting entry to Montenegrins. ASVe, Collegio, Relazioni, b. 65, July 13, 1742: "[...] vietato il libero accesso, che si usurpavano entrando armati nella città e in numero superiore ai dovuti riguardi di una gelosa custodia, e sotto pretesto della importante materia di salute, ch'esclude ogni replica."

prevented the spread of epidemics. In essence, the buildings can be divided according to two main functions: those for long-term stay (*fondachi*, urban *bazzane*) and those for short-term (*bazzane* as caravan stations). However, this did not give rise to a typology. The implemented solutions were highly heterogeneous, ranging from modified urban houses and palaces (Venice, Zadar, later Split), the military-influenced lazaretto (Split), to the loggia (Split, Šibenik, Herceg Novi, Klis, Sinj) and the cavalry stations (Benkovac, Ostrovica, Zemunik, Zadar). In all cases, these modified basic models were locked at night, had controlled entry, were surrounded by high walls, and if they had external windows, visibility was heavily restricted. In almost all cases, their location was peripheral. They were positioned somewhere accessible but on the outskirts, most often out of the city walls in view of fortifications, and always removed from churches. This position, together with controlled entry and the later addition of double walls, ensured that only those locals with business in mind would frequent them while removing the security and socio-religious dangers to the town. Segregated spaces cannot be segregated if they do not contain internal provisions which, coupled with genuinely Muslim housing requirements, resulted in Venetian solutions that incorporated Islamic housing culture. Each of the instruments central to the discussions and realised projects will be tackled in the following subchapters and compared to the prevalent Ottoman Islamic solutions.

5.1.1. Segregating the *Turk*

Residential segregation was established as the first and foremost reason for the development of these structures, varying between the arguments of safety *for* and safety *from* the *Turks*. As already well-established in literature and this study, the instruments of segregation had their root in the (relative) residential segregation Europeans experienced in the Levant during the Middle Ages, from where the model was translated to the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*,⁶⁸³ reaching a climax with the establishment of the Ghetto. Furthermore, the direct precedent could already be found during the War of Cyprus when Ottoman Muslims and Jews were confined to the palace of *bailo* Marcantonio Barbaro. Albeit the precedents for segregation can easily be established in these structures, the evolutionary narrative they ostensibly reveal is not confirmed in the discussions. The involved parties only rarely and marginally mention the Ghetto and the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, instead pointing to reciprocity as the precedent for segregation, mentioning the *funduq* (khan) of the Ottoman Empire. As already established in the introduction, this reciprocity was false. In medieval times the Europeans, separated into nations, were restricted to the *funduqs* of North Africa and Syria, but this rule was only exceptionally kept in certain areas during the Early Modern Era. Furthermore, it never existed in the core territories of the Ottoman Empire, where most Europeans could be found in the same period. Mehmet the Conqueror preferred settling the Catholic Europeans on Galata across the Golden Horn, but this did not mean they were constrained to stay there, enjoying freedom of movement, religion, and representation. For the Muslims, the khan/caravanserai system was a personal choice, used because of its practicality and low (or non-existent) cost. By invoking the *funduq*, Membré references the final days of the medieval Syrian and Egyptian system he experienced, but one that the great majority of the Ottoman merchants would not know. However, various forms of segregation of foreign merchants evolved in Venice based on Arab models, so all the *fondachi* and similar structures in the *Serenissima* can undoubtedly be positioned within this tradition that took a more religious character in the 16th century on the eve of

⁶⁸³ Where solely the merchants were segregated, and them to a lesser degree than the Muslims afterwards.

Protestantism, the institution of the Ghetto, and finally the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and similar structures in the *Stato da Mar*. By forcing the *fondaco* on all Muslims irrespective of ethnolinguistic divisions, and the *bazzana* (ideally) on all Ottoman subjects, the Venetian system was clearly different from the Ottoman commercial experience.

The particular instruments of segregation need to be addressed in detail, as was referenced as a Levantine practice. They include the overnight locking, the gate guard, and the blocking of visual communication with walls and small high-positioned windows. All of these existed within the Ottoman practice, not with the aim of segregation but intended to ensure privacy and safety. Moreover, by positioning these places on the periphery, the Venetian administrators negate the centrality that the commercial space has as a place of socialisation and business,⁶⁸⁴ again confirming that this system aimed to limit social ties.

The overnight locking of a structure for foreigners and a guard to control entry were first observed in Europe on the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, but it housed only merchants and was primarily the means of commercial control. That is why there were no restrictions on entry and no blocking of visual communication. Only one Venetian solution before the *Fondaco dei Turchi* contains all of those: the Ghetto. If Jewish quarters existed in Europe for centuries, what makes the Ghetto a specific Venetian invention? Benjamin Kaplan points out a specific set of laws regulating contact and the segregated space as the key, and the primary among them is nocturnal segregation. Its sole reason was to prevent the Jews and the Christians from socialising during those hours not dedicated to work but leisure and during which intimacy may arise.⁶⁸⁵ This made the Jews a separate community, not of the city in which they lived but could not own real estate and settle down, having their space regulated by the authorities they could only indirectly hope to influence. And their division was at times even more strictly accentuated, as when the *Cinque Savi* ordered all windows looking out to be closed and high walls constructed in other places. As the Jewish community was not of the city and formed a separate urban body, they could observe their religious rites and construct synagogues inside. As was argued in the chapter on the *Fondaco dei Turchi*, the presence of a mosque actually brings the *Fondaco* solution closer

⁶⁸⁴ Mortada, *Traditional Islamic Principles of Built Environment*, 78.

⁶⁸⁵ Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (London; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 295–296.

to the Ghetto and away from the argument of Venetian cosmopolitanism. Like the Jews, the Muslims were separate from the city, sufficiently isolated, so they could observe their religious rites and customs while segregated. This relative religious liberty is, therefore, not at odds with the absolute Christianity of Venice, as it was not part of it, formally unrecognised by any decree and not visible from the outside. As the existence of a mosque was possible only due to segregation, the whole set of concessions to the Ottoman Islamic housing culture was required and possible only because of the same segregation that united the Muslims in one place.

5.1.2. Hosting the *Turk*

Establishing what was considered specific about these structures is not difficult, having been explicitly mentioned by the dragomans and the *Cinque Savi* and perpetuated throughout the projects.

The first, most present and least mentioned is the stove, the oven, or the fireplace. Besides heating, its goal was to provide the guests with the possibility of preparing the food for themselves.⁶⁸⁶ Already in 1575, Lettino mentioned the different eating habits, and it is well testified that breaking the Christian fast was one of the main contentions of Christian-Muslim intermingling for the Inquisition. For those who wanted to procure food directly or did not want to cook, provisions were made in the form of a *vivandiere* – a private individual who procured the necessary monopoly to be the sole food supplier. Besides him, the custodians in Venice, Split, and Zadar performed the same function. Comparable to the *funduqs* and the khan of the Levant, even the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, eating habits were accentuated as a point of differentiation. The guests were not excluded from the local gastronomy, but the locals were from theirs so that the religious food restrictions (which exist in every Abrahamic religion) would be dutifully observed. Apparently, the stove (*stufa*) mentioned by Membré and incorporated in the *osteria Angelo* as a *Turkish need* was not the prevalent solution in Italy, where the fireplace was preferred.⁶⁸⁷ The fireplace is found in every other surveyed building.

The second provision were the *tavolati* – raised benches for sleeping and the deposit of more valuable merchandise. Sleeping was also mentioned as a differing factor by Lettino,

⁶⁸⁶ When Omer bey Babić, the ambassador to the *Serenissima*, stayed for 30 days in the lazaretto and then the *fondaco* of Split in 1756–1757, his entourage cooked for him, while the local count supplied all the food. The complete expense sheet was published by Ljerka Šimunković, “Prehrana osmanskog izaslanika Omer-bega Babića i njegove pratnje u splitskom lazaretu,” *Grada i prilozi za povijest Dalmacije* 16 (2000). Further testifying to the anti-epidemic character of the post-1731 segregation is the fact that the Ottoman envoy and travel writer Evliya Çelebi only had to spend a night there during the Cretan War before being given audience. Evliya Çelebi, *An Ottoman Traveller: Selection from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*, trans. Robert Dankoff, Sooyong Kim (London: Eland, 2011), 161.

⁶⁸⁷ Sarti, *Živjeti u kući*, 108. Exclusivity of a single solution is, of course, impossible to claim but Leon Battista Alberti also links them to Germany and other colder climates. Stoves are more efficient in terms of fuel consumption and heat dispensation, and in Italy were often connected with baths and saunas. Thornton, *The Italian Renaissance Interior*, 27.

and the *tavolati* were often invoked as a solution most convenient for the Turks on which they could lay their sleeping mats. They are present in every project. There can be no mistake here – wide benches were the most common solution found in roadside caravanserais and private homes. In the reconstructed Ottoman house, these benches usually spanned the entire width of a room. In Split and Venice, the *tavolati* were reminiscent of large wooden boxes, providing a decent and cheap local variant. On the *bazzane*, a closer connection can be established, having in mind that, while being the symbol of Muslim modesty, this simple solution is by no means exclusive to the Islamic world. It was used in prisons, barracks, and certain monasteries. This means that the *tavolato* did not have to be directly borrowed from the Ottoman housing culture. As the simplest of forms, it could have been easily explained by a mediator to the architect-engineer by using a local paragon. The same solution was used for guard houses in front of the *bazzane*, meaning that an official, a soldier, or a guard could just as easily find it convenient. The argument can be expanded further on the example of Melchiori's *bazzane* in Sinj and Klis – the first two caravan stations on Venetian territory. They are the only structures that show some correlation with the Ottoman roadside caravanserai. In many rural caravanserais, animals and people would be lodged together (fig. 2.2). Raised benches and fireplaces were the only things provided (appendix 3). There was no water supply or toilets inside as they were intended for the shortest of stays. Sometimes these buildings were single-nave vaulted structures, and sometimes two or three-nave buildings with open timber roofs held by rows of supports. This is the composition offered by Melchiori – a single space divided in two, providing further division with a very tall and wide *tavolato*.⁶⁸⁸ However, while one could feed a horse from a bench in the Ottoman world, Melchiori's was so tall that it functioned more like a mezzanine. Furthermore, the building was completely open to the courtyard in the tradition of the loggia. This means that Melchiori does not reproduce the Ottoman caravanserai in any meaningful manner, rather reformulating the needed facilities within the Western tradition. Therefore, so clearly elaborated by the dragomans, the facilities provided are the central points of these projects.

⁶⁸⁸ On all other examples the animals were kept separate from the people.

The sanitation facilities were central in almost every example and positioned as the single greatest need of the Muslims. This included an abundant water supply, a toilet, and a bath – if not a dedicated room, then at least the possibility to bathe in accordance with religiously established hygienic norms. Furthermore, as was pointed out for the *fondachi* in Venice, these buildings needed to be kept continuously clean. Several solutions were implemented to solve this central problem. Toilets and baths were discussed during the formation of a *fondaco* in Venice, and the *osteria Anzolo* and the *Fondaco dei Turchi* had them as separate spaces. In the *Fondaco*, the toilet, separated into compartments, was centrally placed, and the sewage system had to be made. In addition, every room had a wash basin. The baths were placed in front of the mosque, with an additional one on the ground floor, respecting the religious nature of personal hygiene. However, the present rooms in the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and Herceg Novi were not real baths (*güsülhane*) and, of course, not the hamam, but simple washing rooms (*abdesthane*).⁶⁸⁹ In Split, the toilets were under the stairs, per the European tradition of positioning such service rooms where suitable. No baths were mentioned, but wash basins were found around the courtyards, while water supply in terms of Muslim hygienic practices was explicitly mentioned as a major preoccupation. In Herceg Novi, sanitation was again central, with a single water and sewage system dominating the project, with an aqueduct, built-in toilets, washbasins, and a bathroom. For the *bazzane*, these preoccupations were not central as they were places of short-term stay, but a well could always be found in the vicinity. Some solutions do provide for this need. Melchiori built his structures on streams, while Zavoreo proposed in Skradin to regulate one just next to his two unrealised projects.

In general, the solutions were heterogeneous, with each architect-engineer proposing his own reflection on the problem of eating, sleeping, relieving oneself, and washing. Even today, handling these functions denotes a housing culture and distinguishes it from another. Before the era of industrialisation, modernisation, and globalisation, differences were only more accentuated. By explicitly tackling these items as something that distinguishes the

⁶⁸⁹ The hamam contains the *apodyterium* (dressing room), *frigidarium* (cold pool), *calidarium* (hot pool), and *laconicum* (steam bath), missing the Roman *tepidarium* (lukewarm pool). Cecilia Fumagalli, “A Merchant’s Travels in the Islamic World,” in *A History of Architecture and Trade*, ed. Patrick Haughey (London: Routledge, 2018), 160–161.

Islamic from the European housing culture, the Venetians enter into a dialogue with a different civilisation. However, what were the limits of this mediated dialogue?

5.2. Architectural solutions and the question of models

5.2.1. Reproducing a housing culture

What was general for the Islamic world (and more rigorously observed than in Catholic Europe) was the overnight locking of all commercial and related hospitality spaces, but they were still much more accessible than either the Islamic private house or the Venetian *fondachi* and *bazzane*. Thus, as further argued in the second chapter, the classical khan could not have been the archetype for Venetian solutions. Indeed, such infrastructure, while found around the Empire, was the exception to the usual merchant experience. Moreover, the khan had a simpler architectural form than the examples from Venice, Split, Skradin, or Herceg Novi and usually did not have the required sanitary utilities.

These provisions could not be sufficiently provided in a typical European house, so the traditional local forms needed to be modified to bring them closer to Islamic housing expectations and experience. That is why certain elements are positioned within the Levantine practice. This did not mean they did not exist somewhere on the margins of the European practice, but the goal was to provide solutions that were as close to the Levantine tradition as possible, to be made as acceptable as possible to the guests while respecting the local imperative for segregation. Indeed, these modifications were subordinate arguments to segregation, whose instruments also needed to be positioned within Levantine practices, at least rhetorically.

Some are present on a khan or a similar commercial structure, but most could be found on private residences. This meant that, although their existence was manipulated to serve segregation, these forms were not unknown to the Ottoman trader, deeply rooted within the Islamic housing culture and its insistence on privacy. The merchants would be accustomed to overnight locking because *funduqs*, khans, markets, warehouses, as well as entire cities and private homes were locked during the night. This rule extends across cultures but is particularly legally established for the Islamic world. The guard who controlled entry and the internal caretaker were also acceptable, entirely within the *funduq*-khan practice. The

difference was that the *funduq*-khan is the continuation of a bazaar (*suq*) in a semi-private environment,⁶⁹⁰ while the Venetians preferred removing these structures from highly frequented areas. By perpetuating the universal and strict dichotomy between inside and outside, the visible and the invisible, the Venetians perpetuated segregation using all previously known forms, but those that were compatible with the Muslim experience, where they protected the privacy of the family. This also meant that when the merchants travelled to other towns of the Islamic world, the private space was also protected from the gaze of the same merchants who thus became strangers detached from local domestic life.⁶⁹¹ That is why the merchants complained about the implementation of the segregation system itself, especially its initial lack of ethnic separation (the Islamic town is separated into ethnoreligious neighbourhoods), and not the segregation instruments, as long as water was provided. Membré and da Nores thus positioned the instruments of segregation completely within what was acceptable to the Muslims, drawing from their own experience of the Levant: division from the outside, controlled entry, overnight closing, single entrance, small and high windows, and ethnic separation. Therefore, while being an instrument of segregation already established in the Ghetto, blocking the view, overnight locking, and guarded entry were forms found in Islamic practice. Hence, they were acceptable to the users.

A recognised central problem was the provision of adequate water supply and sewage disposal systems within these segregated spaces. European forms could not suffice, so for each building a well-thought-out but not always efficient and economic system was implemented. This is evident in the centrality of the toilet, which in reality separates the *Fondaco dei Turchi* and the house in Herceg Novi from both Eastern and Western traditions. As mentioned, latrine design was not neglected in the Islamic architectural

⁶⁹⁰ Ibid., 160.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid., 162: “A merchant’s journey experiences at once both the inner and the outer parts of the city. Moving from a point to another, what was an ‘inside’ turns into an ‘outside’ and, vice-versa, what was an ‘outside’ becomes an ‘inside.’ It is on such couples of sequential dichotomies, on the opposition of an ‘inside’ against an ‘outside,’ that the city of the Islamic world is based. This first opposition of terms raises a second: the one between ‘visible’ and ‘invisible,’ since what is ‘inside’ is generally invisible from outside and vice-versa, as a consequence of the so-called ‘principle of progressive and mutual exclusion’ that governs the physical pattern of the Islamic urban fabric. [...] Merchants, in fact, are a particular kind of urban users and, for this reason, they are not allowed in the most protected and thus invisible part of the urban fabric.”

tradition as in the West,⁶⁹² and the question of sanitation and waste disposal is regularly addressed on architectural plans. Be as it may, their position within the architectural composition is always marginal, somewhere on the side, detached from other rooms.⁶⁹³ Also, those khans that were part of a larger complex – as most canonical examples were, did not include these facilities because they could be found in the immediate vicinity. For the smaller khans on caravan routes, the internal latrine was non-existent, while it can be marginally found on particular urban examples, together with the *abdesthane*.⁶⁹⁴ By posing the latrine as a central question of the project, Rossi and Rigo show how much they consider the Ottoman housing culture different from their own (to the point of caricature), and to what degree such a dedicated service room was not a part of their usual repertoire. However, they did provide for internal separation into cubicles, possibly referencing the *hijab* regulation.

The *tavolato* was a local reflection on the *seki* – the multipurpose wooden bench which was the staple of Islamic furniture. As a highly economical simple solution, it was everywhere, but it varied widely – from a free-standing bed case or a high mezzanine to a real wall-to-wall wide bench. The same can be said for stoves and other cooking–heating solutions, which were singled out as a specific accommodation, but their implementation varied greatly.

In conclusion, the Venetian patrons and their architects-engineers try to implement certain aspects of Islamic housing culture pertaining to its basic elements: the need for privacy (redefined as a tool for segregation) and culinary, sleeping, religious, and hygienic habits. As such, the Venetians evoke the medieval Arabian *funduq* for the European Catholic nations, already transmitted in the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, but redefine it as a place of rigorous separation most closely resembling the Ghetto – another invention of this Age of Confessionalisation. However, the Venetians introduce elements of Islamic housing culture within existing architectural forms, only slightly modifying them according to variations in function. By intentionally developing a specific space – furnishing it with sleeping benches

⁶⁹² With the exception of several hospitals and lazarettos.

⁶⁹³ This is a rational choice which facilitates waste removal, connection to the sewage grid, and better ventilation.

⁶⁹⁴ See Kreševljaković, *Hanovi i karavansaraji*, 21–24.

or a toilet, providing water in a certain room, enclosing the courtyard in a double wall, arranging a room as the mosque, its function becomes designated, facilitating easy comprehension.

5.2.2. Visual communication and the question of forms

The comprehension of the architectural language and function is tied to a visual memory built on immersion within a specific architectural culture. Both the language of symbols and the experience of spaces constitute an understanding. We expect a certain outlook and spatial disposition from a post office, a theatre, a hotel, or a university. But how does one communicate this message when it is not self-explanatory – to a person with somewhat different expectations of architectural forms and spaces? Analysing all the examples in this thesis, it seems one does not. In all cases except the one in Herceg Novi, the buildings are devoid of the classical vocabulary. The *Fondaco dei Turchi* moves into a medieval palace without much respect for the earlier structure, passively negating its form. The *scala di Spalato* repositions all dedicatory inscriptions and architectural plastic to the outer perimeters, even to the sea façade, leaving only the church decorated. Even in Herceg Novi, the building opens to the square in front, signifying its mercantile function to the citizens. By removing architectural style from the equation, the architects and engineers opt for the most rationalist solutions as they have no need for legible visual communication with the users of space. In Ancona, a large grain warehouse was repurposed. In Venice, first, a hostelry and later a large medieval palace were accommodated. A similar situation could be observed in Dubrovnik before Muslim merchants and the *emin* were removed from the city to the annexe of the lazaretto. In Split, as in later Dubrovnik, the *militarised lazaretto* was sufficient enough. For the *bazzane* of Šibenik, Zadar, Split, and Herceg Novi, a loggia was adequate, as was in simplified terms for Klis, Sinj, Imotski, and Obrovac. A cavalry station was elaborated in Benkovac, Zemunik, Ostrovica, and later Zadar, while its most mature form was planned for Skradin. Through the heterogeneous solutions implemented, it seems a conclusion was never drawn on the architectural type convenient for hosting the Ottomans. Depending on the preoccupations of a specific era, one form would be dominant. For 16th and 17th-century Dalmatian towns, that was the loggia – the dominant form of merchant hospitality in the West. In the following century, the loggia was divided by ever

more walls, while the cavalry station became more convenient for overnight caravan lodging in places without trade.

A comparative example can be found in the mentioned *Narenta* (Gabela near Čitluk, Herzegovina) – the main Ottoman-owned Adriatic trade port (fig. 4.59, 4.60). There, an elaborate border-crossing and mercantile complex was envisioned as a section of a commercial street that led to nearby Mostar (an important trade node and urban centre) – a *souq* or a *bazaar*, open and welcoming with a pier, rows of shops (probably with rooms above), a customs house (*dogana*), a mosque, and a bath – as in any other urban quarter.⁶⁹⁵ Francesco Melchiori, the same military engineer who built the *bazzane* of Klis, Sinj, Skradin, and Obrovac, was then well aware of Ottoman forms but chose not to use them.

⁶⁹⁵ BNM, Ms.It.VII.94, *Carte topografiche e piante di città e fortezze per la guerra di Morea (1684–1697)*. To my knowledge, the map has not been published before. It was extrapolated from the original context (probably a military dispatch) and united with other War-related maps in the Marciana. The Venetians held Čitluk between 1694 and 1716, so it would be interesting to see in future research how they treated this complex in the short time span. What is generally known is that they redirected international trade to the ports of Split and Herceg Novi.



Fig. 4. 59 Francesco Melchiori, *Plan of Čitluk*, 1695 (BNM, Ms.It.VII.94, *Carte topografiche e piante di città e fortezze per la guerra di Morea (1684–1697)*).




Fig. 4. 60 *Detail*

A deliberate lack of understanding of architectural types is shown in the disuse of Ottoman architecture after the Venetian conquest. In all cases, except for two mosques-turned-churches, continuity was broken. The local governors built other residences, aqueducts mostly went to waste, new urban centres were organised, and in all cases, the caravanserais were abandoned.⁶⁹⁶ A town had to have at least one; however, none survived or were even known to have been reused. Today, only one partially survives. The khan of Vizier and Grand Admiral *Silahdar* Yusuf Pasha (*Jusuf Mašković*; ca. 1604–1646) in Vrana (*Laurana*), halfway between Šibenik and Zadar, is probably the westernmost such structure (fig. 4.61–4.64). It was commissioned by Mašković in his hometown in 1644/1645 as part of a pious endowment (*waqf*). The original project was only partially completed because Mašković was strangled in 1646 at the onset of the Cretan War. The large square perimeter (60x52m) consisted of two parts, uniting the public facilities of the endowment (hamam, apartment wings, possibly a mosque, a religious school, or an almshouse) in the northern courtyard with a caravanserai to the south.⁶⁹⁷ After its conquest in 1699, it was given to the Borelli family who neglected its facilities, using the building as a part of a rural estate. The same phenomenon can be observed in the contemporary Austrian *Reconquista* of mainland Croatia, Hungary, and Serbia. In each and every case, the *Reconquista* signified a break with the previous civilisational frames of urban life, and introduced were new models of urban and architectural form, travel and life, replacing the previous models in the vast swaths of the conquered land. While in a different national narrative and with much more vigour, the same held true in the 19th century. One can find rare surviving examples of Ottoman architecture and urbanism in Greece, Serbia, Romania, and Bulgaria. Considering that the patron of all the mentioned structures was the Government, and the engineers were

⁶⁹⁶ See Kornelija Jurin Starčević, “Islamsko-osmanski gradovi dalmatinskog zaleđa: prilog istraživanju urbanog razvoja u 16. i 17. stoljeću,” *Radovi zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 38 (2006). Kornelija Jurin Starčević, “Osmanska graditeljska baština srednjega jadranskoga zaleđa u povijesnoj perspektivi,” in *Spomenica Josipa Adamčeka*, eds. Drago Roksandić, Damir Agičić (Zagreb, Filozofski fakultet, 2009).

⁶⁹⁷ Reproduced here is the functional division established by Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, “Yugoslavya’da Türk abideleri ve vakıfları,” *Vakıflar dergisi* 3 (1957): 193–194, contrary to the one established in Croatian historiography by Ivo Petricioli, “Han Jusufa Maškovića,” *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 18 (1971) who claims the opposite. The comparative material does not corroborate Petricioli’s claim. Ayverdi’s reconstruction does not allow for the vizier’s private quarters, which is akin to other Ottoman pious endowments. It could have possibly included a soup kitchen or an alms house, a religious school, a mosque or similar. The only parts that can be undoubtedly positioned are the hamam, and the two-floor rooms in the northern courtyard.

state employees, their outlook could not be found anywhere else than in the usual repertoire.



Fig. 4. 61 Maškovića khan after its rebuilding and modification into a hotel in 2014 (photo: Davor Strenja, <https://www.maskovicahan.hr/hr/o-nama/povijest>; accessed 24.6.2022)




Fig. 4. 62 Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi, *Functional disposition of the Maškovića khan in Vrana* (“Yugoslavya’da Türk abideleri ve vakıfları,” fig. 63)⁶⁹⁸

⁶⁹⁸ *Avlu* – court, *Ahir* – barn, stable, *Ilave odalar* – additional rooms; *Han kısmi* – the khan portion.




Fig. 4. 63 Geronimo Benaglio, *Vrana Piazza del Turco*, 1647 (BNM, Ms.It.VII.200, *Carte topografiche, piante di città e fortezze, disegni di battaglie della guerra di Candia (1645–1669)*)




Fig. 4. 64 Detail, note Z – *Uspitio Fabrica magnifica dell Mascovich Bassa di mare, di valsente di più di cento milla reali*

Thus the Venetian government preferred their solutions to the ones already present, albeit the ones present could serve all functions, being self-sufficient structures enclosed from the outside with every need already provided for. However, giving the *Turks* a space of their own, built by them, would negate their subordinate position in the context of the European city and provide visibility. When the *provveditore di sanità* Simone Contarini, the engineer Melchiori, and the *provveditore generale* Giacomo Grimani (1732–1735) decided on the position of the *bazzane* during the plague of 1731–1732, they still had these Ottoman structures at their disposal,⁶⁹⁹ but preferred modifying the solutions from personal visual memory. The usage of Western architectural models is therefore a constant, but these models were nonetheless filled with new functions through the process of mediation and translation. This seemingly presents a contradiction. How can a segregated space provide freedom to those that are inside? How can forms that foster exchange, such as the loggia, be used to limit them? The greatest contradiction is between the outside and the inside. The insistence on the otherness of the Islamic domestic experience and the expectations of space and its functions that arise from it resulted in internal functional solutions more-or-less comprehensible to the users of space, notwithstanding the heterogeneous typologies or external forms. There is no need to hybridise or reconcile this *appeasing* interior with the exterior because the exterior is in relation to its immediate surroundings, communicating an inaccessible segregated place to the locals, a place not quite of the city while still being a place of commercial contact with those who are not us.⁷⁰⁰ At the same time, the interior is in linear relation with all other similar structures, both in Venetian and Ottoman lands.

The fact that there was no attempt to reconcile these layers of meaning makes these places a heterotopia – *other places* where an incompatible way of life can freely be observed without disturbing the prevalent social order. Heterotopia was coined by Michel Foucault through a series of lectures to architecture students in 1966/1967 as a term that describes

⁶⁹⁹ Everything in the newly conquered lands that the previous owners abandoned became state-owned. These holdings were slowly *privatised* through investitures given to colonisers.

⁷⁰⁰ The dialectics of opening and closing, suggested by forms and models, can easily be followed in the mentioned afterlife of these structures. During the Austrian and later governments, when the system became redundant, the complex in Split was easily transformed into a prison, a barracks, and ammunition depot, the *bazzana* in Sinj part of the barracks, while the *bazzane* of Imotski, Makarska, and Herceg Novi became markets. In Split and Sinj, the isolation-military aspect was followed, while in other places it was the commercial one. Architectural forms and their meanings allowed both directions.

sites “that have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralise, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect” and which are “capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.”⁷⁰¹ These early modern structures are within the type that Foucault calls *heterotopias of deviations* in which individuals who deviate from the required norm are placed in contemporary times, such as prisons, psychiatric hospitals, and even retirement homes. Another feature of heterotopias is heterochrony, observable in the semi-accessibility of these places only from dawn till dusk when they operated as commercial venues, turning to a real ghetto during the night – again responding to a “system of opening and closing that both isolates them and makes them penetrable.”

Therefore, an architectural model, *foreign form*, would disturb the limits of the social order that these structures aimed to precisely delineate, giving excessive visibility to a phenomenon that was to be kept as invisible as possible. Those differences of Muslim life so insisted upon necessarily moved to the interior, out of sight. Therefore, it was not important to the contemporaries if and how Muslim and Christian housing cultures and practices of daily life overlap. Their incompatibility was important and thus emphasised, because it fit well within the prevalent narrative of the *Other*, justifying separation – the heterotopia, on yet another level. In other words: How can a Muslim (or a Jew) be housed within a Christian household when they are so clearly and completely different? This does not mean that these *specific* solutions are marginal, just the opposite, and were the product of lengthy consultations with mediators, just as the (acceptable) instruments of segregation were.

⁷⁰¹ Michel Foucault, “Des espaces autres,” *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5 (1984): 47.

5.3. Translation as a mechanism of exchange

“All languages are mixed. Neighbouring each other, they borrow from each other.”⁷⁰²

The famous quote by Martin Luther anticipates the post-modern comprehension that contact between cultures inevitably leads to an exchange of some sort. However unintentional, examples of loanwords such as *fondaco*, *bazzana*, *loggia*, *lazaretto*, *gabela*, *bazaar*, *dragoman* and many others are inevitable and found throughout this thesis. Other than words, objects – cultural artefacts travelled through this very network and were reused in a new cultural setting. Especially textiles and other luxury objects went back and forth, affecting fashion trends. However, these small forms are easily transmitted and (re)interpreted while architecture is fixed in place. It needs to be seen, measured, drawn, and observed as it is being used and personally experienced. The lack of an encompassing typology and modes of visual communication, together with the heterotopia of appeasement within segregation, shows that the European tradition could not respond to these problems by itself. In all cases, the facilities provided to the Muslims were adapted into the Venetian frame, so it is worth asking the same question as Peter Burke did in his book *Cultural Hybridity: Who does the adapting?*⁷⁰³ This demonstrated an intellectual struggle of both the patrons and the architects-engineers, remedied through rhetorical and practical means by various mediators.⁷⁰⁴ These mediators most often served as consultants to the projects and their subsequent modifications, and ranged from public dragomans, the so-called assistants of the Turks in Zadar, their innkeepers and brokers to their Catholic consuls in Split and friends among the local merchants. In all cases, these were the people *in-between* – loyal Catholic subjects of the *Serenissima* who understood the Ottoman merchants, had personal

⁷⁰² “Omnes linguae inter se permixtae sunt, quia, cum regiones inter se sint vicinae, mutuatur altera ab altera aliqua vocabula.” Martin Luther, *Tischreden* (Eisleben: Urban Gaubisch, 1566), saying n. 2758.

⁷⁰³ Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press, 2009), 100.

⁷⁰⁴ By rhetorical means I refer to the legitimisation of the *fondaco-bazzana* system as something based on Islamic tradition, while practical means refer to implemented aspects of Islamic housing culture.

experiences in their lands, and who the Ottomans could trust. The implemented system can only be explained through their engagement and the process of cultural translation.

Beginning from Lettino's proposal and the Senate's response, a building for Muslims was envisioned as a space that would need special accommodation. The patron (Senate and the Board of Trade) was mainly concerned with residential segregation based on religion. The instruments of said segregation, internal ethnic separation, eating and sleeping arrangements, and sanitation solutions were accommodated through the engagement of mediators – dragomans for the most part. They tried to present the *Fondaco dei Turchi* as a building based on Levantine models but accustomed to Venetian experiences through the complicated process of cultural translation. When there is cultural encounter, exchange is imminent. However, the responses to this exchange vary between acceptance, rejection, segregation, and adaptation.⁷⁰⁵ They are not exclusive; the acceptance (or appropriation) of certain aspects of Ottoman dress goes hand in hand with the complete rejection of Islam and its practices. Most useful for this study are the notions of segregation and adaptation. Segregation is the willingness to accept some aspects of a foreign culture while denouncing others. The Venetians had no problem with most artefacts of Ottoman provenance as long as religious habits did not go with them.⁷⁰⁶ Even so, certain elements of domestic society (women and children) were best kept as separate as possible to avoid cultural contamination. Adaptation can already be observed in the case of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, and the subsequent implementation of the system at play here referred to as an Ottoman practice. In terms of concrete objects, it is best explained in the case of the *tavolato*. It is undoubtedly part of the Ottoman housing culture but is a simple wide and long bench. This bench was re-imagined as a bed case in Split and Venice or a mezzanine in Klis and Sinj, first de-contextualised from its origin and then re-contextualised as comprehended by Venetian engineers. The widely varying solutions of both the architectural models and the simple household furnishings, such as the *tavolato*, testify to the constant renegotiation of what is needed and why, and how it should look,

⁷⁰⁵ Burke, *Cultural Hybridity*, 79.

⁷⁰⁶ Burke uses the examples of modern pre-industrial Japan and the Ottoman Empire who both coveted Western technology and modernisation, while rejecting cultural Westernisation. Burke, *Cultural Hybridity*, 90.

demonstrating a degree of cultural confusion when met with a different housing culture. To help with this were the mediators – in all cases testified translators.

Translation requires not only knowledge of the source and the target languages but also cultural acquaintance. Translation word for word is not possible, as concept and context need to be interpreted. This is especially true when there is no direct semantic paragon between two concepts. Umberto Eco famously stated: “translation is always a shift, not between two languages but between two cultures.”⁷⁰⁷ This cultural aspect leads to the problem of cultural untranslatability. In the words of J. C. Catford: “[Cultural untranslatability] arises, however, when a situational feature, functionally relevant for the SL [source language] text, is completely absent from the culture of which the TL [target language] is a part. [...] This type of untranslatability is usually less 'absolute' than linguistic untranslatability.”⁷⁰⁸ For example, when Michiel Membré translates the *caravassarà* as *fontego* in his *Relazione di Persia*, he uses a local paragon, but one that is only approximate.⁷⁰⁹ The caravanserais are mercantile lodgings of choice, while the *fontego* is a warehouse, except in the case of the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*, which is again a restrictive space.

Before standardisation (and to some degree even today), the same word would easily have had different connotations for a different individual, depending on personal background. To Membré, before he settled in Venice, the *fontego* might have been the Syrian and Egyptian *funduq*, counting its last days. For any Venetian, it is something else altogether, and especially so for an Ottoman. This means that merchants often needed to negotiate with the Venetian authorities via mediators to establish a decent solution. This also means that the realisations could not be hybrid. There was a limited attempt to reproduce Oriental housing solutions but always burdened by the cultural tradition of the patron, the architect-engineer

⁷⁰⁷ Umberto Eco, *Mouse Or Rat? Translation as Negotiation* (London: Phoenix, 2013), chap. 4, e-book.

⁷⁰⁸ John C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 99.

⁷⁰⁹ Membré, *Relazione di Persia* (1542), 10–13; 22. A comparative example is Hernán Cortés (1485–1547) who called the Aztec temples mosques (*mezquita*) in his letters to Emperor Charles V (1500–1558) evoking an *infidel* temple familiar to the Spanish reader. *Fernando Cortes: his five letters of relation to the Emperor Charles V*, ed., trans. Francis Augustus MacNutt (Cleveland, OH: Arthur H. Clark, 1908), 164, 216, 220, 228, 260, 282, 287, 292

or the craftsmen. At the same time, all consultations with the mediators were of a verbal or written nature, and no visual sources or descriptions were procured. Instead, traditional local forms were filled with new meanings from the simplified explanations of the wider Levantine housing culture. This dialogue between local forms and foreign needs is confirmed in the multilateral discussions during the conceptual process. The large number of participants also required simplification during translation to produce a more uniform understanding.⁷¹⁰ A dragoman might have had a vivid image of an Ottoman house or caravanserai in their mind, but the patron and the architect did not. As a result, we got the architecture of Venetian solutions to Ottoman problems.

⁷¹⁰ Misunderstandings were common. Affected by cultural stereotypes, the Senate in 1575 understood that the building needs bathrooms and regular cleaning services because the tenants were dirtier (than them), not because of cultural requirements known to the mediators.

Appendices ⁷¹¹

- 1) ASVe, *Senato, Terra*, reg. 15, f. 79v (previously f. 64v), June 10, 1505 – transcribed by Simon P. Oakes, “‘Hieronymo Thodesco’ and the Fondaco dei Tedeschi,” 495.

Decision to rebuild the Fondaco dei Tedeschi and a first inquiry into how to do it.

Ser Dominicus Marino

Ser Andreas Venerio

Ser Antonius Trono

Ser Thomas Mocenico

Ser Paulus Trivisanus

Sapientes Consilii

Ser Hieronymus Quirino

Ser Hieronymus Capello

Ser Andreas Lauredano

Sapientes Terrae Firmae

Die X. Junii [1505]

Non e piu da differir la fabrica del fontego nostro di Thodeschi, essendo sta maxime compite le do parte de le fundamente videlicet sopra el canal grande et el rio: Et perche manifestamente se vede, che ampliar dicto fontego e necessario, perchel sera molto ad proposito si di mercadanti, come de la signoria nostra: E ben conveniente etiam á questo proveder.

Et perhó landera parte, chel collegio nostro habi faculta de poter practicar et concluder cum li patroni de quelli stabelli circumvicini al dicto fontego: accio el se possi ampliar: come e al tuto necessario.

Et perche la differentia cum alcuni Patroni de li dicti stabili, bate da v. a vi. per cento solamente: et alcuni se contentano de tanti affitti: Ex nunc sia preso, che quelli del collegio nostro per tuto doman, debano haver concluso cum li dicti patroni: et quello che sera deliberato per dicto collegio á bossoli et ballote cum li do Terçi, sia fermo et valido.

Preterea siano obligati tuti quelli del collegio, per tuta la presente setemana venir á questo Consiglio cum le sue opinion circa el modo de fabricar: accio se possi continuar la fabrica cum diligentia, come sera iudicato expediente.

⁷¹¹ No changes were made to the documents, and any possible errors are left as they are in the original. The author's uncertainties are marked [?], while illegible and missing words are indicated with [illegible].

De parte.....	136
De non.....	12
Non syncere.....	1

- 2) ASVe, Senato Terra, reg. 15, f. 81v (previously f. 66v), June 19, 1505 – transcribed by Simon P. Oakes, “‘Hieronymo Thodesco’ and the Fondaco dei Tedeschi,” 495–496.
Acceptance of the project of Hieronymo Todesco for the Fondaco dei Tedeschi and remarks on its future construction.

Ser Franciscus Barbadico

Ser Aloysius michael

Ser Nicolaus Fuscarenò

Ser Aloysius Venerio

Ser Stephanus Contarini

Ser Andreas gritti

Consiliarii

Ser Franciscus minio

Ser Alexander pisani

Ser Sebastianus Balbi

Capita de xl^{ta}.

Ser Dominicus Marino

Ser Andreas Venerio

Ser Antonius Tronus

Ser Thomas Mocenigo

Ser Paulus Trivisan

Ser Georgius Corneli

Sapientes Consilii

Ser Marcus georgio

Ser Hieronymus Quirino

Ser Hieronymus Capello

Ser Andreas Lauredano

Sapientes Terrae Firmae

Die xviii. Junii [1505]

Havendose cum diligentia visti et ben examinati i modeli del fontego di Thodeschi, apresentadi á la signoria nostra: et considera non esser gran differentia de spesa da luno, et laltro: le ben conveniente satisfar á la grande instantia facta per li mercadanti de esso fontego: i-quali dovendo eser quelli che lo hano ad galder et fruir: Hano supplicato se vogli tuor el modello fabricado per uno de i suo, Nominato Hieronymo, homo intelligente et practico, per esser non mancho de ornamento de questa cita et utele de la signoria nostra, che comodo ad loro, si per la Nobel et ingeniosa compositione et Constructione de quello: come etiam per la quantita et qualita de le camere, magaçeni, volte et botege se farano in esso: dele qual tute se traçera ogni anno de afficto bona summa de danari: Perhó Landera parte, per Auctorita de questo consiglio: la fabriga del fontego suprascripto far se debi: iuxta el modello composto per el prefato Hieronymo Thodescho, et accadendo quello conçar over modificar in parte alcuna, ad benefitio de la signoria nostra et comodo de le mercadantie, haverano ad star in esso: sia da liberta al collegio nostro á bossoli et ballote: passando i do terçi: posserlo fare si come li parera expediente, cum questo perhó, che la faça, et rive da labanda davanti, non sia in parte alcuna alterada, ne mossa: immo sia facta et reducta secundo la forma de esso modello, tuta volta chel non se possi ussir piu fuori in Canal grando cum li scalini de le Rive, de quello e al presente la fundamenta: Et ulterius dove da basso sono magaçeni da la parte de fuori: Redur se debi in tante botege et volte, come stano i altri modelli: Ne se possi in esso fontego far cossa alcuna de marmoro: ne etiam lavoriero alcuno intagliado de straforo, over altro per alcun modo: Ma dove lacadera, far se debi de piera viva batuda de grosso et da ben: si come sera bisogno.

De parte.... 166.

De non....19.

Non syncere.....0

- 3) Luigi Bassano da Zara, *I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de' Turchi* (Rome: Antonio Blado Asolano, 1545), ff. 44v–45v.

On Ottoman homes, living in them, and hospices for travellers.

Delle habitationi de Turchi e del modo che s'alloggia massimamente per gl'Hospitali

Cap. XXXVII

Dal Serraglio del Signore de Bassa, & altri nobili inpoi, tutte l'altre stanze sono bruttissime in Turchia, e mal fatte, sono di legname, di gionchi & pietre come mattoni di creta cotte al sole: in luogo di calce, adoperano il luto, non usano finestre, hanno vanti alla porta un poco di porticale al modo de Villani di Lombardia. Alcune havendo il muro nella strada vi fale finestre, ma alte di modo che chi e dentro non v'arriva, e le ferrano con vetri che non si possono aprire, & se pur' qualche nobile ha finestre, vi tiene una gelosia stretta, e spessa intanto che nó si vede nulla, ne si può aprire, & tutto questo fanno per gelosia, c'hanno delle loro mogli, e donne. Malissimo à ordine stanno di finimenti, non usan panche non sedie, nó letiere, nó tappezzerie, a muri, nella camera: per terra haranno un tapeto, con materazzi, e qui dormano senza lenzuoli, & rare volte si spogliano, mangiano in terra con una tovaglia di coio, la quale lavano có la spugna, & la domandano sofràstendano una corda per mezzo della casa, dove distendono tutti i loro stracci, o vero le mettono dentro uná Botte. Conficano legni spessi per le mura, per appenderci le lor cose: I loro camini fanno tanto fumo, che molto meglio stare alla campagna ch'al fuoco, e chi si vuol scaldare siede in terra fra la cenere. Le stanze sono tutte terrene, non fanno mai bogata, lavano có acqua calda solamente e sapone il quale è fatto con sevo per caristia Polio (però che loro non hanno olivi). Onde i panni son sempre pieni di pedocchi. I piu nobili adoperano il sapone di Venetia, e di Soria. In somma non háno politezza alcuna. Mangiano in rame stagnato sottilmente, tanta ch'apparisca quell bianco. E con tutta questa loro lordissima vita, si reputano i piu dilicati & politici huomini del mondo, ne gli pare cosa ben' fatta senon quella che si fa tra loro. Non si trova bosteria in alcun' luogo di levante. Distante chi cavalca per que paesi, bisogna star sotto il padiglione, l'inverno nelle cappane, tanto basse che per iscomodita, e spesse volte molto meglio il stare alla campagna. Hanno alcuni Hospitali dove hanno delle stanze dette Charvoserà, c'hanno certi camerini da starvi con quattro persone. V'è il camino, ma senza legna, senza letto, senza fieno, senza paglia. V'è la stalla comune, ma da mangiare, cosi per te, come pel Cavallo, bisogna andarlo à trovare altrove. Trovansene di questi luoghi per tutto e de belli e riccamente fatti: molti de quali alloggiano per amor' di Iddio: Molti vogliono un'aspro il giorno. E bisogna ridursi la sera nanzi un' hora di notte, altrimenti non si

trova aperto. Qui i mercanti tengono securissime tutte le loro mercantie, & v'habbitano loro stessi. V'è un guardiano che riscuote, & se cosa fusse robbata egli è obligato, a ritrovarla. Chiamanolo charvasaranzi. In questi ogni natione senza differenza alloggia, & chi prima arrica, piglia la stanza, sia Turcho, Christiano, Moro, o Giudeo. Se ne trova fuora delle Città anchora di questi luoghi, ma senza guardiano, e solamente le mura. Trovasi in alcuni luoghi d'alloggiare tra Christiani, Greci, Serviani, o Bulgari, di qua li ogn'uno accetta volentier Christiani & danno ricapito: Ma sono poveri, ne hanno da darvi altro ch'il coperto. Trovasene alcuno Riccho che per gli vostri denari vi darà quel che domanderete, eccetto cheletto, perche nó l'hanno. Però i Christiani vanno piu volentieri ad alloggiare có questi, che ali Carvoserà. Se la necessita non gli stringe.

4) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia*, 2. serie, busta 187, fasc. 1, Oct. 28, 1574

Supplication of Francesco di Dimitri Lettino for the institution of the Fondaco dei Turchi

Ser[enissi]mo Prencipe et Ecc[ellentissi]ma Signoria

L'immenso desiderio che Io povero Fran[ces]co de Dimitri ho sempre havuto di veder quest' Ill[ustrissi]ma Città, et patria mia libera d'ogni sorte di scandali massimam[en]te da quelli che con segnalata offesa del Signor Iddio, infamia del nome Christiano, et disonor della sua Città, possono occorere mi sprona, a riverentem[en]te esponerle, et ricordar a V[ost]ra S[ereni]tà, et è per fuggir l'inconvenienti che alla giornata soleva succedere nella nation Turchesca di questa Città, di Rubar, et condur via, Garzoni, et Garzone, usar con Donne Christiane, et esser da molti dove alloggiavano Rubbati, et assassinati, come ben speso lor Turchi si lamentano, et diversa altra sorte di errori che possono commetersi si da lor Turchi come contro loro, sia ottima, et necessaria deliberazione il provvedere a detta Natione Turchesca di un loro ridotto, et Albergo particular, come hanno molte altre Nationi, et Genti in questa Città, et come anco lor Turchi nelli loro Paesi di Levante hanno provisto alla Natione Christiana; al qual albergo venendo loro in questa Città debano subitamente ridursi, star, et ivi habitar sin al partir suo, qual loro albergo sii governato, et custodito, se cosi a V[ost]ra S[ereni]tà piacerà per me, et successori miei, senz' alcun dispendio di V[ost]ra S[ereni]tà et ciò in ricompensa di questo buon ricordo, et acciò ritrovandomi carico di moglie con figlioli et figliole 9, oltre 2 nezze [nipoti] di fratello, et due nepoti del d[ett]o, che in questa guerra Turchesca furono fatti prigionieri, habbi modo mediante la molta pietà che suol usar V[ost]ra Ser[enità] verso li miserabili, et discaduti suoi sudditi come sono gl'infelici supplicanti, di poter con la servitù, custodia, et fedeltà mia, et de miei successori mantener, et a qualche modo sostentar essa

mia famiglia miserabile senza la quale buona gratia sua son fuori de ogni speranza di poterla sostentar, et alla Ser[enità] sua, bontà, et clarità prostrato a terra me le raccomando lacrimosamente.

28 Ottobre 1574

5) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia*, 2. serie, b. 187, fasc. 1, Aug. 16, 1575.

Second supplication of Francesco di Dimitri Lettino

Copia di una simile inserta in una parte presa nel Senato a 16 Agosto 1575

Se importantissimo sia l'arrecordo, che io Francesco de Dimitri Lettino hò dato a V[ostra] S[erenità], essa stessa per sua prudentia lo può considerare. Sapendo Io adunque quanto la sua bontà sia pronta a riconoscer coloro, che le da qualche giovevole arrecordo, mi son mosso a riverentemente supplicarla, che quando le piaccia di levar tal Casa della Nation Turchesca, et che alla sua custodia io sia deputato ad haver a memoria, che di continuo bisogna haver tre, et quatro ministri, che ad altro non attendano, che a tener essa Casa monda, essendo tal natione per natura sporca, et che con ogni mia industria, et fatica sia di continuo custodita essa Casa, et insieme le mercantie, che di raggion de tali capitassero, onde le saranno contente tassar, quanto per testa mi habbi ad esser assignato, accioche possa non pur nelle fatiche neccessarie con ogni fedeltà continuar, ma anco spesar, et salariar chi sarà sforzato tener meco in tal opera. Non restarò anco di riverentemente raccordarle, che acciòche manco spesa sii messa alle spalle con tal natione, non sarà fuor di proposito ordinare, che de ogni balla di mercantia, che sarà in esso luoco venduta, il Comprator sia obligato pagar al Custode di esso luoco soldi quatro per beberaggio, il che essa natione non ne sentiva incommodo alcuno, et alli mercanti parerà cosa levissima, anzi in nessun momento in una summa de B [bagattini ?] 200, 300, et 400, et più esborsar soldi quatro, come anco è consueto in Soria [Siria] nelli fonteghi de Christiani, del che V[ostra] S[erenità] si puo informar.

6) ASVe, *Secreta, Materie miste e notabili*, b. 55, fasc. 2, ff. 7r–8r, Sept. 9, 1575.

Proposal of Bartolomeo Vendramin to establish the Fondaco dei Turchi in his osteria Angelo on the Rialto.

Ill[ustrissi]mi et Ecc[ellentissi]mi S[igno]ri Sopraproveditori alla Giustitia Nova.

Havendomi io Barth[olome]o Vendramin fù di m[esser] Andrea ritrovato presente quando che le S[erenità] V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me per cominciar in qualche parte a dar forma, et essecutione all'ordine, che hanno havuto dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato di ritrovar loco da poter unitamente accomodar in esso tutti li Turchi, che vengono in questa città insieme con le loro mercantie, che hora vanno dispersi habitando in diverse case, furono a veder il mio stabile posto in Rialto appresso San Matthio, che soleva esser altre volte l'hosteria con l'insegna dell'Angelo a fine di poter quando questo si fosse parso a proposito per tale effetto farne elettione, sicome credo, che la debba anco esser parso, essendo che il loco (sicome le S[erenità] V[ostre] Ecc[ellentissi]me haveranno potuto con la sua molta prudentia considerar, e col proprio occhio vedere) è copioso di molte, e diverse stantie di ogni qualità si nel piano da basso per accomodar le mercantie grosse, come in tutti li suoi quattro solari per il stantiar delle persone di essi Turchi, e conservar le merci più sottili; è poi così ben serato, et tutto unito, che con puoca fatica può esser guardato da quelli, che ne doveranno haver cura; è vicino alla piazza di Rialto, il che tornerà di molto utile et beneficio a quella natione, la qual non venendo in questa città per altra causa, che per quella di mercantia principalmente, trovava molto commoda questa vicinanza al loco, dove essa haverà da contrattar tutte le sue facende; è finalmente situato in parte, che da commodità a tutti, e non da travaglio ad alcuno: tanto più che io mi offerisco, se ci sarà cosa alcuna, che habbia bisogno, o che pari alle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me che debba esser fatta per maggior commodità, o sicurtà, o per qual si voglia altra causa di dover prontamente farla, quando ne sarà stata fatta l'elettione, sicome ho anco fatto fin hora; percio che quando il mese di Maggio passato sua Ser[enità] e l'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Coll[egi]o mi fece commandamento che io dovessi dar questo mio loco a quel Francesco de Dimitri Litino per l'accomodo delli Turchi, che all'hora in gran n.º erano con diverse merci venuti, io così commandato, et ordinato da questo Francesco [Lettino], e da Michel Membré Dragomano vi feci spesa di piu di sessanta scudi in far le stufte, o lavatori per essi Turchi, in far diverse mostre per le mercantie, et molte altre cose, che a loro parera a proposito; in modo che quelli Turchi, che vi entrarono, vi sono sempre stati comodamente, et volentieri, et partiti quelli, ne sono sopravvenuti degl'altri, e tuttavia ve ne habitano in buon n.º, che se altramente fosse, hora che essi sono in libertà, e non astreti a star in più in quello che in altro luoco, lo haveriano già abbandonato. Mi è parso

conveniente narrar alle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me con ogni sincerità, et verità la serie di tutto questo fatto, accioche elle sappino per questa mia scrittura a punto il tutto, e che parendole, che per le sudette cause, et per li interessi patiti, et spese fatte io sia meritevole del suo favore, et gratia me ne possano far degno; sicome io le prego, se cosi le par ragionevole. Ma perche le S[erenità] V[ostre] Ecc[ellentissi]me e tutti quelli altri Ill[ustrissi]mi S[igno]ri che udirano legger questa mia scrittura conoscano, che appresso il beneficio mio particolar desidero, et procuro anco l'utile publico li dico, che accettandosi questo mio loco per habitatione di tutti li Turchi che vengono in questa città, e con conditione, che nessuno di essi possa habitar in alcuna altra casa, ne stantia che in questa, ne portarvi le loro mercantie dopo tratte dalle Doane, eccetto però gli Amb[asciato]ri che vengono alloggiati, e spesati del denaro publico, che io son contento, che la giuriditione, che io ho dell poter tener hosteria in questo stabile con l'insegna dell'Angelo resti liberam[ente] in dispositione, et volontà di sua S[erenità] o delle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me et Ecc[ellentissi]me le quali possino venderla, donarla, affittarla, o farne quel tanto, che piu le piacerà con patto espresso però, che se in alcun tempo per alcuna occasione, o causa paresse a sua Ser[eni]tà o alle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me di deliberar, o ordinar altro in questa materia, sicche io restassi privo del beneficio di questo alloggiamento dato alli detti Turchi, che io subito possa ritornar nel medesimo stato, et essere, che io son al presente, et mi sia restituita la giuriditione, e libertà di poter tornar ad essercitar l'hosteria nel sudetto mio stabile, e con la predetta mia insegna dell'Angelo, sicome sarà di giustitia; et questo senza eccettione, ne contradictione, ne impedimento alcuno, ne di Sua Serenità, ne delle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ecc[ellentissi]me, ne di qual si vogli altro magistrato, officio, consiglio, o persona particolare, e senza alcun strepito di giudicio, et alla sua buona gratia mi raccomando. Et perche la Serenità V[ostre] e le S[erenità] V[ostre] Ecc[ellentissi]me siano anco chiare della intention mia circa l'affitto di questa mia casa, le aggiungo, che mi contento delli d.[ducati] 300 all'anno, sicome ho anco detto a bocca alle S[erenità] V[ostre] Ecc[ellentissi]me li quali siano tratti dalli primi affitti delle camere, magazeni, et tassa della mercantia da esser fatta.

7) ASVe, *Secreta, Materie miste e notabili*, b. 55, fasc. 2, ff. 11r–13v, Sept. 21, 1575.

Opinion of the dragoman Michiel Membré on the modifications of the osteria Angelo and its administration as the Fondaco dei Turchi.

Clarissimi, et Ecc[ellentissimi]mi Sette Savi della Giustitia Nova in Rialto

Io Michiel Membré fedelissimo Interprete di V[ostre] S[erenità], et amorevole servitore di V[ostre] S[erenità] Clarissime, con ogni diligente mio studio ho procurato, et considerato di quanto sia necessaria et utile l'informatione, che Io debbo dare per istrutione di V[ostre] S[erenità] Clar[issimi]me in materia di provvedere un Alloggiamento in questa Città che sia a proposito, e comodo per doversi albergar tutta la Natione Turchesca con le loro Mercantie. la qual' sia con sodisfatione della Ser[enissima] Signoria, et della detta Natione.

Onde essendo cosa di gran importanza si per esser novo ordine in questa città, come anco per le difficoltà che si potria nascere dovendo oviar il mal e inhonesto vivere che detta Nation era solita di far liberamente nelli suoi alloggiamenti per la qual cosa convien trovar modo tale, che in ogni parte di questo edificio sia ben concordato, et con evidente utilità del publico, et del privato come meglio con la prudentia sua provederano al bisogno di questo negotio, però quanto a me qui sotto capitolo per capitolo farò mentione.

Capitolo Primo. Siando cosa necessaria, et oportuna che detta stantia sia trovata ben ordinata con prestezza senza dilatione, come è ben noto a V[ostre] M[agnificenze] Clarissime, dirò che al presente in essere non si può trovare in questa città pronta, et apparecchiata stantia, e più a proposito per questo effetto che la stantia del Mag[nifico] m[esser] Bartolo Vendramin fù de m[esser] Andrea, in contra[da] di San Mattio in Rialto.

2.º Doppo che V[ostre] M[agnificenze] Cl[arissimi]me parerà de accetar questa stantia per Albergo, e Fontego delli Mercanti della Nation Turchesca ordinerano per patto espresso che tutti li Balconi che rendono luce nelle camere e Porteghi, di fuori via siano fatti in alto con feriate e vedri, che siano duoi piedi, et mezzo per quadro in luce di modo che la Nation Turchesca di dentro via, non possi discoverzere di fuori via, ne quelli di fuori habbino occasione medesimamente a discoverzere, et guardar dentro nelle abitazioni de Turchi, imperoche questo medesimo ordine è osservato in Levante, in Turchia, et Soria [Siria] nella fabrica delli Fonteghi de Mercanti.

3.º Che per patto espresso il Patron della stantia sia obligato di tener li pozzi della detta stantia opulenti di Aqua, et anco continuamente ogni giorno far portar via le scovazze, che si farano in

detto fontego di maniera che continuamente sia tenuto mondo, e netto come sogliono fare in Levante quelli che hanno il cargo delli fontegi.

4.º Che quella persona, la quale havrà il cargo di custodire la porta di detto fontego sia obligato per patto, et pena espressa che a 24 hore sia serata la porta del detto fontego con buono, et sicuro cadenazzo, et chiave, ne si possa di notte per modo alcuno, et parimente habbi il cargo di averzere la mattina nel levar il sole custodendo la porta che per alcun modo non ardisca ne permetta che in detto fontego intrasse, ne di giorno, ne di notte persone sbarbate; havendo sempre la mira di guardar, che non si portino dentro azzali, ne lame, ne cose proibite, ma che in caso fossero portate, havuta la nova, al' hora senza scandalo immediato debba denunziarlo alli Cl[arissi]mi Avogadori di comun, et qualunque fiata detto portinaro havesse notitia di tal cosa, et non havra fatto il debito suo sia tenuto delinquente.

5.º Perche li Mercanti Turchi, che vengono in questa Città sono di diversi Nationi, et diversi paesi; abenche tutti siano di una fede, et setta, nondimeno hanno diversi costumi, indifferente una nation dal altra per il che alloggiandosi insieme non si accordano di star in pace et se non fosse il gran timor che tengono della loro giustizia, et della gran severità delli ministri del lor Prencipe, non potriano albergar insieme nelli loro fonteghi. Dico dunque che al presente levandoli la libertà del suo solito vivere in questa città, et anco farli habitar tutti in un fontego, senza dubbio gli parerà cosa molto strana. La onde spinti da certi sanseri di mala qualità, havranno da correr in Collegio per ottener la lor solita libertà di alloggiar ove gli piace, però per rimediar a questo riverentemente dico che starà bene, che per spatio di qualche tempo, sin che queste nationi si desmestigassero [addomesticassero] in questo albergo, et redurli nel quiete vivere fosse destinato il cap[itano] che fa la guardia al ponte di Rialto, il qual habbi il cargo di custodire, et tenir in fren li abitanti del ditto fontego si per terror accioche tra lor turchi non seguisca scandalo alcuno; si anco per tenir in freno li sanseri, et altri delli nostri di mala qualita, li quali si fano leciti contro le proclame, et ordine di Sua Serenità dar molesti a questa natione et massimamente perche nelli contratti, et mercedi loro forzamente con le armi in mano gli basta l'accio contendere con la detta natione, et un senser con l'altro voler far mercato contro il voler del patron della robba. Dove che per mia opinione la detta provisione è molto neccessaria da esser fatta per beneficio delli detti mercanti Turchi, e della giustizia; imperoche dalla utilità che renderà il detto fontego si caverà tanto che basterà a pagar tutte le spese che saranno necessarie, senza dar molestia, ne gravezza superflua alli detti Turchi, sicome qui sotto sarà dichiarito.

6.º Che per ridur alla perfetion quest' utilissima et ottima operatione, et per haver loco la deliberatione dell Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, parendo a V[ostre] Mag[nificen]tie Clarissime che la

persona di me suo servitore farà bisogno di star di giorno in giorno in detto fontego per concordar li animi delli detti Turchi et amonirli in caso di discordia tra loro fino che si assetasero, et parimente per tenir le loro ragioni nelli mercadi che contrassero con li nostri secondo il carico che ho della Ser[enissi]ma Sig[no]ria mi offro di farlo con tutti quelli modi, desterità, antivedere, et altro che sarà necessario, et a me possibile per il beneficio di Sua Ser[eni]tà, et per la quiete del una, et l'altra parte, con piena autorità però, che le terminationi della Ser[enissi]ma Signoria già fatte in materia delli sanseri che contrasseno mercadi con la nation predetta del tutto, et per tutto debbano essere osservate, et inviolabilmente eseguite, et quelli che contrafarano criminalmente sia giudicati, et castigati per l'ufficio di V[ostre] Cl[arissi]me Mag[nificen]tie come quelli che sono stati causa, et instrumento di quella bona, et religiosa opera.

7.º Che sia fatto ordine del Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato che ni uno delli sanseri ordinarij di Rialto, et anco straordinarij non ardiscono sotto gravissime pene intrar nel ditto fontego con le arme, et voler per forza mostrar la robba delli turchi alli nostri mercadanti per doverla vendere con intention, et presuposito di guadagnar la metà della sensaria, abenche non restassero d'accordo di far il mercato imperoche nella regola delli sanseri dice che chi mostrerà la mercantia ancor che non facesse mercato, se sarà venduta per un altro sanser il primo che l'havrà monstrata ha da conseguir la mettà della sensaria per la qual cosa nasce tumulti grandi tra sanseri, et mercanti turchi, et mettono mani alle arme di maniera che non provvedendo a questo inconveniente potria nascer qualche gran scandalo, et dano. Dico dunque che a questi tali sensali che saranno disobidienti il preditto cap[itano] hauta la parola di me debba retenerli fin che la Giustizia cognosca il mancamento di cadauno per farli castigare per essemplio delli altri, imperoche senza la obediencia non si può governar questo fontego.

8.º Che sia provisto che quando li mercanti Turchi haverano fatto mercato delle sue mercantie con li nostri Christiani, et con intervento, et saputa mia, li sanseri non ardiscono levar, et portar via la robba del fontego senza far cautar il Turco del amontar di ditta robba, overo che il mercante turco di sua spontania volontà voglia darla, et fidar il suo denaro al mercante che la compra; perche a inteligentia di V[ostre] Cl[arissi]me Mag[nificen]tie di duoi anni in qua li sanseri si fanno lecito di far mercato della robba delli turchi con li forestieri dico di somma di migliara di ducati dando ad intendere alli Turchi che sono sicuri del suo havere; al che potria succedere, che li turchi perdessino il suo cavedale [capitale] per le cose che occorono alla giornata com'è noto a V[ostre] M[agnificenze] Cl[arissi]me.

9.º Mi resta ancor a dir alcuni ordini, che saranno necessari da esser messi in consideration in materia della utilita che Sua Ser[eni]tà per conto del publico potra cognoscere, et conseguir per

causa di ditto fontego senza gravezza di ditti Turchi, ne di altri. Quali ordini io mi riservo a dire quando piacerano a Sua Ser[eni]tà. Fin qui sia ditto quanto aspetta alli ordini che bisognerano per mia oppinion esser fatti per la conservation, et vincolo di questo novo fontego de Turchi.

X.º Havendo io calculato per piu vie, et modi quello hano da pagare li mercadi Turchi per conto di affitto di questo fontego; et visto, revisto, et considerato quello ho potuto in questa materia, et havendo visto le stantie dove che si ha da il ditto fontego, et numerato le camere, et magazzeni, et calculato la spesa che anderà per conto del ditto fontego, trovo che li turchi mercanti sicuramente potranno contentarsi a pagar il fitto qui sotto specificato.

Li magatteni da basso grandi a d[uca]ti 3 al mese dichiarando che il di [?] che haverano le chiavi delli magazzeni allora [al'ora ?] al principia il fitto, et se ben non fosse compito il mese, che havesse spedito la sua robba, sia obligato pagar per un mese intiero, et cosi s'intenda che debba esser di tutti li magazzeni, et camere.

Li Magazzeni più piccoli a d[uca]ti 2 al mese

Li Mezzadi grandi a d[uca]ti 3 al mese, et li più piccoli d[ucat]i 2

Le camere grande del primo soler a d[uca]ti 3 al mese, et le più piccole a d[uca]ti 2 dichiarando che non habino da stantiare più di quatro persone per ogni camera, et stando de piu debbano pagar soldi otto per testa al giorno, et questo s'intende per tutte le altre camere

Le camere maggior del secondo soler per esser comode da merle le mercantie debbano pagare d[uca]ti 4 al mese, et le minore d[uca]ti 3

Le camere del terzo soler con fatto, che siano grande per essere in alto debbano pagar d[uca]ti 3 al mese.

Et perche in questo albergo del fontefo oltra le camere, ogni soler ha il suo portigo molto comodo, et lucido; mettendo robba in quelli habbino da pagar questa limitatione, et dormendovi di notte habbino da pagar per testa al giorno soldi 4.

Per ogni collo di seda s[oldi] 10

Per ogni collo di specie, et drogarie s[oldi] 8

Per ogni collo di cordovani s[oldi] 4

Per ogni tavola di zambelotti s[oldi] 6

Per ogni collo di cera s[oldi] 4

Per ogni collo di tapedi s[oldi] 4

Per ogni collo de imboio s[oldi] 12

XI. Quello debbono pagare li mercadanti nostri che comprano robbe dalli Turchi, et le trazzeno fuori del fontego, et delli magazzeni sottoposti al ditto fontego habino da pagar per beverazzo delli

custodienti del ditto fontego, et per altre spese che convien fare per la conservation del ditto fontego la sottoscritta limitatione. Essendo cosa osservata per tutto il paese del Levante, et massimamente qui in Venetia sempre hano pagato li compradori cortessissimamente senza essere astretti ne obligati il ditto beverazzo della qual cosa io faccio questa fede:

Per ogni collo di seda s[oldi] 10

Per ogni collo di specie, et drogarie s[oldi] 8

Per ogni collo di cordovani s[oldi] 4

Per ogni tavola di zambelotti s[oldi] 6

Per ogni collo di cera s[oldi] 6

Per ogni collo di tapedi s[oldi] 4

Per ogni collo de imboio s[oldi] 4

Suplico dunque a V[ostre] M[agnificenze] Cl[arissi]me che quelle per sua bontà mi habbino per escuso, se in questa facenda io non ho saputo far cosa degna alla sapientia, et prudentia di quelle dando la colpa al mio debole ingegno, accetando il mio desiderio, che tengo di servirle, et honorarle in tutto quello che io potrò fare con ogni mia forza, et alla bona gratia di quelli humilmente mi racc[oman]do.

Di Venetia adi 21 Settembre 1575

8) ASVe, *Senato, Deliberazioni, Mar*, filza 69, Jan. 13, 1576 m. v.

Supplication of Daniele Rodriga for the establishment of the scala di Spalato.

Il fine che mi sono proposto Io Daniel Rodriga hebreo già molti anni inanzi la Guerra et dopo è stato di giovare et servire alla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra. Atrato da questo ardentissimo desiderio, ho impiegata la persona et la spesa diversamente travagliando, et mi sono più volte sottoposto a gravi pericoli et in qualche parte credo haver dimostrato evidente et utile testimonio della mia volontà. Ma fra l'altre cose in che mi sono adoperato è stato il manifestare molti miei pensieri; proporre molti miei raccordi et offerirmi a varij servitij della Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra di un solo degli 5 [?] io fossi statosi fortunato in finirle come sono stato divoto et industrioso in proponerlo haverei [?] in buona parte satiato il mio desiderio, et la mia vecchia inclinatione con qualche maggior gratia di V[ost]ra Sub[limi]tà et mia maggior riputatione. Ma è occorso parte per la molteplicità del negotio, parte per la neccessità del governo, et parte per mia avversa fortuna ch'io non habbi potuto veder alcun frutto della mia opera, benche molte cose per me offerte et raccordate siano state da V[ostra] Ser[eni]tà accettate et commendate, cosi che ella sia restata in un certo modo defraudata delle sue utilità, et di me di cui molto si prometteva la natione levantina sia fatta in certo modo dubiosa et restia: Onde nel mezzo delle mie maggiori speranze et della sua gratia mi sia occorso cascare appresso i miei di opinione et di stima. Hora dopo tante difficoltà et dopo mio lungo et travaglioso servitio, poi che pure di novo mi ritrovo in questa Città Capitato; anzi venuto con la moglie et con la casa per ben servendo morire sotto questo Ser[enissi]mo Stato, non ho dovuto mancare di portare qualche dono quasi come rinovamento della mia servitù nova et importantissima cosa promovendo et raccordando, la quale se io sarò bastante al guadagnarmi le forze per condurla a compimento posso largamente promettere non solo di allargare il commercio a questa Inclita Città, et accrescere le utilità pubbliche, et le private commodità; ma assicurare in buona parte la salvezza del Golfo et levare molti impacci che per occasione di l'Uscocchi variamente traviagliano la Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra. Per tanto brevemente raccontando ciò che mi trovo bastante di ridurre a compimento mi offerisco di dricciare nella sua terra di Spalato una ricchissima et amplissima scala et assumendomi io il peso di travagliare sù et giù; di accomodare le strade di dricciare hostarie, preparare Cavalli, et altra cosa espediente al fondare il commercio in poco spatio di tempo stabilire in questa Città uno pretiosissimo corso; dallo esito del qual negotio da me saldamente trattato et coi doni et con la grand' importanti huomini Turchesci contrattato et fondato, posso con raggione sperare qualche maggior credenza dalla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra sotto il cui benigno favore habbi a dare ad altri pensieri felicissimo fine. Da questa importantissima scala capiteranno molte merci et mercanti in questa

Città; cascherà necessariamente per gli incontri ch'io ho il negotio di Narenta et di Castelnuovo, il cui traffico è occasione delle fuste turchesche. Gli uscochi non così vicini et opportuni ma per lunga distantia remoti non turberanno con tanto danno la sicurezza del Golfo. Divertendosi il traffico della Scala di Ragusa sarà la terra di Spalato un'amplissimo alveo alle ricchezze di Levante il qual tutto intiero sarà trasmesso nella vostra Città et finalmente per non poter spiegar in penna le infinite commodità di questo novo disegno saranno aggrandite le entrate pubbliche, sarà aggrandita la dignità, sarà arricchita la povertà con la varietà et molteplicità delle merci le quali sostenteranno la industria di tante arti della Città et si allargheranno più sempre le private ricchezze. A perfettione di così ben disegnato proposito può con honeste conditioni et con nessuno interesse esser prestato honesto favore dalla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra alla quale queste quattro cose solamente ammirando.

Prima. La libertà di esso transito per le robbe anderanno et veniranno per levante come ha la Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra concesso a Corfù et a Zante, et più che siano in ogni tempo et occasione di guerra così le Mercantie come le persone di che nation si voglia che si troveranno in detta terra di Spalato, et nel Lazaretto sicure senza esser molestate in niuna maniera a tal che il traffico di essa scala non sia conturbato, ne la utilità della Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra diminuita.

2. Un comodo Lazaretto per sboriar le Mercantie fuora o dentro di Spalato come parrerà alla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra, che sia ben sicuro et serrato per difendersi da cattive genti.

3. Che li privilegi dimandati da me per Avanti alla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra siano concessi a tutti i mercanti che nation si voglia habitanti con le loro famiglie nel Stato della Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra conforme ai Cap[itoli] di essi Privileggi.

4. Che la Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra mi concedi lettere patenti generali che comandi a tutti li rappresentati di Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra così di mare, come di terra che debbiano dar aiuto et favore a tutte quelle cose che giornalmente accascheranno et conosceranno et di benef[ici]o della Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra, et comodo et utile del neg[ozio], notificando in esse h[ono]re esser io Procurator generale della nation hebrea in ogni et qualunque cosa potrà occorrere per beneficio suo così in mare come in terra fuora però di questa Inclita Città di Ven[ezi]a nella quale non ricerco intromettermi se non solo nelle cose concessemi dalla nation sotto 19 Genaro 1573. La qual nation hebrea non permette ne concede che ne io ne altri possa haver autorità di Consolato in Venetia.

Quanto poi al carico mio che veramente in questi principij sarà di molto travaglio et spesa per aprir la detta Scala et che la Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra non habbi a sentir alcun interesse anzi grand[issim]o utile io ricerco la Impositione che io le presento la quale è sottoscritta et laudata da mercanti per cosa honesta. Et detta Impositione non voglio in niuna maniera sia messa sotto nome di Datio, ma che la

Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra la chiami sotto nome della fabrica et spese di Lazaretto, et tal Impositione si debbia cavar per anni Cinque et sia raccolta et partita in questo modo cioè la metà per la fabrica et spese del Lazaretto et del neg[ozio], et l'altra metà mi sia data libera a me ò alli miei heredi et successor per detti anni Cinque di mesi sei in mesi sei. Il quel tempo di detti anni Cinque debbia cominciar mesi tre doppo la confirmatione dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Pregadi, et mi sia data detta metà senza niuno mio interesse per far le spese mi occorreranno fare in Turchia con Sangiacchi, Voivodi, Emini, et Nasori, et altre molte spese che necessariamente mi occorreranno, che lungo sarei narrarle tutte alla Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra. Questo è Ser[enissi]mo Prencipe ciò che mi è bastato l'animo di pensare et alle forze di ottenere per benefi[ci]o et per ampliam[en]to di questa Ecc[ellentissi]ma Rep[ubbli]ca. In questo Indirizzo veramente io prometto di conseguir poca mia utilità ma sarà mio importante Tesoro il buon nome che io mi guadagni con la Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra et la honesta riputazione con la mia natione per le quali due cose ho rinvigliato [?] tanto tempo ho patito tanti dispendij et tanti pericoli passati. Et poichè di grandi honori civili non è capace la mia virtù ne la mia natione mi con tali depressioni resterò consolato poi che io veggo haver travagliato per riuscita di grandi imprese per la gran' [grandezza] et la utilità della Ser[eni]tà V[ost]ra. La qual voglio credere non sia immemore delle mie continue spese et fatiche che volentieri ho fatto tanto tempo et farò sempre per l'utile et beneficio del suo Ser[enissi]mo Dominio. Et alla buona gratia riverentemente m'inchino et raccomando.

13 Gennaro 1576

[Signed in the Hebrew alphabet, transliteration by Viktor Morpurgo:]

Matatja bahar Moshe

Moshe Abduraham

Josef bahar Menahem Akohen

Moshe bahar Macliah Nafussi

Flijau Marori

Josef bahar Avram Baruh

Josef Fresco

9) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Prima serie*, b. 492, *Lettere*, f. 195r, Mar. 17, 1593.

Instructions given to the engineer Bartolomeo Galese and a cavacanalè.

A 17 Marzo 1593

Habbiamo deliberato di mandar in quella città con la galea da mercantia un Proto, et un cavacanalè, accio che diligentemente si possano informare di quanto sarà nec[essario] conforme all'ordine che li habbiamo dato in scrittura, la copia del quale mandamo anco a V[ostra] S[erenità] Cl[arissi]ma accio che il tutto sia fatto con il suo parere, et consiglio procurando di far che habbiamo quelle altre informationi, quella giudicherà piu a proposito per questo servitio secondo la sua solita prudenza et diligentia, et quanto prima far che detti operarij diino [siano ?] fissi a questa fattura, et si espediscono, accio che ritornati si possa poi fondatamente venir alla rissoluzione di quanto sarà giudicato nec[essar]io.

Commissione data a Bartolomeo Galese provisionato all'Off[icio] delle acque

A 17 Marzo 1593

Volendo noi esser a pieno informati della qualità, sito et stato della doana et lazaretto di Spalato, et dello stato del porto di quel loco habbiamo pero deliberato di mandar voi Bartolomeo Galese provisionato all'Off[icio] delle acque come persona perita, et intendente in questo servitio con li infrascritti ordini, vi commetteremo pero noi Giulio Michiel et Cinque Savi sopra la mercantia che vi dobbiate trasferire quanto prima a Spalato con la commodita della galea da mercantia però, per partirsi, dove gionto [?] immediato vi apresentarsi dinanzi il Cl[arissi]mo Conte di quella città facendo caso con sua Sig[nor]ia Cl[arissi]ma di quanto vi sarà bisogno per questo servitio. Trovate in disegno tutta la doana et lazaretto con li debite misure, et distantie, cosi di quello che è fabricato come del loco, che si ha da fabricare con quello più particolarità che saprete, et si come vi habbiamo anco discorco a bocca, et si vi consegna il disegno per maggior vostra instruttione. Informandovi parimente della qualità di homini, marangoni, mureri et altri operarij che siano in quella città atti per il servizio di detta fabrica, se vi saranno pietre, calcina, legnami et altre cose nec[essar]ie et a che prezzo, et con che avantagio, et nell'andar et ritorno a Pirano vi informerete con diligentia delli prezzi delle pietre, coppi et della spesa che si potesse fare per condur dette robbe a Spalato. Riconoscerete parimente quella parte del porto che è verso la città scandagiando il detto porto, et rivedendo la porporella, over muolo, et di quanto sarà nec[essar]io intorno ciò informandovi se la a Spalato vi saranno persone atte che possino servire o per principali o per aiutanti nella escavazione di esso porto, et a che prezzo si potranno havere essi operarij avertendo [?] particolarmente il

cavacanalè che mandamo con voi di tutte quelle cose che giudicarete di considerazione et ne[cessar]ie per la escavazione di detto porto così della spesa che vi potrà andare, come del tempo che si potrà spendere in detta opera. Et il tutto con diligentia poi in scrittura vi commetteremo, che al ritorno vostro vi dobbiate far sapere il qual farete che sia quanto prima affinché ben informati possiamo poi venir alla deliberatione di quanto sarà ne[cessar]io facendo che d'ogni operatione vostra quel Clarissimo Conte ne habbia a pieno notizia. Vi habbiamo fatto consegnar cechini 20, a bon conto della provisione vostra, la quale sarà a ragion del cechino uno al giorno. Et così vi commetteremo che dobbiate eseguire, aggiungendo voi con la vostra diligentia a quel di piu, che fosse necessario et che giudicasse di beneficio di questo negozio.

Comissione data al Cavacanalè

A 17 Marzo 1593

Noi Giulio Michiel et detti [?] commetteremo a voi che dobbiate transferirvi con l'occasion della galea da mercantia che si partira quanto prima nella città di Spalato dove gionto insieme con il proto con il quale andarete in compagnia rivederete, et riconoscerete il porto di quella città misurandolo, et scandagiandolo dove sarà bisogno, et vi informerete circa li operarij, et gente che potesse servire di la a detta escavatione, et a che prezzo si potranno havere, et di legnami, et feramenta et instrumenti che saranno ne[cessar]ij et parimente del tempo che vi andera nel far detta opera, et finito tutto cio vi ritornerete in questa città quanto prima dandomi poi del tutto con vostra scrittura particular informatione. Vi habbiamo fatto consignare ducati 10, a bon conto di vostra provisione a ragion di ducato mezo al giorno et così eseguirete con diligentia, con quel di piu che essendo [?] sopra il loco giudicherete ne[cessar]io facendo che di ogni cosa quel Cl[arissi]mo Conte vi sia a pieno informato.

10) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Prima serie*, b. 142, *Risposte*, ff. 78r–79r.

Excerpt of the opinion of the Cinque Savi on the modifications to be made on the scala di Spalato.

Scala di Spalato per le suoi provisioni per le galere, et per il novo partito

1608, 11 Luglio

La scala di Spalato, che con tante leggi et con tanta spesa è stata dalla S[erenti]tà V[ostra] introdotta diffusa et conservata con l'occasion del constagioso male a quella città ultimamente occorso et per gratia del S[igno]r Dio hora cessato, ha patito come lo è ben noto cattivissimi incontri, poi che li m[ercan]ti et altri, che attendivano alla conservatione di quel negotio si sono divieti per altre scale aliene con malificio delli datij et traffico di questa città, et di essa medesima scala, ma però non siamo fuori di speranza. Anzi stimiamo che sij per tornare nel suo pristino stato quando sijno fatte ad essi merchanti le commodità, et provisioni nec[essa]ri, perche da essi allottati habbino modo di continuar questo viaggio piu facile, piu sicuro et piu commodo delle altre scale, et per hora tralasciando li beneficij, che si sono ricevuti da questa scala, et che si possono ricever, poi che l'usi d'una volta sono stati esplicati in altre scritture per l'off[ici]o nostro, per studio di brevità li racconteremo solamente il bisogno delle provisioni nec[essar]ie perche di novo si possa ben stabilire così utile et importante negotio, onde primitramentre [?] li dicemo. Esser grandemente necessario il dar ordine che siano finite le stanze del lazaretto vecchio, che restano ancora imperfette, perche essi mercanti possino haver commodita maggiore nel sborar, et governar li loro mercantie in quel modo, che si conviene per questo servitio come si dira più a basso.

Et perchè essi mercanti hanno specialmente grandissimo bisogno di acqua per dar da beber alli loro animali, et per servitio delli loro bagni, et altra necessita, per causa di che li fu fabricata la cisterna in quella doana con molta spesa publica, et essendo noi informati che essa cisterna produce acqua salsa, et non buona per la poca diligentia usata in essa opera. Onde essi poveri mercanti, che vengono di lontano assetati, et desiderio di sollevamento con le loro caravane vengono a patri grandemente pero per principal provisione reputamo il dar ordine, che di novo sia rifatta, et accommodata essa cisterna, providendo al difetto si che possa produrre acqua buona dolce, et atta a servitij loro.

Et appresso a questo sara anco nec[essar]io far accommodar le gorne di quella doana, dalli quali vengono transmesse le acque in essa cisterna, per di per quanto intendemo sono guaste, et rotte, et vien per ciò impedito il corso loro.

Et oltre a ciò è anco necessario far salizar il cortile di essa cisterna perche possino scovar le acque nette pure, et facile per esso cortile in essa cisterna, et non per fanghi, o terren sporco che va producendo anco il cattivo gusto di esse.

È servitio nec[essar]io che la galea possi nel caricar, et discaricar le mercantie haver acqua recipiente nel porto di quella città, o in altro loco, che vien giudicato piu commodo, questo li dicemo, perche se ben con molta spesa, et interesse publico è stato cavato esso porto piu di una volta, non di meno essa spesa si vede esser riuscita vana, poi che in poco tempo si è di novo atterrato, onde la galea per questa causa riceve nel caricar molto incommodo, et pericolo, et volendosi ancora di novo far esso cavamento si perderrà la spesa, et opera insieme, pero sara meglio sicome viene raccordato far un nuovo porto dietro il Lazaretto Vecchio, che riuscirà loco piu commodo, et capace, et si redurrà con manco spesa come vien detto, et utilissimo a questo servitio.

Dicevano ancora grandissimo malificio essi mercanti nel far più di una contumacia, et restano percio grandamente disgustati con molto incommodo spesa, e travaglio, oltre il disturbo delle loro mercantie, onde sara nec[essar]io terminar, che faccino una sola contumacia, dove, et come meglio parera alla S[ereni]tà Vostra perche ricevino anco in cio honesta sodisfattione.

[...]

11) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Prima serie*, b. 142, *Risposte*, ff. 100v–104v.

Second opinion of the Cinque Savi on the improvements and modifications to the scala di Spalato

1608 [m. v.] 4 Zener – Spalato provisionij per la scala, lazaretto, et doana

Desiderando le Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me haver particular informatione del stato presente della scala di Spalato per proveder, a ,quando dalla loro prudenza fosse stimato bisogno per mantener, et accrescer quel viaggio, Il quale troviamo in stato di ricever notabil augumento si per occasion della pace seguita tra la Maesta dell Imperator et Il gran Signor, mediante la qual resteranno nelle provincie della Crovatia, Bossina, Ongaria Inferior, et Superior, Valachia, Transilvania, e Moldavia, il commercio libero, et le strade sicure, che daranno occasion di concorer con le loro m[ercan]tie alla scala di Spalato come luogo commodo, et opportuno per la qualità di suoi negotij; fara anco augumento di assai considerabile conseguenza le sede che partendo di Persia facevano il suo viaggio per via delle svale del levante; hora lacuni mercanti di quella nation per viaggio novo, et non prima di questi tempi usato sono venuti con le sue sede fino a Spalato, et in questa città, essendosi imbarcati nel mar Caspio, et sbarcatisi al confin di Giorgiani, havendo poi continuato il suo camino fino al mar negro, dove si sono la seconda volta imbarcati per Constantinopoli hanno poi fatto il suo viaggio per terra fino a Spalato [...].

Dalle cose sopradette puo considerar le Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] che quel lazaretto di Spalato non sara capace per supplir al sboro della m[ercan]tia che in esso capiterà, servendo alco al presente tanto strettamente per l'angustezza di esso che per non poter le m[ercan]tie ricever il debito sboro l'officio Cl[arissi]mo della sanita di questa citta non puo in ogni tempo assicurarsi di licentiarla, come libera d'ogni suspetto, et il darle due contumacie riesce con deterioramento delle robbe, spesa, et longhezza insoportabile. Pero sara conveniente proveder che la mercantia venga libera in questa citta sicche possa a sua gionta senza alcun perioco esser licentiata.

Quanto al luoco dicemo, che quel Lazaretto vecchio, ove al presente si fa la contumacia non puo per la sua angustezza servir al bisogno ne per le persone ne per la mercantia, et quello che piu importa si trova non picciola difficulta nell' allargarlo per esser situato in un'Angolo che non puo ricever beneficio salvo con allargarsi sopra l'acqua, quando però non si volesse occupar parte del stradon, che è tra li lazaretti, et la muraglia della città.

Il Lazaretto novo, che serve per le m[ercan]tie et mercanti che hanno finito la contumacia, et per li effetti che vengono portati da Venetia è alquanto piu capace dal vecchio come dal modello si vede

però lauderissimo che per il presente omentano [?] bisogno si valesse del novo per il sboro, et il vecchio fosse destinato al bisogno, che hora serve il novo, facendo alquanti stancie appoggiate alla muraglia delli lazaretti dalla parte di fuora accio supplisca al bisogno della galea, et altro.

Questa provisione servira a qualche maggior commodo de mercanti, et sicurezza della sanita, si ben non dovera le Ecc[ellen]ze Vostre fermarsi in questa sola provisione, ma senza dilation pensar di allargar le fabriche di alcuna delle parti delli lazaretti, o sia dalla parte del vecchio o del novo, che ambidui sono confinati dall'acqua si che d'ogni parte sara necessario fondar in acqua. Sopra il qual particolare non dilateremo il nostro discorso, si piu espressamente non ne sara significata la sua volonta. Questo solo diremo, che se la scala augumentera di negotio, come siamo informati et la ragion lo permete, per le cose dette di sopra li mercanti sentiranno molti incomodi, et la mercantia assai deterioramento, convenendo sostar al scoperto esposta a sol et pioggia per mancamento di fabriche in modo tale, che quando non se li facesse maggior et miglio commodità, canterà [?] come accennano li Turchi in suo memoriale il far voltar li mercanti alla scala di Ragusi con pregiuditio gravissimo di questa città et altrettanto commodo d'Ancona, Livorno, Messina, et altre però incittiamo le Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] a pensarvi, et proveder avanti segua il disordine, che riverentemente le rapresentiamo essendo noi informati che si pensa et si procura ad ogni industria, et aletamezo [?] di sviar questa scala di Spalato. Et non resti le Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] di proveder al bisogno per spesa ingorda, che fosse seguita per il passato nelle fabriche di quelli lazaretti la qual troviamo esser da suo principio fin questo tempo presente di 27 m[ille] in c[irca] i quali si siano stati ben e fruttuosamente impiegati in quelle fabriche non lo possiamo referire. Quanto alla sicurezza della sanita, e buoni provisioni sopra il sboro principalmente fa bisogno che il Prior sia persona di buona condition si per haver obediencia nel suo carico come perche non faccia indignita, che lo rende odioso senza alcuna stima, come del presente l'universita delli Turchi, et hebrei se ne duol con suo memoriale imputandolo de tristezza, che sara bisogno indagar della verita, et proveder. Nella elettione di questo Priore presente vediamo esser detto che lo saranno dati li ordeni, che dovera osservare nel suo carico non di meno non si vede che fin hora li suoi emolumenti. Si doverà quanto prima proveder alla imperfettion del pozzo, che con molta spesa si fece li anni passati, l'acqua dal quale vien affirmato esser salsa, ne altra ve ne sono in quelli lazaretti, alimento a tutti bisognoso, et alli Tuchi necessarissimo, per il qual mancamento convengono sentir molto interesse con pericolo della sanita, per la conversatione di necessariamente convien esser permessa a quelli, che portano l'acqua. La provision dovera esser il mandar il perito di quella profession, et dopo fatte le debite provisioni, non facendo riuscita si potra ridurlo in cisterna. Essendo li lazaretti per la loro angustezza incapaci delli mercanti Turchi, et hebrei con suoi haveri, però non è da permettersi che

d'altri particolari siano occupati, come intendiamo esser al presente pero si dovera quanto prima farli liberar formando processo da chi sono goduti statie, et magazeni chi li hano concessi, et quello, che pagassero di affitto, et a chi per parte delli mercanti Turchi vien fatta condoglienza che la distribution delle stantie, et magazeni nelli lazaretti vien fatta parzialita, et essendo conveniente che non li sia fatto torto, si dovera commandar al Prior che faccia la compartita sincera senta premio assignandole la pena conveniente se confratacesse dovendo esser prohibito ad esso Prior di esser agente de mercanti in riccever non robbe sotto pena de privation del carico et altre pene, come meglio parera a sue Ecc[ellenze].

Non havendo la nation Turca particolar persona come hanno li hebrei col mezo del qual stando nella contumacia possi proveder alli suoi bisogni et aggravandosi di sentir incommodo nella provision di viveri per loro uso, si potria far saper alla loro universita che volendo possi per suo comodo nominar persona che habbi cura di proveder alli suoi bisogni. Per levar li fraudi delli pagamenti che fossero pretesi indebitamente da chi si sia per qual si voglia causa si dovera stampar la tariffa o capitoli delle cose piu principali da esser osservate si nelli lazaretti, come fuora, et tradotti anco in lingua Turca a maggior sodisfattione di quella nation, affiggrali in luochi conspicui nelli lazaretti et in altro luoco stimato conveniente per diffenderquanto piu sia possibile dalle estorsioni, et mali trattamenti che possono esser fatti a questa natione, che da parti stranierevengono con li suoi effetti in questa città sara opportuno rimorso a quelli, che havessero cattiva intention l'obligar il savio alla mercantia, che si trovera in settimana all'arrivo della galea d' pigliar costituito con la sua presenza da ne monsulmani, et altrettanti hebrei, se nelli lazaretti, o altrove li sara stato stato tolto o in altro modo strussati [?], ovvero se fossero stati astretti a vender le sue mercantie o, parte di essi, come par che alcuna volta se ne siano doluti, o, in altro modo dalli ministri, o, rappresentanti publici, o, in terra, o, in mar le fosse stato estorto pagamento indebito. Il qual esame non possi esser tralasciato sotto quelle stretze, che alla loro prudenza parisse di commetter, et trovando transgressioni digne di castigo sia cio esseguito per quel Magistrato, che piu piacera alle Ecc[ellenze] V[ostre]. Alla sicurezza della sanita giovera, che li [g]uardiani siano di questa citta, o, al meno del stato da terra, et che non habbino moglie, ne famislia ma siano liberi da ogni interesse di pratica per ovviar a quelli inconvenienti seguiti ultimamente, che per esser maritati fu traffugato delle robbe co'l mezo delle loro moglei, et famiglia. Il contrattar mercanti sosttoposti alla constumacia, sarà sempre con pericolo grande, et pero si dovera sotto gravissimi peni prohibir che non si possa ne vender, ne contrattar se non dopo licentiate dalle contumacie come si osserva in questa citta. Intendiamo parlare dal Clarissimo Ser Dolfin conte di Spalato che l'Emino di Spalato per li datij a quella scala non temendo il pericolo della peste vadi, per veder li suoi interessi, nelli lazaretti, ove sono robbe di

suspetto, et poi tornando fuori, pratica senza riserva cosa digna di provisione come vien da esso clarissimo conte raccordato, che resterà provisto con il far un pozuol di legno, che guardi sopra il cortil del lazaretto nel quale montando dalla parte di fuori potra veder il fatto suo con sicurezza della sanita. Et simile disordine par che segua nella sentinella, che ronda il Torrion sopra il Lazaretto che si puo proveder con il medesimo modo per via di un corridor. Con l'Emino si deve usar ogni termine di buon trattamento come persona alla relation del quale li suoi maggiori danno credenza, et essendo stato porto memorial da quella Nation nel qual vien detto, che esso Emino non ha stantia in luoco opportuno, dove possa star a far li suoi conti, et essercitar il suo carico, ricercando che lo sia fatto habitation, altramente di li sara sforzato partir, et reputando noi cosa conveniente Il sodisfarlo, con fabricar una picciol casetta da quella parte, che comportera il sito più commodo, si come stimiamo, che il principal oggetto di far navicar la galea a quella scala sia l'assicurar la vita et li effetti di mercanti Turchi, et hebrei, pero si deve proveder sotto strettissime pene da esser imposte al conduttor di essa galea, et al scrivar, che non possa caricar sopra essa alcuna minima quantita di mercantie se prima non saranno caricati tutti li effetti di mercantie solite capitar nelli lazaretti a curo non reste difraudata la intention per la quale fu instituita questa navigatione. Per ovviar alli fraudi che si dice esser fatti al datio del trentesimo, che si scuode in Spalato, Il qual come intendemo viene difraudato con il portar robbe nella doana dicendo esser transito sia provisto di questi tali trovati nella contraffazione siano castigati di quelle pene maggiori, o per via di denontia o, in altro modo giustificata la visita, che parera alle Ecc[ellenze] V[ostre]. Dando anco parte delli contrabandi (104r) alli dinontianti. Quanto si è detto di sopra serve per favorir mercanti benchè stranieri et di fede diversa, non di manco portando la sua facolta in questa città con beneficio di datij, sotto la publica fede, stimiamo degni di esser protetti, acciò l'esempio inviti altri, a, concorrervi con augumento de negotij, tanto più favorabili in questi tempi presenti, che per varij accidenti il traffico delle scale del levante, che sia quasi proprio et particolare di questa città si e fatto commune con tante altre nationi, che poca parte resta per questa piazza come le Ecc[ellenze] V[ostre] sono benissimo informate. Terminiamo adunque questo nostro discorso, non volendo pero restar anco di riverentemente raccordarle per honor del signor Dio e buon esempio, oltre il commodo di nostri mercanti quello, che altre volte si ha havuto desiderio, l'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, se ben non mai posto in effetto ch'è il deputar in questa città un luoco proprio, e clausurato nel qual possa, et debba stanciare li Monsumani con le sue mercantie resolution grata al S[igno]r Dio per ovviar a quelli inconvenienti che per sua prudenza li dovemo esser noti, servirà anco a reputatione di questo commercio et sodisfattione o proprio commodo alli Turchi, sicome fu deliberato dall'Ecc.mo Senato sotto 4 Zugno 1588 et 28 Marzo 1589. Li qual

leggi, si ben commessi all'ufficio nostro, non habbiamo però voluto per esser passato molto tempo poner mano in esso senza saputa, et ordini del medesimo Senato, li quali Turchi stano sparti per la città con poca sicurtà delli loro haveri con molto suo interesse. Sopra questo Concetto non diremo maggior particolare senza che siamo tanto consapevoli della volonta di V[ostre] Ecc[ellenze] Ill[ustrissi]me che all'hora se ne potra far particular, e fondato discorso. Ma per non deviar dal principal oggetto che è di trattar circa la scala di Spalato et di disordini introdotti in essa per dar quelli ordini che parera alle sue prudenze diciamo che opinion nostra sarà, che si facesse elettion di un nobile nostro soggetto intendente et honorevole con qual titolo, et provision che dalle Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] fosse stimato conveniente al qual fossi commesso questo particular carico, con quelle circuspettioni, et avvertimenti, che a suo tempo sariano particolarmente espressi, regolando la forma di spender per via di quella camera, et con mandati, come piu diffusamente si puo andar discorrendo, essendo mosso l'animo nostro a questa proposta per non accusar li affari al Clarissimo Conte che essendo occupato nelli ordinarie audienze, et provisioni di quel governo non potrà assister ne proveder al bisogno. Consideriamo anco quanto grande, et imporante sia il carico del Provveditor General in Dalmatia, che pero non ardiamo di proponer che le sia aggiunto questo, che ha bisogno di una assistenza ordinaria sopra le fabriche per assicurarsi che sia quanto prima perfettionata, et fugar la longhezza, et la spesa molto grandi seguite per il passato , et sara per fine di quanto possiamo dire in questa materia rimandosi alla prudenza delle Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostre] Ill[ustrissi]me.

Lo. Lorenzo Barbarigo

Lo. Longo Lion

Lo. Marco Gradenigo

Lo. Federigo Dandolo

Lo. Andrea Paruta

Presentata per delli Clarissimi Savi alli Eccelentissimi Signori Savij.

[Margin] Sperando noi che con l'assistenza di persona particolare, et diligente in termine di breve tempo non dovendo haver altro carico li verita [?] a buon fine nel negotio di essa fabrica, et di quanto dara bisogno, dovendo [illegible] come per diciamo tutta la spesa del denaro, operarij, legnami, pietra, feramenta, et altro passar con [illegible] per quella camera sicome dispone la parte del Senato di 8 agosto 1598 con obligo di non poter andar a [illegible] se non parti con fedì che cosi sia stato eseguito il qual obligo sia anco risposto al [illegible].

12) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Seconda serie*, b. 162, August 1, 1610.

Andrea Renier's 33 rules for the management of the lazaretto in Split.

Noi Andrea Rhenier Proveditor alla sanità in Spalato.

Dovendo noi partire di questo nostro Carico per la licentia, che habbiamo ottenuto dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato di poter andar alla Patria come di ciò appar per lettere dell'istesso Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato de 10 Luglio passato, et volendo noi in conformità delle lettere istesse, et di altre dell'Ill[ustrissi]mi Sig[no]ri Savij alla mer[canti]a di primo detto lasciare quelle regole, et buone ordeni, che si conviene, et ricerca la materia di Sanità, col tenor delle presenti nostre ordiniamo, et terminiamo, che gli Infrascritti Capitoli, et ordeni debbano dal Prior presente, et Successori suoi, et de ogni altro à chi spetta in differentemente, et inviolabilmente esser eseguite sotto pena di privation perpetua de loro Carichi, bando, Galera, et altre maggiori pene, che parerà àgl'Ill[ustrissi]mi Sig[no]ri Rettori, che per tempo si attroveranno à questo Carico i quali così presente, come hano à venir pregamo, che debbano ad essi far dare quella debita essecutione, et obbedienza, ch'e di mente dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato commettendo per tanto noi, che à chiara Intelligenza di ogni uno, la presente nostra terminatione con li ordeni indetti, debba esser registrata, et affissa sopra una sottela da esser continuamente tenuta nelli Lazaretti, acciòche in ogni tempo possino vedersi le transgressioni di ogni uno, e per conseguente il Castigo, che li doverà esser dato dall'Ill[ustrissi]mi Sig[no]ri Rapp[rese]ntanti sudetti i quali anco similmente pregamo, che per loro maggior instrutione debbano essa Terminatione, et ordeni far registrar, et tener registrati nella sua Cancellaria à memoria, et servitio de ogni uno, che possi in ogni tempo vederli, et valersene ad ogni beneplacito, et così habbiamo ordinato la presente, qual sarà di propria mano sottoscritta in quo[... ?] fide.

Dati in Spalato il primo di Agosto 1610

Andrea Rhenier Proveditor alla sanità

Ordini da osservarsi nel Lazareto di Spalato.

1 Che alcuno sià chi si voglia non entri nelli Lazaretti, mentre vi saranno persone, et robbe sospette, et che faccino contumacia senza licentia sottoscritta dall'Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Conte, ma volendo parlare, ò dare vittuarie à quelli fossero in Contumacie, stiano alli restelli parlando, et dandoli quello porterà con quella distanza, et sicurtà conveniente, con l'assistenza però delli Guardiani, che saranno à questo deputati.

2 Che niuno Sanser, mercante, ò altra Persona non possi vender, contrattar ò far mercadi di robbe, che fossero in detti Lazaretti, ò fuori di essi doppo sborate per esser tutte quelle per ordine

dell'Ecc[elentissi]mo Senato destinate per Venetia sotto quella pena, che parerà all'Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Conte, che sarà per quel tempo, et non possino esser doppò libere condotte per altro loco, che per Venetia, ma capitando qualche robba per uso di questa Città doppò licentuata, possi con licentia dell'Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Conte esser ammessa.

3 Che niun Guardian, Sboradore ò altra persona, che fosse di sospetto, overo in contumacia non possi andar vagando per li lazareti, ma stare alli lochi, che gli saranno assegnati per far le sue contumacie, acciò non si mescedi una con l'altra contumacia.

4 Che niun Guardiano, Sboradore, mercante, ò altra Persona, che sarà in contumacia, non possa mangiar, beber, o giocar à gioco alcuno con persona di altra contumacia, che della sua propria, benche stessero lontani.

5 Che alcuno sià, chi esser si voglia, non possi vender Vino, Malvasia, ò Aqua Vita, ne meno tenir bettola di robba da mangiar nelli detti Lazaretti.

6 Che per ogni contumacia di persone, che si farà à parte de mercantie se gli ponerà un Guardiano, et alle contumacie de mercantie, che si farà separatamente, se gli ponerà uno, ò più Guardiani, sicome la quantità, ò qualità loro ricercherà, li quali Guardiani doveràno intrar, e star sequestrati, sopra esse contumacie, fin che saranno licentiati ne possino essi Guardiani, ne Sboradori ricever da mercanti spese di bocca, ò beberazzi, ma solamente il suo Semplice Salario.

7 Che alcun Guardian, ò Sboradore non possi comprar, ne sotto nome di donativo accettar robba di sorte alcuna, ò portarle, ò mandarle fuori delli Lazaretti, et licentiati, che saranno li sià cercato per il Prior con diligenza nelle sue robbe, et trovandone cosa alcuna, ne dia notitia al Rettore nel Sborar le mercantie, che saranno poste in contumacia sià osservato, come quì sotto.

8 Che ogni mattina fatto, che sià giorno li Guardiani faccino aprir tutte le porte, e balconi delle stanze dove saranno le mercantie, tenendole continuamente aperte fino l'Ave Maria, mentre però, che non siàno tempi, che bagnino ò guastino dette mercantie.

9 Che si come veniràno giornalmente le mercantie di Paese, siàno medesimamente per ordine poste a sborare, et medesimamente doppò liberate sià osservato il caricarle in Galera senza interrompere l'ordine delle prime gionte, et sborate, ne precipij alcuna contumacia, se prima non sarà finito di aprir tutta quella robba, che li doverà intrar per sborarsi.

10 Che li sboradori deputati sopra le contumacie debbano levarsi alla medesima hora ancor loro al maneggio di dette robbe, continuando per tutto il giorno con l'assistenza delli suoi Guardiani, fuori, che per quelle hore li saranno deputate, cioè per il suo viver.

11 Che le Tavole delli Zambeloti siàno poste l'una tanto larga dall'altra, che li suoi invogli possino star in Terra in maniera, che non coprano li Zambeloti, siàno poi aperte le dette Tavole,

calati li suoi invogli, si che restino le pezze senza cosa alcuna sopra, doppò siàno maneggiate dette pezze à una per una, ponendogli le mano più volte per le pieghe, volgendo quelle pezze di sotto sopra, et ciò per doi volte la settimana disponentandoli, si che restino aperte.

12 Li mussoli, boccasini, et Tellami simili siàno slegate li pezze ad una ad una ponendoli le mano nel modo delli detti Zambeloti.

13 Li Feltri siàno del netto desfatte le balle, doppo siàno maneggiate le pezze à una per una, spiegandole, et repiegandole per due volte la settimana.

14 Le Schiavine, Schiavinoti, Felzade, Zenie, Boldroni, Agnelli, et fodre di pelle di ogni sorte siàno gettate à rifuso, maneggiate à una per una stese altre tante volte quanto il Tempo buono lo concederà, per tanto quanto staràno in Contumacia et se intendi il primo, et ultimo giorno, che staranno tutte le Contumacie per un sol giorno.

15 Le Sede li siàno levati de intorno tutti li invogli, et Camisa che havessero doppò poste, come le tavole de Zambeloti, si che se gli possa andar intorno maneggiandoli se gli faccia molare li suoi lazzi tanto che la Seda si slarghi benissimo poi per quatro volte il giorno ponerli le mano più volte per entro cadaun [?] collo di netti quelli, che saranno per sborarli, et à meza la Contumacia siàno fatti voltar detti colli, si che quella Parte di sotto venghi di sopra.

16 Le Sede Curte di Morea, Ianina, Valona, ò altro loco siàno gettate à collo per collo, à monte fuori delli invogli, et doppò siano stivate à massa per massa, voltandole, et mutandole da luoco à luoco ogni settimana.

17 Li Cordoani di ogni sorte doppò sligate le balle, siàno poste le balle in monte, convenientemente, e siàno poi aperti detti mazzi quelli maneggiando à pelle per pelle ogni settimana, una, et più volte.

18 Li Cuori bovini de ogni qualità siàno posti in luogo aieroso, overo discoperto, facendoli aprire, et stender col pelo insoro, ò in Terra doppò si sbattano, ripiegano, et restinano una ò più volte la settimana.

19 Li Gottoni de ogni sorte, che capitassero siàno posti li sacchi l'uno appresso l'altro in taglio, doppò sià sussita [?] la tela, ò stuora di detto Sacco per longo in modo che si possi calar la tela fino la metà del Sacco, sfendendo poi benissimo il Gotton per longo, tanto che si possi penetrare fino la metà di esso gotton, nel qual per quatro volte al giorno si anderà ponendo le braccia per cadaun Sacco in piu luoghi, li quali Sacchi nella metà della contumacia saràno fatti [?] da quella banda, che saràno sborati doppò revoltati dall'altra banda siàno scusiti [?], aperti, et maneggiati nel med[essim]o modo della prima banda con l'assistenza però sempre del Guardian.

20 Le lane de ogni sorte siàno gettate fuori delli suoi sacchi, et poste à monte, ma però più basse, et larghe, quanto il luoco lo concede voltandole sottosopra, et da luoco à luoco una, et più volte la settimana, ne si debbano liberare, se non doi giorni doppò finito di essser insacate, et conservati li suoi sboradori sani.

21 Li Lini de ogni sorte doppò esser gettati fuori delli suoi sacchi à refuso siàno accommodati piu larghi sià possibile, maneggiati, et voltati spesso, e gettati fuori, quando sià tempo buono per maggior sicurtà, si potrà fare sligare le ligature delle teste delli mazzi.

22 Le pene, et penachi di qualunque sorte, che capitassero prima, siàno posti tutti li mazzi fuori delli Invogli à refuso, stendendoli in Terra sottilmente doppo siàno maneggiati, sborati, et voltati à mazzo per mazzo per più volte la settimana, appendendoli ancora sopra corde, et in loco aieroso, se venissero de loco infeto li siàno sligate le ligature delli mazzi, et religate al quanto nel mezo del mazzo solam[en]te, poi siàno maneggiate, et sborate com'è detto.

23 Le Cere in uno, ò due invogli si possino buttar nell'aqua per il tempo sarà terminato, et se occorresse darne fuori, siàno gettate refuse, slargate, e visto per entro non vi siàno corde, spaghi, ò cose simili, doppo bagnata benissimo con aqua salsa si può liberare.

24 Le Specie, e Droghe de ogni Sorte lo siàno levati tutti gl'invogli de intorno, et lasciati li colli mette sue Camise, quali siàno voltati, et maneggiati esteriormente per quel tempo, che staranno in contumacia, ma se alcuno volesse dar fuori dette Specie, ò Droghe si possano suodar à refuso sopra stuore con la presenza del Guardian, il quale con diligentia doverà vedere, ch'entro non vi sià altra cosa contagiosa, et con la distanza conveniente si possono liberare.

25 Li groppi de dennari, che veniràno de ogni luoco, se li Interressati li vorràno siàno tagliati li detti groppi da persone sospette, e gettati li denari à refuso in aqua salsa, ò aceto, et brusati li detti groppi, doppò siàno ricevuti liberamente li dannari con la debita distanza, ma quando li volessero cavare così intieri per mandarli à Venetia, siàno posti in aceto, tanto che stiano tutti coperti per quanto parerà all' Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Conte, doppo che si potràno ricever da persone libere sicuramente.

26 Le lettere, che si daràno fuori di detti Lazaretti li sià prima per li Guardiani levati de intorno tutti li spaghi, che havessero, e veduto con diligenza, che entro non vi sià altra materia contagiosa, siàno poi con un vello profumate con incenso, et senza più maneggiarle darle fuori.

27 Li Anemali de ogni sorte di fuori delli Lazaretti occorresse cavarli siàno sequestrati, sguassati prima nel mare, siche restino tutti benissimo bagnati senza però altra cosa sospetta de intorno poi da persone libere spotrano esser ricevuti.

28 Se nelle contumacie, che si faràno di Cordoani, et Cuori solam[en]te à parte di altre mercantie, sarà ritrovato altra sorte di robba di maggior contumacia, la qual prima non sià sta [?] datta in nota o dalli mercanti, ò dalli sboradori, et Guardiani, sià prima tenuta detta contumacia giorni quaranta doppò li detti mercanti de chi sarà la robba, et li sboradori, et Guardiani caschino in pena ad arbitrio di esso Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Rhettor.

29 Se occorrerà, che alcuno se amali, che fosse sopra mercantie, òvero in contumacia à parte si opererà, che immediate quel Guardiano della contumacia lo notificchi al Priore, et lui subito lo riferisca al Rettore, il quale manderà il medico deputato à riconoscere il male, et ritrovandolo de infettione, si separi subito l'amalato dalli Sani con tutte le sue robbe, principiando da nuovo quella contumacia, e trovando esser altro mal non sospetto si lasserà continuare la detta contumacia.

30 Che l'amalato infetto, e sue robbe da dormire, et di uso quando guarisca, et sià in stato, che lui non possa dar altra infettione si muti de drappi netti, et si ponga alla sua contumacia, et si brusino tutti li altri panni infetti, facendo benissimo scovar, et profumar le stanze da quelle habitate, il med[essi]mo si può osservar quando l'infermo fosse morto, et di quelli l'havessero servito, et sepolto.

Limitation de Sboradori

31 Che per ogni Tavole 40 di Zambelorti Feltri, e balle di robbe simili sià un homo, per ogni sessanta de Cordoani un homo, per ogni quaranta de Cuori un homo, il tutto à ragion di balle da somma.

32 Quel di più si potrà in tutte le indette cose ordinare, et secondo li occorrenti accidenti parerà alla molta prudenza dell'Ill[ustrissi]mo Sig[no]r Rhettor di commandare etc: [?], dalla pratica, et diligenza di quelle persone, che governerà li Lazaretti soprà esser di maggior sicurtà delle cose pubbliche.

33 Che alcuno Spalatino, ne Dalmatino possi sotto alcun colore ò pretesto, che dir, et imaginar si possa esser introdotto nei Lazaretti per sborare qualsivoglia mercantia.

13) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia*, Seconda serie, b. 187, Mar. 12, 1620.

Petition to move the Turks from the osteria Anzolo.

Ser[enissi]mo Principe Ill[ustrissi]mi et Ecc[ellentissi]mi Signori

Sicome fù sempre, et in ogni tempo da questa Sacrosanta Republica protetta, difesa, et conservata con ogni riverenza et divotione la fede, et Religion Christiana, et per conseguenza i Tempij, et Chiese fabricate per il Culto de Iddio, honorate, riverite, custodite, et preservate da Infedeli, così dobbiamo sperare, che nel presente caso, et accidente V[ostra] Ser[enità] et V[ostre] E[ccellenze] Ill[ustrissi]me siano per fare. Ritrovasi vicino alla Chiesa di San Matthio a Rialto, l'Osteria, dove alloggiavano li Turchi nemici nostri dalla qual vicinanza ne nasce, che da questi infedeli, et nemici della Religion Christiana tutto il tempo dell'anno, et nelli giorni delle maggior feste, et solennità commettono di molto eccessi, passando essi per detta Chiesa, ridendosi et beffandosi delli Santissimi Sacrificij, et del Vero culto Divino. Ma particolarmente il giorno della Festa di quell Benedetto Santo, che fù il Mese di Settembre prossimo passato, mentre si cantava la messa solente, et il Vespero, quelli maledetti huomini, si fecero lecito di continuar scaricar arcobuggi nelle finestre di detta Chiesa con notabil pericolo, et scandalo di tanta frequenza di popolo : atto troppo vilipendissimo, et indegno : per tanto si supplica con ogni humil riverenza la Ser[enità] Vostra, et V[ostre] Ec[cellenze] Ill[ustrissi]me nelle viscere [?!] di Giesù Christo Signor nostro, et à condolatione di tutta quella contratta, et de ogni fedel Christiano vogli per pietà degnarsi di provvedere a questa gente nemica del vero bene di altro luoco per loro habitatione più lontano dale Chiese, vere Case de Dio, acciò non succedano più di simili inconvenienti, che di continuo per così santa, et prudente operatione, et rimedio pregheranno S.D.M. per la esultatione, et conservatione di questo Ser.mo Dominio.

1620: 12 marzo

Che sia commessa alli Savij dell'una, et l'altra mano.

5+, 0/, 0/

Cons[igliato]ri

Z. Giacomo Zane

Ger[olamo] Corner

Giusto Antonio Belegno

Lorenzo Zustignian

Sebastian Venier

Roberto Lio Seg[retario]

14) BMC, PDc 740, item II, *Giornale del Fondaco dei Turchi*, pp. 53–58, 1620.

First opinion of the dragoman Giacomo da Nores to the Cinque Savi alla mercanzia on the organisation of the Fondaco in the Palazzo Pesaro, propriety of the Doge Antonio Priuli.

Ill[ustrissi]mi, et Ecc[ellentissi]mi Signori Cinque Savij sopra la Merc[anzia]

Dovendo Io Giacomo da Nores Interprete Maggiore di questa Ser[enissi]ma Rep[ubbli]ca, et servitore humilissimo di V[ostre] Ecc[ellenze] Ill[ustrissi]me, per riverente, et debita essecutione di quanto mi è stato da loro imposto di dir l'opinion mia in scrittura circa l'ellesione che deve fatta d'un stabile, nel qual debbano unitamente habitare tutti li Turchi che giornalmente capitano in questa città, con le loro mercanze, per quel tempo che starano in Venezia, conforme l'ottimo ricordo dato a Sua Ser[enità] dal Francesco di Dimitri Littino, fin sotto 28 8bre 1574 in essecutione delle delliberationi, et Parti prese, mediante esso ricordo nell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato gl'anni 1575:16 Ag[os]to, 1578: 23 Genaro, 1588: 4 Giugno, et 1589:28 Marzo, le qualli tutte cometon unitamente l'effettuazione di questa buona, et Santa opera. Onde torno a dire che dovendo Io conforme al comandamento di V[ostre] S[erenità] Ill[ustrissi]me meter in scrittura quello che Io sento circa l'ellezione di detto luoco le dirò venerentemente il mio senso nell'infrascritti capitoli da me per più chiara loro inteligenza, con quanto mi è parso dire, et addure con verità in questo proposito.

Primo. Che Io ho stimato sempre, e stimo che sia non solamente bene ma necessaria oltra modo l'ellectione di un luoco comodo, et capace per ridur tutti li Turchi Mercanti in un sola habitatione come si costuma anco in Soria [Siria], et Allessandria, et nella Città propria di Costantinopoli, et altri luochi mercantili, ne quali non solamente le nationi straniere, ma li medesimi Turchi hanno i loro Fontegi chiamati Han, che vengono serati, et custoditi di notte per sicurezza delle Robbe, et Persone loro; per la comodità che hanno in essi Fontegi di poter aggiustatamente logare mercanzie loro, amando essi Turchi haver sempre le loro Robbe et effetti app[ress]o di se stessi, nelli alloggiamenti dove personalmente habitano.

2.o Quanto sia utile, et necessario il ridur essi Turchi in una sola habitatione, per molti rispetti, Divini, et Umani, può esser benissimo considerato dal Prudentissimo loro giudizio, poiche si viene non solo a oviare molti importantissimi disordini, et inconvenienti che giornalmente seguono, et massime di condur e ricondur sempre dentro , e fuori in tempo di notte Robbe di contrabando Arme proibite, et anco delle creature di tenera età sui Vacelli Turcheschi, come più volte e successo stando essi Turchi sparsi per la Città, senza alcuna custodia, et liberi di poter camminare Di, et Notte, guidati massime di persone di pessima qualità, et concienza, che non hanno, ne Amor, ne Timor di Dio, ma si viene anco con tal mezzo a levar l'occasione, se non in tutto almeno in gran parte, di

molte Diaboliche, et ne fando operationi che vengono comesse con gravissime offese del Dignor Iddio, scandalo, et disgusto di tutta la Città, et disonor del nome Christiano, habitando essi Turchi in case di Christiani, e Christiane, per lo più di mala qualità, e di cattiva vita, che vanno suggerendo, e somministrando sempre ad'essa gente materia di mille cose abbominevoli che offendono l'animo, e l'orecchie d'ogn'un che le sente.

3.o Che fin ad ora non sia mai stata data esecuzione alle sopradette Parti dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, et ridotta questa opera cosi necessaria a perfetione, non è da farne meraviglia, percioche tante volte a mio ricordo i precessori di V[ostre] S[erenità]Ill[ustrissi]me solcitati dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio procuronno con ogni possibile diligenza di trovar qualche Stabile comodo, et capace per questo effetto, et non si trovo mai casa che fosse a proposito, per il che havendo essi preso resolutione, cosi consigliando anco l'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio di trovar al meno un Fondo, o Terreno idoneo, da poter erreger esso Fontego della Pianta in sù a spese Publiche disegnando apunto di farlo in tre soleri per accomodar in uno gl'Asiatici, nell'altro i Bossinesi, et nel terzo gl'Albanesi, si andò per la Città a veder diversi Fondi, et in particolare quello da Ca Milioni a San Gio Crisostomo, che fù appunto più degl'altri stimato approposito, ma prima che fosse portata parte in Senato, fù considerato le spese grande, che andavano in essa Fabricha, oltre costo del Terreno, restò il negotio suspeso, ne mai è stato effetuato sino al presente.

4.o Che se mai è stato tempo d'effetuare questo negotio, è di proveder a questo importantissimo bisogno, è per mia opinione adesso; percioche, il luoco, over casa posta a San Mattio di Rialto, che fù gia elletta, et destinata con l'auttorità dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio per habitatione di essi Turchi, et consegnata al sudetto Littino custode, in virtù del suo aricordo. Benche poi non essendo ella stata capasse per tutti li Turchi, fu habitata solamente dalli Turchi Bossinesi, et Albanesi li quali hanno continuato, et continuano tuttavia ad' habitarla, ma hora non volendo il Clar[issi]mo Signor Nicolo Foscolo, fù dell'Ill[ustrissi]mo Signor Francesco come quello che Vxo Nnne [?], è subintrato Patrone [?] della maggior parte di detto stabile, che i Turchi continuano più ad' habitare in esso, volendo egli impiegarlo in altro uso, convengono essi Turchi per necessità partirsi il che seguirà prima con molta loro confusione, et disturbo, mentre che non siano, essi, d'un altro stabile provisti, et secondariamente anco con maggior offesa di Dio, et scandalo della Città, quando che questi Turchi ancora di Bossina et Albania, che sogliono habitare unitamente, et che sono per natura molto audaci, et insolenti più degl'altri, anderano sparsi per la Città ad' habitare in case di huomeni, et Donne di mala qualità, et profetione, con dispiacere universal di tutti com'è detto di sopra.

5.o Che li medesimi Turchi di Bossina, et Albania, vedendosi in necessità di doversi partire della sopradetta casa di San Mattio, et essendo anco stati fin hora in essa casa, con molto loro incomodo,

et patimento si per esser ella discosta, e molto lontana dalla Riva, et per conseguenza dispendiosa, et incomoda da poter caricar, e descaricar le Robbe, et Mer[canzi]e loro, havendo massime detta casa le scale altissime, et incommode per esser in quattro soleri, et senza alcun Portico, et loco di sboro, et anco per non haver essi in detto loco comodità che basti da poter legare tutte le Robbe, et Mer[canzi]e loro, che ben speso vengono perciò in Rissa, et contesa tra di loro. M'anco più volte pregato che Io debba far offitio con li Signori del Mag[istra]to, come ho fatto con V[ostre] S[erenità] Ill[ustrissi]me, et con i precessori loro più volte, che li sia quanto prima assegnato, et deputato un altro luoco capace dove possino essi star, con le Robbe, e Persone loro più comodamente per l'avenire, di quello che hanno fatto per il passato.

6.o Che per non haver, cosi questi Turchi Asiatici, et Costantinopolitani, che Albergano sparsi per la Città con maggior spese, et interesse, et non havendo le comodità sufficienti di poter tenere le Robbe, et Merc[anzi]e loro ne luochi dove essi alloggianno, convengono più delle volte fidarle in mano de senseri i quali portando esse Robbe nelle proprie loro case, et magazeni, si fano per tal via arbitri delle voglie, et delle Robbe d'essi Turchi, manegiandole, et vendendole a loro modo senza che gl'altri sanseri possano haver libertà di mostrarle a niesuno, et di poter tratar mercato, et offerir alcun poretio avvantagioso ad'essi Turchi.

7.o Che quando cosi sia il volere di Sua Ser[enità], et di V[ostre] S[erenità] Ill[ustrissi]me di ridur essi Turchi in una sola habitatione conforme alle Parti dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato per le cause, et rispeti ricordati di sopra, et per quelli che possono, esser dalla loro molta prudenza più profondamente considerati, è preveduti. Io al presente non vedo, ne credo, che si possi trovar luoco, ne più comodo, ne più capace, ne più raccolto, ne più a proposito di Fabrica, et di sito di quello del Ser[enissi]mo Signore Ant[oni]o Priuli Principe Nostro presente di gloriosa Fama; posto nella contra di San Gio[vanni] Decolato, essendo esso luoco, over casa primieramente in Isola senz' alcun impedimento attorno, copiosa di stanze, di mezadi, et di magazeni, con una corte grande, con due pozzi, due scale, due Rive, et tutte le altre sue comodità, di tener, di sborar le Robbe, e di ridurle anco con Barche grosse alla Riva, che li richiedono al uso, et bisogno di essi Turchi, quando però siano fatte le sue tramezzete, corridori, lavatori, et altre cose che sono necessarie, et opportune per tal bisogno.

8.o Che essendo il sudetto stabile grande, et capace come è notto a cadauna di V[ostre] E[ccellenze], si potria divider la sala, et stanzie, con tramezzate, et dar una parte alli Asiatici, et Zambelotieri, et l'altra alli Bossinesi, et Albanesi che sogliono per l'ordinario habitar insieme, che cosi si verà ad accomodar tutti senza alcun incomodo, et se bene saranno uniti, saranno però separati, per esser essi di natura, e costumi differenti, havendo massime detta casa due scale, et due

fori, che l'uno serve per l'una l'altro per altra parte della casa. Onde tramezzata che sarà la sala, et serate alcune Porte non haverà communicatione con l'altra, et tutti starano comodamente.

9o Che quelle tante stantie, over mezzadi, che sono sotto il solaro della casa, et che sono separati affatto, che non hanno corispondenza et corelatione alcuna con le altre stanze poste nel solaro havendo essi la sua entrata, et il suo esito fuori della corte, sopra la Fondamenta del Rio, per esser sempre soliti ad'affitarsi separatamente dalla casa grande, come sono affittati anco al presente. Io stimo che sia bene darli alli Armeni, i qualli starano separatamente dai Turchi, et havarano consolatione, et gusto d'haver ancor essi un luoco racolto, comodo, et capace di poter ricever quanto che li vengono senza alcuna briga, et disturbo d'andar cercando case d'alloggiare, come che sogliono far per l'ordinario, convenendo essi più delle volte habitar per necessità in una medesima casa con i Turchi con grandissimo incomodo, dispiacere, et disgusto loro.

X.o Che Io spero che l'effettuatione di questa buona, et Santa Opera riusirà di satisfatione, e gusto di tutta la città, et si farà anco senza spesa alcuna, et interesse Publico, et credo anco che quel istesso Littino, che ha havuto in custodia, et in governo fin hora la predetta casa di San Mattio, di Rialto, in virtù dell'aricordo datto gia dal sudetto Francesco de Dimitri Littino suo Avo, havendo cosi lui come anco suo Padre, et Avo predetto essercitato sempre esso carico con Publica, et privata sodisfatione; sarà ottimo per cosendere, et governare anco questa per la pratica che egli ha del ministero, et cognitione della natura, et de costumi d'essi Turchi et per esser anco tenuto da tutti in stima, et concetto di persona reale, et suficiente, et per quanto egli dice rispondera al Ser[enissi]mo Prencipe il suo fitto prontamente di tempo, in tempo mentre che piacerà a Sua Ser[enità] di dare essa casa sopra di lui per quel tanto che sarà stimato necessario, et conveniente.

XI. Che quando piacerà a Sua Ser[enità], di loccare detto stabile, et all'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio d'accretarlo, dirò poi all hora riverentemente a v[ostre] S[erenità] Ill[ustrissi]me il mio pensiero, se cosi mi sarà da loro comesso, cosi circa i concieri necessarij, che si doverà fare con l'acenzo de Sua Ser[enità] in detta casa, come anco circa la regola che si haverà da esiger secondo la qualità, et capacità delle stanze, et di ogni altra cosa necessaria, et oportuna per bon incaminare, et regolare il negotio per Publico, et privato servitio riportandomi però sempre al sapientissimo Giuditio di Sua Ser[enità], et di V[ostre] S[erenità] Ill[ustrissi]me, suplicandole ad'escusar l'inperfetione della mia lingua, et pena, et perdonarmi del lungo redio causato dal desiderio di voler compitamente satisfare il comand[amen]to loro, et al debito mio, et alla loro buona gratia mi racomando.

15) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Seconda serie*, b. 187, fasc. 1, May 27, 1621.

33 rules for the modification of Palazzo Pesaro into the Fondaco dei Turchi, and its subsequent management.

Dovendo noi Cinque Savi sopra la mercanzia in essecution della deliberatione dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio con intervento, e ballotatione del magistrato nostro de 11 marzo 1621, e per essecutione della Parte dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato di 28 marzo 1589, instituir quelli ordini, e regole, con le quali doveranno i Turchi iuxta esse Parti, e deliberationi andar a habitare, et con le quali deve esser custodita, et accomodata la Casa, che soleva esser del Sig[no]r Duca di Ferrara situata nella Contrà di S. Giacomo dall'Orio sopra Canal Grande, ch'è destinata per habitatione de tutti i Turchi, e desiderando noi, che ricevino in ciò quella maggior commodità, che sià possibile, siamo però venuti in rissoluzione di dare gl'infrascritti ordini, e regole.

1. Che in conformità della Parte dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio la sudetta Casa sia data in custodia al fedel Gio[vanni] Batt[ista] Lettino, il quale ben intendendosi con il Patrone di essa, no ntanto nell'affitto, che dovrà pagare, e nel modo di trovar dannari per riddurla nelle infrascritte forme, quanto nell'osservar gl'infrascritti oblighi a tutte sue spese, e riseghi, senza che il publico possi ricever in qual si voglia occasione pregiud[icat]o, ò danno alcuno, ne che il Patrone, ò altri possino pretender riffacimento, ò havere pretensione alcuna per qual si voglia immaginabile accidente, che potesse occorrere; debbi eseguire tutti gl'infrascritti Capitoli sotto le pene in essi contenute, dovendo avanti, che sià posto mano in detta fabrica apparer assenso, e contenta del Patrone di essa, ne possino essere introdotti i Turchi in detta habitatione, se prima non sarà riddotto il tutto à quella perfettione, come di sotto viene espresso, e dechiarito; il che dovrà esser approbato dal Mag[istra]to nostro.

2. Che siano stroppate con muri tutte le porte di essa Casa da parte da terra, così quelle che vanno sopra la salizada, come quelle che vanno sopra il Rio dal meglio, e siano lasciate solamente la Porta maestra grande, che guarda sopra la salizada, e quella dei mezadi sopra il Rio del meglio, che doverà servire all'introito della sola habitatione del Custode.

3. Che sopra Canal grande resti la Riva, che è al presente, e ne siano aggiunte due altre una per banda, acciò i Turchi possino più commodamente scaricar le mercantie loro. Quali due Rive, che saranno aggiunte per l'ordinario, stiano serrate, ne siano aperte, se non per il bisogno di scaricar mercantie.

4. Che nella corte di essa Casa da Terra siano levati tutti gli aspetti che guardano sopra essa corte, ò con far allevare un muro che li chiudano, ò con stroppar tutte le finestre, e fori de ogni sorte, che

sopra essa Corte guardano, così che essi Turchi non possano esser veduti da quei vicini, e che sia per il medesimo sudetto rispetto rialzato il muro Vecchio, ch'è in mezo delle due Case, che guardano essa Corte fino alla gorna della Casa più bassa.

5. Che il muro sopra Canal grande sopra la Riva sia alzato di più di quello, ch'è al presente piedi quatro.

6. Che tutti i Magazeni che al presente si ritrovano a pe' pian siano riddotti al n[umer]o di 26, cioè trè, che sono dalla banda del Rio del meggio sopra Canal grande, restino uniti con l'habitatione del Custode, quali dovranno esser separati dagli altri, ne haver altri ingressi, che per l'habitatione sua, et gli altri, che sono vintri trè, siano a commodo, e servitio de tutti i Turchi Bossinesi et Albanesi. Quali magazeni debbino haver un balcone per uno grande con feriada, da esser fatto sotto la Travadura del solaro, acciò renda maggior luce, e ciò non solo di quelli magazeni che sono sopra la salizada, ma anco di quelli che sono sopra il Rio; riducendo però quelli balconi che guardano dentro la Casa, come sarà stimato più proprio, e neccessario.

7. Che i balconi delli magazeni, che al presente sono sopra Canal grande siano murati.

8. Che tutti i mezadi, che al presente si ritrovano, siano riddotti in mezadi 25, cioè sette che sono dalla banda del Rio del meggio, e sopra Canal grande restino per l'habitatione semplise del Custode, senza haver immaginabile ingresso, aspetti, balconi, ò fori di qual si voglia sorte verso l'habitatione di essi Turchi, e sia alzato il muro della Terazza di esso Custode verso la Corte, così che resti superiore in altezza al muro, che dovrà esser fatto per chiuder il poggio delle Collonelle, e gli altri, che sono 18, siano divisi, cioè 8, che sono dalla parte del Rio del meggio servino per l'habitatione de Turchi Asiatici e Costantinopolitani, e gli altri 10, che sono dalla banda della salizada, servino per l'habitatione de Turchi Bossinesi ,et Albanesi; i balconi de quali mezadi, così da parte del Rio, come da parte della salizada siano tirati più in alto di quello che sono, ponendo sopra di essi le sue ferriade, e di fuori via le sue trombe di Larese acciò non possano esser veduti da vicini.

9. Della Terrazza dalla Banda del Traghetto sià fatto un altro mezado con i balconi sopra la Corte, et una scalla da basso, che assenda detto mezado.

10. Che le Camere, Stanze, e sopra Camere siano divise nell'infrascritto modo, cioè: La sala grande sopra la Corte sià divisa per Traverso con muro che continui quello, che si ritrova al presente di sotto, et la banda verso il Rio sià de Turchi Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, e quella verso salizada sià de Turchi Bossinesi, et Albanesi.

11. Similamente sià diviso per traverso la loggia, che guarda sopra Canal grande, e la banda verso il Rio sià de Turchi Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, e quella verso salizada sià de Turchi Bossinesi, et Albanesi.

12. Dalla banda del Rio del meggio, siano Camare n[umer]o 13, e sopra Camere 6 con suo lavatorio, e locco commune, quali calino anco a basso nei mezadi, e servino per i Turchi Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, dovendo esserli fatto un Corridor, che principij nel Canton della Sala nel luogo, dove al presente si ritrova la scalla, che va di sopra, qual arrivi fino sopra la loggia, che guarda sopra Canal grande, et ogni una di esse Camere non habbi che una sol porta.

13. Dalla banda della salizada siano Camare nove, computate le due camere che si deve fare della Cucina, e sopra camere sette, et il Corridor, che al presente si trova, et un lavatorio, e loco commune, che calino a basso anco ne mezadi, quali Camere non habbino che una sola Porta, e tutte esso stanze servino per i Turchi Bossinesi, et Albanesi.

14. Siano stroppate le colonelle della loggia con muro avalido [?] un piede superior al pozo con il ligamento di sopra via della sua piana di piera viva.

15. Tutti i balconi de tutte le Camere, e sopracamere, che guardano così s[opr]a il Rio, come sopra la salizada siano fatti a luce, alti piedi sei da Terra, ponendoli le Trombe di Larese di fuori via.

16. Tutti i balconi di detto solaro, che guardano sopra Canal grande, così da una banda, come dall'altra, siano serrati di muro alto piedi sette da Terra.

17. Le due Torreselle, così da una banda, come dall'altra, siano stroppate, ò distrutte.

18. Nella soffitta Morta siano fatte due rebalte per poter in occasione andar sopra il colmo, con una chiave per una, da esser tenute dal Custode, nel qual colmo non si possi andare, se non in occasione urgente.

19. Che tutti i Mezadi, Camere, e sopracamere, così da una banda, come dall'altra, habbino il suo Camino per comodità loro.

20. Le medesime habbino i suoi t[av]ollati per habitarvi, e dormirvi secondo l'uso loro.

21. Che sopra la porta di tutti i magazeni, mezadi, Camere, e sopra Camere sià notato un numero il quale dovrà regolar l'affitto che dovranno pagar i Turchi iuxta la Tariffa qui sotto annotata, la quale per intelligenza de tutti i Turchi, che in esso fontego stancieranno, dovrà esser affissa in luogo conspicuo.

22. Tariffa di quello dovranno pagar i Turchi per l'affitto degl'infrascritti magazeni, mezadi, camere, e sopracamere, dovendo principiar l'affitto del mese il giorno della consegna delle chiavi, il qual mese, se ben non fosse finito al della renontia, che facesse il Turcho delle chiavi, debbi però pagar per il mese intiero, et entrando nell'altro mese, debbi pagar per giorni 15, e continuando doppo li giorni 15, debbi pagar per il mese intiero, e così de 15, in 15 giorni doppo il primo mese si debbi osservar; con dichiarazione, che habitando in maggior numero di quello che viene dechiarito nella infrascritta Tariffa, debbino pagar di più dell'affitto infrascritto soldi sei per persona al giorno,

et il medesimo dovrà indendersi di quelli, che non volessero, ò non potessero habitare nelle infrascritte stanze, et occorrendo, che i Turchi volessero tener mercantie negli andidi, corridori, e portichi, si risserviamo in tal caso a noi, e successori nostri auctorità di poter terminar, e liquidar quanto si parerà conveniente, che debbino pagar.

Magazeni

I magazeni maggiori cioè n[umer]o 1, 2, 3, 12, 17, 21, 22 paghino per cadauno al mese d[ucati] 8

I magazeni grandi, cioè n[umer]o 4, 11, 20 paghino per cadauno al mese d[ucati] 6

I magazeni minori, cioè n[umer]o 5, 8, 19, 23 paghino per cadauno al mese d[ucati] 5

I magazeni piccoli, cioè n[umer]o 6, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16 paghino per cadauno al mese d[ucati] 4

I magazeni più piccoli, cioè n[umer]o 7, 13, 18, 24 paghino per cadauno al mese d[ucati] 3

Mezzadi

I mezzadi maggiori, cioè n[umer]o 8, 10, 16 paghino per cadauno al mese ducati otto, non potendo star in ogni uno di essi più di sei persone, e stando più di sei, paghino soldi sei per testa al giorno – d[ucati] 8

I mezzadi grandi cioè n[umer]o 11, 12, 20, 21 paghino per cadauno al mese ducati sei, non potendo star in ogni uno di essi più di sei persone, e stando più di sei, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 6

I mezzadi minori n[umer]o 1, 2, 3, 22 paghino per cadauno al mese ducati cinque, non potendo star in ogni uno di essi più di cinque persone, e stando più di cinque paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 5

I mezzadi piccoli n[umer]o 5, 7, 13, 18, 9 [?] paghino per cadauno al mese ducati quattro, non potendo star in ogni uno di essi più di quattro persone, e stando più di quattro, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 4

I mezzadi più piccoli n[umer]o 14, 15, 17, 23 paghino per cadauno al mese ducati trè, non potendo star in ogni uno di essi più di trè persone, e stando più di trè, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 3

Camere

Le Camere maggiori n[umer]o 1, 3, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21 paghino per cadauna al mese ducati otto, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di sei persone, e stando più di sei paghino soldi sei per testa al giorno – d[ucati] 8

Le Camere grandi n[umer]o 4, 5, 7, 12 paghino per cadauna al mese ducati sette, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di sei persone, e stando più di sei, paghino, come di sopra – d[ucati] 7

Le Camere minori n[umer]o 2, 22 paghino per cadauna al mese ducati sei, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di sei persone, e stando più di sei paghino, come di sopra – d[ucati] 6

Le Camere piccole n[umer]o 18, 19 paghino per cadauna al mese ducati quatro, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di quatro persone, e stando più di quatro, come di sopra paghino – d[ucati] 4

Le Camere più piccole n[umer]o 11, 17 paghino per cadauna ducati trè al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di trè persone, e stando più di trè paghino, come di sopra – d[ucati] 3

Le Camere piccolissime n[umer]o 9, 10 paghino per cadauna ducati doi al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di trè persone, e stando più di trè paghino, come di sopra – d[ucati] 2

Sopra Camere

La sopra Camera maggiore, cioè n[umer]o 1 paghi ducati sette al mese, non potendo star in essa più di sei persone, e stando più di sei, paghino soldi sei per testa al giorno – d[ucati] 7

Le sopracamere grandi cioè n[umer]o 8, 12, 13 paghino per cadauna ducati sei al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di sei persone, e stando più di sei, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 6

Le sopracamere minori, cioè n[umer]o 3, 11, 14 paghino per cadauna ducati cinque al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di cinque persone, e stando più di cinque, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 5

Le sopracamere piccole, cioè n[umer]o 27 [?; 2, 7], paghino per cadauna ducati quatro al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di quatro persone, e stando più di quatro, paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 4

Le sopracamera più piccola n[umer]o 9 paghi ducati trè al mese, non potendo star in essa più di trè persone, e stando più di trè paghino come sopra – d[ucati] 3

Le sopra Camere piccolissime cioè n[umer]o 5, 6 paghino ducati due al mese, non potendo star in ogni una di esse più di trè persone, e stando più di trè paghino come di sopra – d[ucati] 2

23. Che il Custode debbi tener la notte de continuo 25 Cesendelli impizzati.

24. Sia obbligato tener i pozzi sempre abbondanti de aqua, acciò essi Turchi, che ne consumano assai, possino restar sodisfatti.

25. Debbi ogni giorno più volte, secondo che sarà neccessario far nettar, e scoppar detto fontego, facendo portar via le scoaze, et altre imonditie.

26. Sià obligato a serrar le porte, così da Terra, come da Mar alle 24 hore, et aprirle al levar del sole con buone, e sicure chiavi de fuori via, da essere da lui tenute.

27 Debbi tener due huomeni alle dette porte, cioè uno alla porta da Terra, e l'altro alla porta da Mar, quali debbino sempre assister a dette Porte, dovendo detti huomeni essere prima approbati dal Mag[istra]to.

28. Che detti Portinari non lasciano entrar in esso Fontego in alcun Tempo Donne, ne persone sbarbate, che siano Christiane, sotto quelle pene che parerà alla giustitia meritar i Transgresori.

29. Che detti Portinari non lascino portar da chi si voglia in detto fontego azzali, ne arme di sorte alcuna, ne archibusi, solferi, polvere, ferramenti, et altre cose proibite dalle leggi, sotto quelle pene, che parerà alla giustitia meritar i Transgressori, et essendo trovata cosa alcuna delle sopradette, debbi immediatamente il Custode darne conto al Mag[istra]to nostro.

30. Che detti Portinari non lascino entrar alcuno sià chi si voglia con armi di cadauna sorte, acciò in detto Fontefo non segui occasione de Scandali sotto quelle pene, che parerà alla Giustitia.

31. E dovendo i Turchi, com'è predetto, che sono, e veniranno in questa Città andar ad habitar in esso fontego iuxta in tutto, e per utto le parti dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, e deliberatione dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Collegio di 11 marzo passato sià, et se intendi perciò proibito a cadauno così Sansaro, come altro qual si voglia il poter alloggiar Turchi, e contravenir alle sudette Deliberationi sotto qual si voglia pretesto imaginabile sotto quelle pene corporali, e pecuniarie, che parerà al Mag[istra]to, oltre le quali doverano i sanseri, che transgrediranno al sudetto ordine restar anco immediate privi del loro Carico.

32. Et i sopradetti Capitoli, et ordini siano dal Custode in tutte le sue parti inviolabilmente eseguiti, et osservati sotto quelle pene corporali, e pecuniarie, che parerà al Mag[istra]to, et etiam sotto pena de privatione della Custodia sudetta.

33. E perche alla giornata per l'incaminamento, e buone regole di esso fontego, potranno occorrer particolari, che ricercassero alteratione, dechiaratione, ò regulatione, risserviamo però a Noi, e Successori nostri autorita de dechiarir, e regular, aggiunger, e diminuir tutto quello che stimerano convenirsi.

Pasqual Cicogna

Ger[ola]mo Corner

Francesco Basadona

Marco Paruta

Domenego Thiepolo

1621 28 Maggio in Collegio

Con intervento, e ballotatione delli V Savij sopra la mercantia

Che i Capitoli sudetti dormati dalli Savij nostri alla mercantia siano confirmati, et approvati, come stano, e giaciono

17 +; 4 - ; 5 -

[Margin] Noi Antonio Priuli Doge di Venetia Patron del sudetto stabile contentiamo quanto di sopra è scritto, et approbiamo di nostra mano propria quanto è stato fatto, et stabilito delli sudetti Ill[ustrissi]mi Signori V Savij alla mercantia per quello aspetto a tutti li nostri Interessi con buona ventura.

16) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Prima serie*, b. 146, *Risposte*, ff. 97r–98r.

Opinion of the Cinque Savi on the expansion of the lazaretto of Split.

1624 adi 26 Marzo – Lazaretto di Spalato

Nella risoluzione che le Ecc[ellentissi]me V[ost]re giudicano bene di stabilire al presente sopra l'aggiunta da farsi al Lazaretto di Spalato per commodo, sicurezza, et augumento maggiore del corso de Mercanti, et robbe a questa scala, commettendo che in essa habbia da concorrere anco il parere di noi cinque Savij alla mercantia per obedire alla loro volontà, le dicemo, che vedute da noi con diligenza le lettere dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Signor Provveditor Generale Molino, con le scritture che ha mandato delli Ingegneri Candido, Alberti, Freddi, et del Vallutello Priore del medesimo Lazaretto sopra le loro opinioni in questa materia, et molto bene esaminati li disegni et modelli da essi formati a questa fine, stimiamo che sia la varietà di lensi, e le difficoltà che vi considerano in ogni parte per divertire quell contrarij che porta con se molta [illegibile] maggiori il fabricar in terra consistenti principalmente nella necessità di occupare molto spatio di terreno di parte [illegibile] con il pregiudizio che si convenirebbe inferire anco per quella via al monasterio et alla Chiesa di San Domenico, oltre al riguardo considerabile che si deve havere alla fondatione delle Cisterne all'impedimento delle immonditie, et alla necessità parimente che non si potrebbe fuggire di accrescer guardie con augumento di continua spesa per la distantia che sarebbe da questa nuova fabrica alli altri lazaretti, la quale venirebbe anco a difficoltare con dispendio il transito delle robbe dall'uno all'altro luoco per li due ponti che si conveniriano fare, sia però molto meglio quando pur le Ecc[ellentissi]me V[ost]re stimino di publico servitio il determinarsi alla fabrica predetta sopra il qual punto ci pare molto necessario ogni più maturo riflesso di fondarla, et costruirla più tosto sopra l'aqua nel modo, che ciene proposto, et discorso dall'ingegniero Alberti, giuntandola all'ultimo Angolo del Lazaretto novissimo per dover terminare sopra la strada Commune poi che mentre si trova nel fondo il sasso vivo, come afferma egli vedersene chiara l'isperienza, si rende indubitabile, che la fundamenta debba riuscire così coda [?], et resistente, che non habbia da riavere

offesa dall'impeto del Mare, et che l'opera si possa anco adempire con qualche più avvantaggio et di tempo et di spesa, et con sicurezza di potersi costruire parimenti in quel sito una molto commoda, et capacissima Cisterna, che è parte tanto importante et principale dell'opera istessa. Questo è quel più che in obediencia de loro comandamenti ci occorre dire del nostro parere.

Agostino Michiel

Francesco Morosini

[crossed out]

Marco [illegible]

Paolo Antonio Valaresso

17) HR-DAZD-1, kut. 12 (Giovanni Battista Grimani, single book), ff. 682v–683r, July 13, 1643.

Regulation on the presence of Turks in the city of Zadar and on the house for their confinement.

Sul ricovero notturno de' Turchi e morlacchi nelle Città

L'esempio delle provisioni fatte dagli Eccellenetissimi Precursori nostri intorno l'alloggiar in tempo di notte Turchi, et loro sudditi che intrano in questa importantissima Piazza, et altre di Provincia ci hà dato occasione di penetrar nelle conseguenze gelose che la libertà di ricoverarli in luoghi sparsi della Città senza sapersi dove, da chi, quanti, con che armi, et oggetti può partorire. Anche si come noi habbiamo tenuto l'occhio pronto, et assiguo con diversione d'ogni accidente et inconveniente, così nel presente repatriare venimo esser chiamati alla provisione stessa dell'ordinata casa, con persona deputata per il loro [illegible] onde resti levato ogni dubbio di suspitione, et scandalo. Havutà però esperienza, che molto avveduto, et pratico in questa genere d'affari riesce il fedel Luca Stagneri assistente alle Porte di Terra Ferma per l'ingresso de Turchi, hà obligato di alloggiar, et far spesar quelli, che con publiche lettere capitano, avezzo, et accreditato ancora à maneggiar con loro negotij Publici. Terminiamo coll'avutta del [illegible] nostro, et in virtù delle presenti per capo di Publico servitio, gli commettimo, che debba haver provveduto di una Casa capace, et commoda, ove possano, et debbano redursi, tutti li Turchi, et morlachi loro sudditi, in tempo di notte senza armi di alcuna sorte, dovendo tenervi continuamente persona, che assiste, et dorma in essa, con cura di serrar le porte la sera à hore 24, et Aprirle la mattina à hora competente, obligando il Stagneri espressamente à portar la sera à noi, et Successori nostri nota del numero delle persone che saranno in Casa, sicuri noi, che nel resto riuscirà avveduto, et destro nel divertirle braghe, et osservar bene quanto fosse degno della notitia nostra, gl riferisci il tutto di sera in sera puntualmente. Per il pagamento poi dell'affitto di essa Casa, et recognitione della persona, che sarà deputata, ordiniamo che la medesima sia rollata in una delle Compagnie di Italiani di questo Presidio, et corrisposta la paga senza altro obligo di fattione, come à punto si è praticato dagli Eccellentissimi Precursori nostri, ne altro di vantaggio possa pretendere dal Principe il Stagneri per la detta Casa, et persona. Le presenti però non dovranno haver effetto alcuno, se prima non saranno confermate et invigorate dal Publico beneplacito, alquale si intendano sottoposte giusta le leggi. in quorum.

Zara 13 Luglio 1643.

18) BMC, PDc 740, item II, *Giornale del Fondaco*, pp. 140–142, Jan. 20, 1699 m. v.

Building survey of the Fondaco dei Turchi by the proto and public building expert Angelo Gornizai for the Cinque Savi,

Ill[ustrissi]mi et Ecc[ellentissi]mi Sigri Savij alla Merc[anzi]a

Humiliati Noi infrascritti Periti alli Reveriti Comun di dell'E[ccellenze] V[ostre] di doverle servire nel sopra luoco fatto al Fontego de Turchi per dover in quello vedere et esaminare li bisogni che occorre per render habitate le camare di detto Fontego come affittati li Magazeni e per poter in essi metervi mercantie come pure altri bisogni neccessarij nel medesimo Fontego.

Fatta da Noi diligente osservatione prima alla qualità dell'Aqua delli due Pozzi nella corte, habbiamo quella ritrovata di buona qualità, ma neccessario d'esser nettato li Cassoni e riffatto molti pezzi di salizo attorno d'essi, ove sono sfondrati, nettar molto rovinazo, che vi sono per detta corte, in particolare la scala al Rio del Megio.

Si doverà riffar il Muro cadente di detta scala, come il muro che serve di pozzo, rimeter molti scalini, che sono sconcertati, ponervi delli Arpesi per ben assicurarli, riffar li salizi dei patti, che sono sconcertati, come pure aggiustar li scalini nell'altra scala fuori di loco.

Si siamo poi portati a rivedere li Magazeni, et questi ad uno per uno gli habbiamo essaminati, nei quali in molti vi occorono di farli li suoi suoli da novo, che in molti non se ne vedono vastige [illegible] di essi, in parte accomodarli, ove sono rotti, in parte metadi da rovinazzo, riffar porte da novo, riffar Balconi, e refficarli ove sono buoni, e mettervi la sua feramenta neccessaria ove occorre, come pure accomodar molti pezzi di salizo della corticella che sono rotti, nella corte verso Canal Grande vi sono la Riva ove si dismonta, che tre intieri scalini di mezo cerchio vi manca il patto disfatto, riffar da nuovo il finimento del muro che sono caduto, rimeter quatro collonelle nelli corsaroli per poter ligar le piatte de mercanzie nettar tutti li rovinazzi, che sono in detta corte; assicurar la travadura della Terazza coperta ove sono intarciti li suoli.

Riffar da novo la scala di legno nel sottoportico e quella ben assicurata per poter per essa trancitarvi con mercantie.

Per la qualli tutte operationi da noi vedute gli potria occorer di spesa tra materiali e fatture in circa – d[ucati] 350

Si siamo poi portati di sopra nel soler ove sono le camare che deve servire per uso de mercanti Turchi, et in queste ne habbiamo vedute, che parte sono accomodate con sue porte spiere e poggioli, parte che vi occorono d'accomodar Poggioli, reffar spiere da novo accomodar camini,

Fogeri per uso di detti mercanti, e parte di esse camare rotte e inabitabili che vi manca travadura, siolo sotto, salizi, porte da novo spiere o Poggioli.

Nella sala grande sopra la corte gl'occorre far da nuovo il suo Pogioli, li lavelli tanto in detto luoco quanto nella sala verso Canal Grande, aggiustar salizi per meso li Pergoli, et anco sioli se fossero imarziti.

Per le qualli tutte fatture da Noi vedute stimiamo che gli potrà occorer di spesa tra materiali e fatture in circa – 220 d[uati]

Vi sono poi le sopracamare, che non si ha potuto vedere per non esservi scale da poter ascendervi, ma per quello habbiamo veduto di sotto nelle camare ove manca le travadure, vi occorerà Porte, salizi, spiere, sioli, scale da novo che per non haverle potute vedere ad'una, ad'una non potiamo sapere la spesa.

Si siamo poi trasferiti nelli mezadi, che sono disabitati senza Porte, senza Fenestre, o Trombe ove gli occorre, e la maggior parte di essi sono ripieni di rovinazzi, con salizi rotti, con scale precipitose per esser marze neccessarie d'esser rifatte da novo, come pure molti parè (pure?) smaltati da riffar da novo che separa un mezado dall'altro.

Per le quali operationi tutte da farsi in detti Mezadi potrà occorere di spesa tra materiali e fatture in circa – 500 d.

Si siamo poi sempre servendo l'E[ccellenze] V[ostre] trasferiti nella Fondamenta del Meglio per vedere un appartamento in detto Fontego al pian dei Mezadi, che di presente s'affitta per uso di casa al presente inaffittato, nel quale vi sono cinque stanze, con altri luochi, ma in questo appartamento non habbiamo veduto occorerci cosa di rilevanza.

Di sotto la sudetta habbitazione si siamo portati a vedere una Botega e casa a pe' pian divisa in cinque luochi affittata al Remer, questo sito era il restante sotto Porticho, e corte del Fontego, ove vi era una Riva al presente otturata e occupata la portione di corte convertita in detta casetta, avanti la corutione della quale soleva esser tutta corte, e sottoPorticho libero per uso del detto Fontego, ne meno in questa habbitatione ne habiamo veduto occorervi cosa di rilevanza.

Vi sono poi dall'altro Angolo di detto Fontego sopra Canal Grande vicino al Traghetto la casa che serve per uso del Guardiano attuale del Fontego, in questa non si siamo transferiti, a vederla per non esservi bisogno di rilevanza.

Questo è quanto potiamo humilmente rappresentare all'E[ccellenze] V[ostre] in adempimento de loro riveriti comandi, e humili andosi [?] s'inchiniamo dall' E[ccellenze] V[ostre].

Terminata li 20 Gennaio 1699

Anzolo Gornizai Protto Aff[erm]o

19) ASVe, *Provveditori e Sopraprovveditori alla sanità*, b. 452, June 22, 1719.

Excerpt from the survey of the scala di Spalato.

[...]

Questa magnifica Fabrica è composta da 7 Recinti; il primo si chiama della Generalità perché è abitazione dell'Ecc[elentissi]mo Provv[editore] Generale et sua Corte; il secondo Doanette, così chiamata perché deve servire di deposito delle Mercanzie espurgate et de Passeggeri ancora, sin tanto capiti occasione d'imbarco et per alloggio delli Mercanti turchi al ritorno che fanno da Venezia, in caso havessero d'attendere Carovane per trasportarsi al loro Paese [...].

Questo secondo Luoco ha due gran tezone et altri sei volti con sei comode stanze in solaro, nelli sei volti é compreso quello serve per Porta. Il terzo é piuttosto Andio che Recinto; da un lato vi é la Capela in solaro, et in pe piano un Magazzino all'opposto del luogo, che benché ristretto, serve d'abitazione, con le adiacenze, alli Priori, dopo che li sono state levate le stanze a loro destinate nel primo Recinto della Generalità. Nel passare dal secondo Recinto a questo stesso luoco, vi é un Solaro di sopra alla Porta, una camera ad uso del Guardiano de Chiave.

Il quarto é il primo Recinto di Contumacia-questo é diviso per il mezo da due muri che formano Calle per il comodo passaggio alli recinti avanzati; per distinguere questi due Tramezati li diremo, Tramezato da Terra e Tramezato da Mare, ognuno di questi Tramezati ha una filla di cinque gran Magazeni, capazzi di 15 in 16 migliara di Lana incirca, ariosi quanto bisogna, per havere la facciata quasi tutta aperta, con gran portone et due gran fenestroni. In solaro, sopra questi cinque Magazeni, vi sono sei camere che ognuna tiene il Spatio d'un Magazeno et queste camere potrebbero servire ancora per sboro di Mercantie, Havendo ognuna sufficiente Porta et uguali finestre [...].

Con il fondamento di informatione havuta, che in questi Lazzaretti pochi sono li Mercanti che si fermino alla Contumacia, ma che una Caravana, benché fosse di 100 cavalli, consegnate che hanno le Mercantie, lasciano un'huomo o due per sopra carico, li altri ritornano al loro Paese, per conseguenza pocco impiegate le Stanze per passeggeri; questo quarto luoco, all entrata ha sopra le porte due camerini, a comodo delli Guardiani che devono stare di Guardia, onde questo quarto Luoco, primo di Contumacia, ha 10 Magazzeni, 12 Camere, 2 Teze.

Il quinto si nomina Doana Sporca, quivi si ricevono le Carovane, da una pare ha un gran Portico, a comodo delli Cavalli, con di sopra sei gran camere. Alla parte opposta 6 Magazeni, con sopra altre 6 camere-servono di deposito, in caso non si potesse dar subito la contumacia et per alloggio di quelli Mercanti che volessero fermarsi una notte o due, fintanto che facciano la consegna delle Mercantie.

Sesto – vi é la Cavana per l’espurgo delle Cere. Questa sar  capace di 300 Colli di Cera incirca in una volta; nell’istesso recinto vi   una gran corte et 2 Magazeni per asciugare le Cere uscite dalla Cavana, sopra quali Magazeni vi   Stanza per il Guardiano, Oltre questa Cavana, nell’ primo Recinto di Contumacia, in un angolo vi   una fontana capace di 20 Colli incirca di Cera

Settimo ed ultimo Recinto, nominato S. Pietro da Terra e S. Pietro da Mar, questo pure   diviso da un muro come il quarto, primo di Contumacia, non ha per  la Calle come l’altro perch  non vi resta altro passaggio. L’uno di questi tramezzati, nel sopradetto quarto Recinto; ha ancora in testa la Teza, tutta aperta come quello et S. Pietro da Mar da 4 pur grandi Magazeni in filla, con sopra sue Camere et in testa parimenti la sua Teza. Cosich  questi Recinti hanno per puro uso di Contumacia Magazeni N. 19-Camere 21 et 4 gran Teze [...].

Dall’erettione di questi Lazzaretti, fu provveduto alli bisogni d’acqua con 4 Pozzi [...]. il primo   nella gran corte della Generalit , con condotti che ricevono tutte le acque de coperti di quel recinto, il secondo nella Doana netta, il terzo in S. Pietro da Mar, il quarto in S. Pietro da Terra. Il primo [...]   di presente ridotto senza goccia d’acqua, non so se a causa che li condotti siano otturati [...] il secondo mi vien detto d’acqua sorgente, perch  mai   stato veduto asciutto, ma l’acqua per bere, mai   stata molto buona [...] il terzo ha d’ordinario scarsezza d’acqua e non molto buona, di presente asciutto, il quarto   l’unico che per Ministri e Passeggeri serve d’acqua buona da bere. [...] sino al 1704 i Priori alloggiavano nel primo Recinto, molto ampio e ricco di stanze, dove si alloggiavano anche Turchi che uscivano dalle Contumacie o ritornavano da Venezia. Gli ultimi due Priori, non si sa perch  furono levati di l . [...] la Doana netta   occupata da protti con famiglie, da Maestranze et da Trombete et Pifari, tutti pure con famiglie, onde di questa non posso disporre n  di camere n  di teze.

[...]

Spalato, 22 Giugno 1719

Andrea Marcobruni Priore

20) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Seconda serie*, b. 187, fasc. 5, Mar. 16, 1740.

Survey of the Fondaco dei Turchi by the architect and public building expert Lorenzo Boschetti.

Ad istanza di Paulo Duodo Agente del N[ostro] H[onorevole] Lunardo Pesaro essendomi conferito io sottoscritto sotto li 14 corrente nel Fontico de' Turchi, et osservate le muraglie di quella Fabrica, ho veduto esser quelle in stato di molto bisogno, mentre per quella che riguarda sopra il rio del miglio quando sino dal suo piede non resta fabricata di nuova ogni lavoro che in detta vi fosse fatto sarebbe inutile vedendo si le pietre logore, ed in più parti pendente che minaccia ruina. Ora però è sostenuta da sbadaggi di legname novamente rimessi in luoco d'altri che anteriormente vi erano, e che si sono dal tempo infraciditi, essendo detti opposti all'antedetto muro di là del Rio.

Altri muri interni sopra una corte coperta nel interno di detta fabrica, sono della qualità del sopradetto muro, et anco questi per anco sbadaggiati fra loro ricevono il vantaggio della loro sussistenza benche pendenti, e di pessima qualità, et questi pure per il loro riparo convengono esser disfatti, e rifatti nuovi di pianta.

Ho veduto similmente porzione d'un muro sopra il Salon al coperto contiguo ad altra porzione che fù rifatta di nuovo già anni otto in circa, e questa porzione [h]à bisogno del suo rifacimento per la mala qualità, che in se s'atrova.

Nelle faciate ancora sopra il Canal, e sopra la corte grande si vedono sconcerti nelli muri, che mostrano bisogno di molto lavoro.

E come le Travadure per l'antichità loro, e per essere molto maltrate dagli'abitanti di detto Fontico sono per la maggior parte fracide, però converano all'occasione della rifabrica de' muri esser rinovare, tutto che in più luochi, ed in più tempi vi siano stati rimessi molti Filli sotto alle dette, e ciò per costruzione presente non essendo in disposizione di potersi col mezzo d'arpesi far legamento valevole per contenere in buona sussistenza li muri sconcertati, et inabili, ridotti anco li medemi a tal grado, che per la sua antichità, e massime perche in molti luochi di continuo sono bagnati dal Acqua che viene gettata dalli sudetti abitanti del Fontico. Avendo veduto nel tempo del sopraloco lavarsi i pani loro nel soler del portico delle collone, e spander le lavadure sopra detto solaro con notabile pregiudizio della travadura, e muri, e più con indiscretezza in più luochi fatta ogni sorte d'imondizia, il che è stato il motivo più forte della rovina di detta Fabrica.

Al ristauo, ò sia rifabrica della maggior parte di detto Fontico sarà considerabile la spesa, e di non pochi migliara di ducati, poco giovanco li giornalieri lavori, che frequentemente vengono fatti rispetto alla qualità della gran molle [?] di detto stabile.

Lorenzo Boschetti Publico Perito Aff[er]mo di mano propria

1740 21. Marzo

Presentata, e letta al Magistrato Eccellentissimo de V Savii alla mercanzia col conto annesso.

21) ASVe, Senato, Dispacci, PTM, b. 478, fz. 682, n. 46, Sept. 22, 1741.

Relation of the provveditore straordinario di Albania Marco Querini on the restoration and hydraulic works in the lazaretto, and the construction of new lodgings for the emin and the merchants in town.

Al sovrano comando di V[ostr]a Ser[eni]tà espresso in Ducali 8 Ottobre 1740 per il restauro di questi Lazaretti pervenutemi solo il giorno 30 del susseguente Novembre non hà mancato la mia obbedienza di prontamente accorrervi con quella sollecitudine, che mi era ingionta, e che ben esiggeva la importanza dell'Opera, ma che nel tempo stesso potrè addattarsi alla stagione che soprastava. Inoltrata questa alla rigidezza non rende atta ai lavori ne altro hà potuto permettermi che l'approntamento de' materiali tutti occorrenti, per poi impiegarli alle costruzioni necessarie nel miglior tempo da cui molto si saria contribuito al risparmio, alla perfezione, e alla durabilità delle stesse.

Tre furono li punti della venerata publica commissione tutti e tre considerati indispensabili, e necessarij dal provvido discernimento dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato.

Il primo d'introdurre nel Lazaretto l'acqua tanto necessaria all'espurgo delle Cere, et agli usi quotidiani de mercadanti Turchi; e restò ingionto all'umillissima Persona mia de sciegliere uno de' due proposti progetti, o alcun altro, che apparisse sul luogo stesso il migliore.

Il secondo di riparare ai molti pregiudizij rimarcati nel Lazaretto stesso, e particolarmente nei Tetti.

Ed il terzo la erezione di un Tezone in questo Borgo, onde mettere al coperto le persone, e le merci fino a che restassero introdotte nè Lazaretti.

Col favore, e colla opportunità della scorsa stagione trovarsi già dalla ma obbedienza tutte e tre le sopra accennate operazioni condotte di presente al suo perfetto termine; nè altro manca a compimento del mio dovere che di renderne a capo per capo distintamente informato l'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato.

E per quello sia la introduzione dell'Aqua nel Lazaretto fatte da me le necessarie osservazioni sul luogo, et avutone ancora l'accreditata opinione del ben perito Ingegnere Nicolò Rigo, quale con merito, e con indefessa applicazione fù sempre assistente ai lavori, si è stabilito tra i varij progetti,

quello di levar l'acqua dal Convento de' Calogeri con riflesso ancora alla perfetta qualità sua, et al maggiore publico risparmio. Fù [illegibile] formato prima con muro un recipiente al luogo di sua estrazione, condurla per una distanza di mille trecento piedi per terreno ora montuoso, e di grebano, in cui si dovè escavar l'aquedotto, ed ora basso, ove col mezzo di alcuni scoladori si rendè necessario difendere l'aquedotto medesimo dalle aque superiori. Raccolta poi alla discesa l'acqua stessa in un pozzo espressamente costruttovi, resta questa col mezzo de' canoni di pietra assicurati da due forti ponti cavali di muro, e per il tratto di piedi cento settanta cinque tramandata fino alla Piazza del Lazaretto, dove formata una Fontana esce ad uso delle necessarie occorrenze, ed inoltre sotteraneamente fluisce nella Cavana delle Cere per espurgo delle medesime. Di tal modo alla stagnante, e corrotta sostituita un'acqua perenne, e salutare con maggior beneficio delle contumacie, si rende questa inoltre molto opportuna alle Navi, ed alle Galere del Golfo solite approdare a queste Bocche, quali potranno aguevolmente accomodarsi per l'avvenire del bisognevole senza allontanare le Ciurme.

Passando ora all'altro capo dei comandati restauri nel Lazaretto stesso, che necessarij rende anzi ad oggetto di assicurare nelle sue stazioni le persone egualmente, e le merci, hò dovuto far rinovare intieramente li coperti delle due Teze maggiori ridotti già a rovinoso stato, fortificandoli con nuovo legname, e ferramenta; rimettere ancora le porte, le finestre, ed i restelli già infraciditi, ed inoltre riordinare il Tezone de' Cavalli fuori del Lazaretto pur cadente, e la Casa stessa, che dovrebbe servire d'ordinaria abitazione agli emini. Fù pure trovato indispensabile coprire la Cavana delle Cere a sicurezza delle medesime. Ne finalmente hò lasciata parte alcuna del Lazaretto senza la dovuta osservazione, e riparo a pregiudizij anche più lievi, ma che il tempo suol rendere gravi, e dispendiosi.

Nel tempo medesimo, che travagliavasi nell'Aquedotto, e nel Lazaretto, ho pur dato mano alla Fabrica in questo Borgo, ch'è la terza ingiontami operazione. Restò questa piantata in Lunghezza de' piedi novantasei, e trentatre di larghezza, e fù ripartita nel suo piano, non solo a commodo de' conduttori, ed a riparo delli Animali, e mercanzie, ma per stazione ancora degli emini, e ciò a studio pure di risparmio, e per iscarsare alla publica cassa l'annuo affitto di Cechini tre assentiti dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato per loro ricovero; giache non potevano [illegibile] di passare all'abitazione loro assegnata nel Lazaretto, la cui distanza veniva di pregiudicare il loro interesse nell'essazione de' Diritti per le mercanzie arrivano in Borgo, e per quelle estratte da questa scala. Fù detta costrutta in Capo alla Fabrica di un solo solaro, e ripartita in due separate stazioni a commodo de' mercanti, che dovessero pernottare, e per ricovero ancora de' soggetti Turchi che di quando in quando compariscono o per loro interessi, o per commissioni delli Passà. Al piepiano della

medesima ho fatto costruire una Stala, ed il quartiere de' Soldati, che devono assistere alle stangate, tutti separati, e senza comunicazione. Chiuso in oltre tutto il luogo della contumacia con muri, onde non possa alcuno sfuggire l'occhio della sentinella, e fornito ancora di acqua col mezzo di un Aquedotto onde per mancanza di un tal requisito non vadano esposti i gelosi riguardi di salute al divagamento degli Animali, e degli Uomini per il Borgo. Il tutto apparirà all'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato dall'unito disegno fatto formare in pianta, prospetto, e profilo con la giusta dimensione, e necessarie annotazioni; et il tutto posso assicurare l'Ecc[ellen]ze V[ostr]e essere stato travagliato in forma consistente, e durabile, e col possibile risparmio. Io certamente e nell'una e nell'altra parte non ho mancato di prestarvi tutta l'attenzione, e diligenza quale si conveniva a publico impegno, et alla aspettazione de' mercanti Turchi, ridotto mi perciò espressamente già quatro mesi in questa Piazza, donde non passò giorno, che io non visitassi i lavori del Lazaretto ben per due miglia distante, ch'è quanto io posso dare.

A soccorso poi dell'occorrente spesa, e a risarcimento de' mercanti, che mi aveano accommodato di danaro per la provista de' materiali, fù pronta la publica provvidenza, facendo pervenire a questa parte con sue venerate Ducali, e col mezzo del magistrato ecc[ellentissi]mo sopra Camere al quartieroni Cechini quatro cento, che a d[ucati] 48 giusto al Publico Comando formano la summa di Lire dieci nove mille due cento. Le tali, e tante indispensabili operazioni dovutesi praticare in questo Borgo per la nuova Fabrica, et al Lazaretto per li restauri comandati, come pure per la costruzione delli due Aquedotti compreso di costosissime condotte per luoghi montuosi, e difficili, hanno seco portato il dispendio li Lire Vinti tre mille settanta cinque soldi quatro, che oltrepassa la summa spedita di Lire tre mille ottocento settanta cinque, e soldi quatro, quali col raguaglio sopradetto formano la summa di Cechini ottanta Lire trenta cinque, e quatro, come dalle due accluse Polize distintamente rilevasi. Anco di questi sono stato fornito dai mercanti, che mi aveano accommodato li primi de quali ne suplico con tutto ossequio la missione per farne la debita restituzione. Oltre le sudette due Polize di spese unisco pure quelle del consumo de materiali, che furono estratti da questi Depositi, implorando, e per l'una, e per le altre dalla publica graziosa condiscendenza la necessaria approvazione a cauzione mia, e degli Amministratori.

Stabiliti di tal modo questi emini nel Borgo di conveniente alloggio viene con ciò, non solamente a cessare a V[ost]ra Ser[eni]tà l'annuo aggravio dei Cechini tre soprariferiti, ma la Casa stessa al Lazaretto, che dovea loro servire di abitazione viene ora a restar libera alle publiche disposizione. Abbandonata questa di Abitatori, et esposta conseguentemente ai pregiudicij verrebbe in poco tempo anche a perdersi; quando per altro potria farsene un qualche uso vantaggioso alla publica Cassa, e commodo a contumacianti medesimi. Mancano [?] questi degl'ordinarij provvedimenti per

diffetto di Vivandieri. Il disordine non è indifferente; la penuria, e il disagio è inseparabile dal disgusto, e dalla allevazione de' mercanti; e però esige dalla pubblica provvidenza un qualche compenso. Potria aversi questo assai pronto investendo alcuno della Casa stessa con una conveniente corrisponsione nella pubblica Cassa, e con obligazione previsa di mantener la in acconcia aggiuntovi però l'incarico di tenersi giornalmente fornito degli ordinarij provvedimenti necessarij al vivere, a non manchi mai il bisognevole a Turchi Negozianzi. Vorrei sperare, che facilmente si rinvenissero persone pronte a assumerne l'impegno; io però non ho voluto intervaRmi con veruna ricerca prima di venerare il Levamento di V[ostr]e Ecc[ellen]ze nel proposito.

Devo finalmente rassegnare ai prudentissimi riflessi dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato la tanto necessaria preservazione, e custodia de' costruiti Aquedotti, quali facilmente o s'ingossano o restano dagli animali, e tal volta ancora in tempo di sicurtà da Villici stessi pregiudicati. Necessaria però a mio umilissimo credere si renderebbe la restituzione di un Fontanaro soppressa già con Decreto di scansazione dalla Pubblica autorità, era il costui incarico di mantenere a proprie spese li Aquedotti, che somministrano a questa Piazza l'acqua tanto necessaria alla sussistenza del Presidio, e degli abitanti, quali bene spesso provano le moleste conseguenze di una tale soppressione particolarmente nella state mentre o ingossata, o distrata l'acqua convien loro attingerla in distanza di più di un miglio. Il di lui assegnamento non era più che di Lire vintiquattro di questa moneta al mese, e di un pezzo di pane. Quando piacesse alla pubblica carità di rimeterlo alla paga, e alle incombenze medesime, si potria ad esso aggiungere senza ulteriore corrisponsione un'egual carico in riguardo anche ai nuovi aquedotti del Lazaretto, e di questo Borgo, ed in tal modo assicurarsi della loro preservazione, e dal pericolo di nuovi dispendij in progresso. Ho creduto di mio particolar dovere assoggettare alle savie considerazioni di V[ostr]e Ecc[ellen]ze l'una e l'altra di queste esiggenze, che ben meritano un maturo riflesso in riguardo alla susistenza di questi Lazaretti, che tanto sono, e giusticamente a Cuore dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato. A me non resta che attendere le sovrane prescrizioni di V[ostr]a Ser[en]ità, et implorare, come faccio profondamente, e sovra la fiacca, ma zelante opera mia, e sovra il presente ossequioso rapporto il publico clementissimo compatimento Grazie.

Castel Novo 22 Settembre 1741

Marco Querini P[rovvedito]r Es[traordinar]io

[follow several expense sheets and material requisitions, united for both projects]

22) ASVe, *Senato, Deliberazioni, Terra*, fz. 2128, February 1751.

The reconstruction project of the Fondaco dei Turchi made with the employment of proto Paolo Rossi. Proposal and explanation of the project by the proprietor Leonardo Pesaro (n.1-2), opinion of the Cinque Savi alla mercanzia (Feb. 9), and the acceptance and final remarks of the Senate (Feb. 11).

[Margin] SS del Cons.o S. Andrea Memo in Tna SS di TT.a

1750: 11 Febraro in Pregadi

Quanto è necessario in questa Città un alloggio separato dai Christiani per uso de Turchi , come lo è quello del Fontico a tale effetto loro destinato, altrettanto è comendabile il zelo, e l'attenzione del Mag[istra]to de' V Savi alla merc[anzia] nell'invigilare alla soprintendenza del mantenimento di esso, e pur lo stato, in cui atrovasi rovinoso, e cadente, nell'avere con prudenti insinuazioni ridotto il N[ostro] H[onorevole] Lunardo Pesaro che ne è il Proprietario a divenire a questi restauri, e rifabbrica, che dalla ora letta Scrittura del Mag[istra]to stesso rilevarsi.

Molto si compiace pertanto questo Cons[igli]o, che a Pub[blic]o decoro, ed a comodo della nazione Ottomana si voglia nella interna rifabbrica di quello Fontico ridurre le camere, e mezzadi al n[umer]o di 53, secondo i suggeriti Capitoli 1621 dal Pub[blico] Dragomano d'allora Membre, colla aggiunta poi di altre tre camere, una per la custodia dell'armi, le altre due da destinarsi all'uso delle ridduzioni delle rispettive nazioni di Europa, ed Asia.

Intenendosi inoltre, che alla parte della salizada verso il Traghetto col nuovo sistema della Fabbrica si desideri dal N[ostro] H[onorevole] Proprietario sudetto costruirvi in porzione di essa alcune piccole abitazioni per uso de' Cristiani, senza però comunicazione veruna col Fontico stesso, si assente alla costruzione medesima, colla clausula peraltro, che devenendo maggiore l'affluenza de' Turchi a questa parte, esse abitazioni pur anche abbiano da essere in allora disposte all'uso di detta nazione, restando sempre al Proprietario N[ostro] H[onorevole] sudetto il diritto della esazione degli affitti sopra delle medesime.

Ridotto a tale sistema il divisato progetto, sarà della attenzione del Mag[istra]to sudetto il far formare i modelli, come pure il far estendere i mentovati capitoli a norma del 1621 colle aggiunte accennate, riportando ogni cosa a lume Pub[blic]o per le deliberazioni, che convenissero.

Avrà in vista il Mag[istra]to stesso nella rifabbrica che il Pozzo particolarmente sia ridotto in modo, che tener possa acqua sana, articolo necessarissimo agli oggetti, ed occorrenze de' Turchi medesimi.

Riducendosi per fine alla condizione, che le antiche Tariffe degli affitti rispetto alle merci debbano essere per il suo intiero osservate, e rattivato altresì l'obbligo di condursi tutte le merci di ragion de' Turchi in Fontico, ne che da esso possano essere estratte fuori della Dominante, se prima non viene supplito a quanto si ricerca riguardo all'alloggio, o magazenaggio, doverà il mag[istra]to distintamente riferire quale sia stato in tale proposito il metodo osservatosi per il passato, e se tutte le merci andanti, o venienti, oppure raccomandate a Turchi, o ad altri, abbiano ad essere soggette agli obblighi accennati, producendo il tutto a lume delle opportune disposizioni nel proposito

+ 102, - 6, - 4

Giannantonio Gabriel Segretario

Serenissimo Principe

A rimozione di quei Scandali che in offesa della Religione contro il buon costume, ed in onta della quite di questa città, nascevano allorchè erano i Turchi al loro giungere in questa città, in pieno arbitrio di ricoverarsi dove loro più aggradiva, si determinò la Pietà Religiosa, e prudente dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato di unirli in una sola abitazione, e staccarli dove la scostumatezza, la frode, e l'inganno cogliono alignare.

Trascielto per tall'uso da V[ostra] S[erenti]tà sopra i suggerimenti di questo magistrato l'attual Fontico de Turchi, fù il medesimo diviso, ò sia destinato per separata abitazione dei Turchi Europei, dai Turchi Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, ad oggetto, che ritrovandosi unite due nationi di temperamento, e di Ritto diverso non accadesse qualche inconveniente, che intorbidar potesse la publica quiete.

Destinatovi in allora un Custode, e due Guardiani. Il primo che invigilasse all'interna quiete del Fontico, et i 2. di perchè ogn'uno al Levar, e Tramontar del Sole aprisse et assistesse alle Porte, che per via di Terra, ed'Acqua davano Ingresso nel medesimo; restò in aggiunta fatta la limitazione de Pagamenti mensuali delle Camere, de magazeni, prescritto il numero de Camerini, et altro come si rileva dai capitoli 1621 suggeriti dall'esperienza del Publico Dragomano di que tempi Membre, et avvalorati dall'approvazione di questo magistrato.

Ridotta dall'Età di più secoli, e dal mall'uso che ne è stato fatto da Turchi di detta Fabbrica all'ultima desolazione, ritrovavasi cadente, e rovisona sino già alcuni anni, di maniera che fù partito di necessità il far sloggiare i Turchi allora concorenti a questa parte da quella porzione di detta Fabbrica, che era loro destinata, e tradurli ad abitare quella tangente del Fontico, che per occasione delle antepassate Guerre Turchesche et oziosità di tale abitazione era stata smembrata, e ridotta per abitazione de Cristiani.

Minacciando in oggi detto Fontico una totale rovina, non si è mancato di portar li più validi eccittamenti al N[ostro] H[onorevole] S[ignore] Lunardo Pesaro, che ha il diritto d'esigere gl'affitti, affine incontrasse la riffabrica del cadente edificio, al che finalmente egli si è ridotto con l'annesso Foglie, che restar dovvrà per monumento dell'assunto Impegno.

Ha egli nella nuova proposta studiato di attenersi all'Idea de precitati Capitoli 1621:

La facciata nel Canal Grande sarà conservata sull'antica sua architettura.

Cinquantatre luochi trà Camere, e mezzadi erano gli abitabili da Turchi nel cadente Fontico: E parimente viene proposto da costruirsi anche in presente con l'aggiunta di una camera per la custodia dell'armi, e di due altre, l'una ad uso delle ridduzioni degl'Asiatici e Costantinopolitani, l'altra degli Albanesi, Bossinesi, et altri Europei.

L'antico Fontico era in due Piani; Questo sarà in trè, cioè mezzadi, camere, e sopracamere.

I mezzadi, e le camere serviranno per alloggiare i Bossinesi et Albanesi, che frequentano questa Piazza; e le sopra Camere per gli Asiatici e Costantinopolitani, che sopravvenissero.

Vi saranno li due alloggi come vi sono anche oggi giorno, uno per il custode da verso il Canalgrande; L'altro per il Guardiano alla Porta della Salizada, che conduce al Traghetto.

Sarà alzato il fondo della nuova abitazione per un piede inc[irc]a, a fine restino maggiormente difesi li magazenì, e Pozzo dall'escrecenze dell'acque.

Le conditioni, che vengono richieste sono le seguenti.

Prima. Che l'appartamento delle 16 sopracamere destinate per uso degl'Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, e che avrà la sua Scala particolare sul piano delle Camere, debba tenersi chiuso, né lasciato in balja [volontà] de Bossinesi et Albanesi.

2.da Che l'antiche Tariffe degli affitti siano in ogni parte eseguite, come altresì ravivato l'obbligo di condursi tutte le merci di raggion de Turchi in Fontico, né che da quello possano essere estratte le provedute a questa parte per fuori di questa dominante, se preventivamente non è supplito quanto a titolo di alloggio ò magazenajo è dovuto.

L'avvisato Foglio n[umer]o 1 con l'aggiunta n[umer]o 2 spiegano più esatamente la fabbrica, e le ricerche di chi deve intraprendere un riguardevole dispendio senza veruna sicurezza di ritraere proventi corrispondenti al Capitale, che sarà per esborsare.

Sopravanzando dalla parte della Salizada verso il traghetto con il nuovo sistema della Fabbrica, sebben più numerosa de Luochi, una porzione dell'antico fondo, desidera il N[ostro] H[onorevole] S[ignor] Lunardo Pesaro, che è il Proprietario degli affitti, costruirvi per proprio conto alcune piccole abitazioni, la schena delle quali sia verso l'interno del Fontico, con muro diritto senza minimo foro che possa dare comunicazione, ò veduta alcuna nel Fontico stesso.

Quando venghi dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato approvata questa Idea, saranno tosto li Disegni ridotti in due modelli afatto consimili, ad'oggetto, che uno senza [?] di monumento Perene a publico lume da conservarsi nella Secreta, e l'altro resti presso chi ha, e sarà per avere il diritto d'esigere affitti, conche l'obbligo di mantenere e ristaurare l'edifizio

Il Piano della Fabbrica è stato formato con l'assistenza di Protto da noi destinatovi, e con la cognizione di questo magistrato, cosicchè nulla abbiamo d'aggiungere.

Le Condizioni sono per sè stesse oneste. Tuttavia vorrà l'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, accettando il Progetto, risservarsi espressamente il diritto, che quella Tangente di fabbriche che ad'uso di Cristiani saranno per esser fatte verso la Salizada su portione dell'antico Fontico, debba questa imancabilmente esser incorporata a spese del pre nominato N[ostro] H[onorevole], ò di chi avesse causa da lui quallor la sopravvenienza di maggior numero de Turchi esigesse più dilatato numero de Luochi, risservata per altro l'azione a detto N[ostro] H[onorevole] per l'esazione degl'affitti.

I Capitoli con i quali dovrà dirigersi il nuovo Fontico saranno poi dall'attività dell'attual Publico Dragomano Iseppo Volta, che serve a questo magistrato estesi, per esser susseguentemente da noi riveduti, et approvati, ad'oggetto, che tutto passi con metodo, e regola ad'utilità del Commercio, a comodo de Turchi, et a giusto proffitto di chi deve incontrare il dispendio. Grazie

Data dal mag[istra]to de V Savij alla mercanzia li 9 Febraro 1750

Ottavian Gritti Savio alla Mercanzia

Marc'Antonio Dolfin Savio alla Mercanzia

Nicolò Erizzo Savio alla Mercanzia

Zan Andrea Dalla Riva Savio alla Mercanzia

Franco Venier Savio alla Mercanzia

N. 1

Ill[ustrissi]mi et Ecc[ellentissi]mi S[ignor]i V Savij alla M[ercanzia].

Comparisce tanto essenziale la spesa che si rende necessaria per la rifabbrica della Casa di ragione di me Lunardo Pesaro destinata per alloggio, o Fontico de' Turchi, che sperarci di meritar compatimento se mi sono atterrito, e ritirato da impegno per tanta conseguenza, dal quale mai posso lusingarmi di ritrarne corrispondente profitto. Pare le zelanti insinuazioni di questo Ecc[ellentissi]mo Mag[istra]to, al quale è appoggiata dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato la grave materia. Li riguardi del pubblico servizio sempre adorati dal mio riverente animo, e le valide speranze dell'E[ccellenze] V[ostre] di assicurarmi il ripristino, e continuazione delli diritti stabiliti a

questo Fontico siano persuasa la mia obbedienza ad una volontaria rassegnazione, ben certo di conciliarmi il pubblico generoso compiacimento.

Conta questa antichissima Fabbrica oltre a quattro secoli dalla sua erezione, e da più di un secolo fu per abitazione de' Turchi, nazione mal colta, e che oltre alli pregiudizij dell'antichità ha dato mano con il mal uso alla sua rovina: ella fu altresì totalmente chiusa per molti anni. Lo che pure ha servito a pregiudicarla, e lasciar la mia casa senz'alcun profitto, e da spese riguardevoli di restauri in caso di riaprimiento.

Ora questa casa non ha si può dir altro di buono, che il suo fondo, per altro conviene distruggerla dal tetto sino alle fondamenta, e voglia il cielo, che queste sussistano in tutto il suo circondario.

La nuova idea della rifabbrica io l'ho fatta poner tutta in disegno con l'esame anche del Perito del presente Ecc[ellentissi]mo Mag[istra]to. Per addattarmi alle intenzioni degli antichi capitoli dell'anno 1621 segnati dal fu Ser[enissi]mo Doge Antonio Priuli in allora Proprietario, e mio autore, unica base, e regola di tal contratto, osserva esser queste dirette ad accommodare due differenti nazioni, l'una di Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, l'altra di Albanesi, e Bossinesi, e di accommodarle in modo, che potessero alloggiare con qualche separazione per la differenza delli loro riti.

Nelli cap[itoli] sudetti erano destinati 53 luoghi fra mezzadi, e camere, cioè 27 per li Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani, e questi dalla parte del Rio del Meggio, e 26 per gli Albanesi, e Bossinesi, e questi dalla parte della salizzata, che discorre verso San Gio[vanni] Decolato, et il Traghetto, oltre li magazzini terreni, e non vi erano mosche, ne camera per la custodia dell'armi.

Per tener questo Fontico piu unito, mi sono condotto a componer la nuova fabbrica in tre piani, ossia solari, cioè mezzadi, camere, e sopracamere, oltre li magazzini terreni, e saranno in tutti 53 luoghi abitabili oltre due mosche, et una camera per le armi, con scale, corridori, passatizi, e sale, coll'oggetto, che a tutto sia provveduto abundantemente, e vi saranno pure li due alloggi per il custode verso il Canal Grande, e per il Guardiano alla Porta sopra la Salizada; sarà conservata l'antica facciata sopra il Canal Grande, e questa nella sua presente architettura, e riparata dell'occorrente per la sua presente sussistenza. Sarà pure alzato il fondo del Fontico per un piede in c[irc]ja, onde da tal alzamento restino guardati li magazzini, e Pozzo dall'escrescenze delli canali.

So darà principio alla rifabbrica tosto che la presente um[ilissi]ma descrizione, e suo contenuto sia approvato dall'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato, e si darà principio dalla parte di Rio, ch'è la più rovinosa, e periditante, sicchè al mio compimento potrà questa servire per gli Albanesi, e Bossinesi, essendo questi quelli, che in presente concorrono a questa Piazza, e nel mre [?] chi si fabbrica, potranno

continuar il loro alloggio dalla parte della Salizzada, che non ha pericoli imminenti con quella forma di custodia, che sarà dall'Eccellenze Vostre creduta necessaria.

Descritti tali miei impegni ben vedono l'Eccellenze Vostre che non tutto devo perdere in una spesa così grandiosa. Non tutta fu mai questa casa, o questo Fontico all'uso de Turchi, e qualche parte restò sempre a beneficio del Proprietario, e vedono altresì l'Eccellenze Vostre che nello stato presente di cose non ho speranza di profitti che vagliano [?] a compensare una tanta spesa, che neppur io so sin dove possa giungere, ed è perciò che resta disegnato il piccolo trato di Fondo dal Canal Grande sino alla Porta dell Fontico verso la salizzada per costruirvi per mio conto quelle piccole abitazioni che potranno in quel fondo annichirsi. Averanno queste fabbriche a mio uso, la schiena all'interno dell Fontico, con muro dritto senza minimo foro, che possa dar comunicazione, o veduta alcuna nel Fontico stesso.

Questa devota descrizione spiega all'Eccellenze Vostre questa nuova rifabbrica, e quello cio sia approvato dall'Eccellentissimo Senato, doverà il disegno sudetto ridursi in modello li elevazione con tutti li luochi, e solari descritti, et esserne fatti due affatto simili, perchè siano questi il monumento perenne a lume dell presente Eccellentissimo Magistralto, e della mia casa, sicchè tale debba conservarsi il Fontico, e non mai alterarsi, supplicando l'Eccellenze Vostre che la presente condizione sia rimarcata all'Eccellentissimo Senato, perchè munita della sua sovrana autorità, sia in ogni tempo eseguita.

Molto gioverà per conservar l'intenzioni delli Capitoli 1621 il tener separate le due nazioni sudette, e destinar a quella degli Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani l'appartamento superiore delle 16 sopracamere con la sua moschea, restandovi per li Bossinesi, et Albanesi tutte le 16 camere, e mezzadi n. 21, sono in tutti 37 luochi abitabili con altra moschea.

Praticano questi di alloggiar in 5, et anche in 6 in un medesimo luogo per risparmio degli affitti, in modo che se mai si promovesse una in ita affluenza, in 37 luochi possono accomodarsi 220 Turchi, vi sarà molto di superfluo, ma non doverà lasciarsi allo strapazzo di questa genti, che in pochissimo tempo sono atte a rovinarlo.

Le sopracamere per gli Asiatici saranno egualmente formate con tutto ciò, che serve a fabbrica, ma si lascieranno con qualche parte occorrente alla loro perfezione, come pavimenti, stoffe, camini, e cose simili, perchè tanto meno s'invoglino gl'Albanesi di volervisi introdurre, oltre che si doverà tener chiuso questo appartamento, che averà la sua scala particolare dal piano delle camere di niun impedimento al resto della fabbrica, per altro a dette piccole mancanze sarà supplito immediatamente che vi giungano gli Asiatici, e Costantinopolitani.

Intendo inoltre che resti preservato l'ordine della Tariffa per metodo sicuro al pagamento degli affitti sì per li luochi abitabili, quanto anche per li magazeni, ed altresì per le mercantie, che volessero salvarsi nelli corridori, entrade, o sottoportici per caso di risparmio, sendosi pure a queste dato sempre qualche prezzo, et il tutto con discreta proporzione della grave spesa, et al merito delle nuove, e sicure stantie.

Sarà benichè cosa ottima la rinovazione della Tariffa, ma inefficace poi senza la valida protezione delle Leggi, e singolarmente della Legge viva del presente Ecc[ellentissim]o Mag[istra]to. Pagano queste genti quando vogliono, e particolarmente gli affitti de' magazeni, tenendoli anni e anni, li passano da uno all'altro de loro mercanti, lasciando mercanzie invendute, per il che mi avvanza un'immenso credito, li aprono, e li usano a loro talento, e in aria di violenti non possono esser frenati dall'onorato custode, e meno servirà impetirle giudiciariamente.

Poco saranno per temere le pene afflittive, alle quali la maturità pubblica non vorrà forse dar mano. Ma avidi costoro, e pieni d'interesse, quando le loro violenze e defraudi siano gravati di pene pecuniarie che vengono di cadere, e di arrestare li loro effetti, prima che possano estrarli dal Fontico, e caricarli sopra Barche di trasporto, potranno giovar molto alla Giustizia dell'intenzione.

Sono altresì sicuro che l'E[ccellenze] V[ostre] con la scorta delle regole, che già vi sono, vorranno comandare, che le mercanzie venir debbano alle pubbliche dogane, et indi nel Fontico con il vero nome delli Turchi Proprietarij, correggendo le abusive espedizioni sotto l'apparente nome de' mercanti di nostra città, lo che altramente pregiudica l'interesse del Fontico, e molto anco il publico interesse.

Infratti, Mag[istra]to gravissimo, a tutto fu provveduto, e con li Ordini, e con li giudicij delli loro venerati precessori, basterà ravvivar questi, a nuovo giorno con quella forma che sarà della loro sapienza, e giustizia alla quale intieramente mi affido nell'importantissimo impegno da me incontrato per atto di rassegnazione alli publici riguardi. In oggi poco mi lusingo [?] di compensar appena il giornaliero dispendio delli salariati. Se la grave spesa arriverà a richiamar persone, e merci spererò incontrar qualche compenso all'importante Capitale, ma certo il vantaggio maggiore potrà essere per li dazij Publici.

4 Febbraio 1750

Presentata al Mag[istrat]o Ecc[ellentissim]o de' V Savi alla m[ercanzi]a dall'Ecc[ellen]te Tomaso Rossini per nome del N[ostro]H[onorevole] S[ignore] Lunardo Pesaro, con quattro disegni segnati del pnn [?] giorno.

Laus Deo p[rim]o Feb[brai]o 1750 Ven[ezi]a

Spiegazione delli disegni formati per la rifabbrica del Fontico per li mercanti Turchi, quale presentamente si ritrova in parte rovinoso, e incapace di ristauo, conservando però in piedi tutta la facciata sopra Canal Grande esistente e prima.

Il disegno dell primo Piano cioè terreno dimostra l'Ingresso, la Riva, passatici, corticella, sito delli luochi comuni, corte, sottoportici, scale per ascender nelli altri piani, abitazioni del custode, magazenì per collocar le mercanzie n[umer]o 20

Il disegno del 2.do Piano dimostra n[umer]o 21 mezzadi con li suoi passatici, et ingressi per entrar liberamente in ognuno di essi mezzadi – n. 21

Il disegno del 3.zo Piano, cioè delle Camere dimostra le due scale, una sopra la corte, l'altra riguardante il Canal Grande, scale, che servono per questo piano, et altre per ascender nel piano superiore, moschea, camera per le armi, luochi comuni, e n[umer]o 16 camere ad uso di abitazione – n. 16

Disegno del 4.to Piano, o sia delle sopracamere che dimostra scale per portarsi nel detto piano, passatici, moschea, e n[umer]o 16 camere – n. 16

Altezza delli Lumi delli piani sopradetti

Piano dei magazenì Piedi 10

Piano dei mezzadi Piedi 7 ½

Piano delle camere Piedi 10

Piano delle sopra camere Piedi 8

23) HR-DAZD-1, *Generalni providuri*, kut. 135 (Giovanni Maria Balbi, knj. II), ff. 52r–53r, July 20, 1752.

The decree of the provveditore general on the house for the Turks in Zadar

Per la concentrazione de' Turchi in tempo di notte in un solo locale in Zara

Lunghe e serie considerazioni ha esata da noi la libertà che in questa Piazza Reale di tanta gelozia godevano per l'addietro li mercanti e consudditi Turchi di prendere alloggio à loro piacere, e per lo più l'uno dall'altro divisi, vagando d'ogni angolo della Città, massim[ament]e di notte con quelle osservazioni che feriscono i riguardi pubblici, non che con pericolo delle vite d'essa Gente, ed altre fastidiosissime conseguenze. Così rimarcabile disordine trovato abbiamo però essere caso da quando al Soprastante attuale di Sanità al Posto di Terra Ferma Antonio Panaggioti, fù col Sovrano Decreto di regolazione abolito il Salario di Lire Trenta al mese assegnatogli con la Terminazione Civran 3 Marzo 1670, e che dall'avidità inoltre dè negozianti fù deluso dell'utilità s[opr]a gli animali provenienti da Stati esteri fiscate all'Impiego stesso con la Terminazione dell'altro Predecessore Nostro da Riva 24 Luglio 1705, appoggiata à ducali dell'Ecc[elentissim]o Senato. Studiando noi per tanto di rimetere l'afare nell'antico salutarissimo sistema, senza aggravio dell'Economia pubblica, doppo essersi persuaso il Soprastante med[essim]o a proveder novamente Casa Capace per ricovero de' sudditi Ottomani, siamo venuti in deliberazione d'incarcarlo dell'oservanza puntuale delle seguenti regole per cautela de riguardi Publici per la buona custodia, et assistenza d'essa Gente, non che à stabilirgli modo, con cui reggere il peso dell'affitto di (52v) Casa, et ad altre spese, ò coll'avanzo di qualche mercede animarlo a prestare il dovuto fedele servizio. Con l'avuta dunque del Generalato Nostro, e relativamente altresì alle Terminazioni, e ducali precitate, decretando terminiamo: che compita la Contumazia dè Turchi e loro consudditi di tempo in tempo venienti in questo Lazareto di San Marco, previe le diligenze comandate dalle Leggi di Sanità, e previo altresì l'assenso di questa Carica, et in assenza d'essa di questo N[ostro] H[onorevole] Capitane, debba il soprastante predetto introdurli in Città, et assegnar alloggio a cadauno nella propria Casa, non che ai Cavalli che [illegibile] avessero.

Dovrà ricuperar, e custodir in luogo ben assicurato le loro armi, ne restituirle se non nell'atto della partenza di cadauno, mai permetendo ch'esca nessuno di loro in tempo di notte, e vada errando per la Città, del che à misura degl'inconvenienti, che succedessero risponderebbe lui etiam con la vita. Perciò ò dovrà abitare nella stessa Casa anch'egli ò mantener un uomo a posta, che vi dorma, e chiuda le Porte a ore ventiquattro, nè siano aperte prima del levar del Sole.

Di sera in sera poi sarà debito d'esso soprastante di rassegnare à questa Carica, ed in sua lontananza al N[ostro] H[onorevole] Capitan, nota distinta dei Nomi dei sudditi Turchi alloggiati nella stessa Casa, unendovi anche il numero de loro Cavalli.

Avrà avvertenza d'usar con detta Gente buone maniere, di ben custodire i loro effetti, assisterle, e farle assister nel prove[di]mento di ciò, che loro abbisognasse, astenendosi d'altercar seco loro, e di pretendere mercedi maggiori di quelle gli restano nella presente Terminazione limitate.

Dovranno dunque essi Mercanti e Consuditi Turchi corrispondere ad esso sopra stante per l'affitto di Casa una Gazzeta per testa tra il giorno, e la notte, et una gazzeta per ogni Cavallo à senso di quanto fù stabilito dalla Terminaz[i]one da Riva preaccennata.

Come poi fù ella dalla Sagacità dei Negozianti derogata nella parte che riguarda la limitazione di mercede al Soprastante sui Cavalli, Manzi, e minuti Forastieri diretti per questa parte, o per Venezia, così troviamo parim[en]te giusto, e conveniente di decretare: ch'essendo per i tanti premessi delicatissimi oggetti necessaria la riduzione in una sola Casa de Mercanti, e Consuditi Ottomani, e la responsalità della loro custodia nel Soprastante accennato, giache resiste l'economia pubblica di ravivargli la paga, cui per il passato godeva, debbano per l'avvenire essergli corrisposti da Conduttori quatro Soldi per Cavallo, e per ca[da]n manzo, e per i minuti soldi due per testa, cioè per quelli diretti ad uso di questa Città siano di forastieri ò di Questa Prov[inci]a.

Per quelli poi che capitano al Caricatore indirizzati al Partito della Dominante Soldi due così per ogni Cavallo come per ogni Manzo, e Soldi uno per ciascun minuto stessam[en]te sianto naturali ò Forastieri, giacche sotto pretesto d'essere animali della Provincia, l'avidità dei Negozianti toglieva per l'addietro al Soprastante (53r) medesimo le sue mercedi legittime, e discrete da cio appunto derivano che tanto meno potendo egli regere al peso dell'affitto di Casa avevano luoco gli accenati osservabili inconvenienti, e giacevano inconseguenza inoservate le regole prudentissime con Publica approvazione combinate dal zelo di tanti nostri illustri Predecessori.

Nei tempi poi minaccievoli, che piaccia alla Divina Misericordia di tenerli lontani, saranno s[opr]a le mercanzie, e s[opr]a gli animali eseguiti quei sguazzi, e quelle diligenze che esecutivamente alle Leggi di Sanità fossero ordinate dall'attenzione di questo Colleggio, dovendo in tali Casi dai Contumazianti nel Lazareto di San Marco essere alli Guardiani di tempo in tempo destinativi corrisposte due lire al g[i]orno per cad[au]no, e le spese, a Seconda di quanto fù da vecchio tempo stabilito dall'Ecc[elentissi]mo Mag[istra]to alla Sanità.

Data li 20 Luglio 1752 Zara

24) ASVe, *Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, Prima serie*, b. 372, n. 131, ff. 5r–6v, Aug. 2, 1768.

Survey of the Fondaco dei Turchi by the architect Bernardino Maccaruzzi after its reconstruction. Notes changes made by Maccaruzzi.

Illustrissimi ed Eccellentissimi Signori V Savi alla Mercanzia

In obbedienza del venerato comando ingiuntomi da questo Ecc[ellentissi]mo Mag[istrat]o de V Savi del di 27 9bre [Novembre] 1767 – con comissione di far sopra luoco alla Fabbrica detta il Fontico de' Turchi, per riconoscere unitamente col fedelissimo Dragomano Giovanni Bellato, se tutte le disposizioni stabilite co' capitoli della Terminazione di detto Ecc[ellentissi]mo Mag[istrat]o del di 30 Aprile 1751 approvati col Decreto dell'Ecc[ellentissi]mo Senato 15 Maggio seguente concernenti alla disposizione, alloggio, e comodo dei Turchi in detto Fondaco; alle camere, magazzini, ed altro uso di detta Fabbrica si ritrovino intieramente corrispondenti al modello che in quel tempo fù dato per cauta direzione, e memoria d'ogni parte, il quale unitamente colla copia dei capitoli sopradetti mi fù consegnato, per l'effetto di una giurata perizia.

Trasferitomi pertanto a detto luogo insieme col Fedelissimo Dragomano sudetto, intervenuta anche l'Ag[en]te Generale delli N[ostri] H[onorevoli] Fratelli da Pesaro, per comissione dei detti N[ostri] H[onorevoli] Padroni di detto Fondaco, ho esaminata diligentemente detta Fabbrica, e visitati li piani tutti col confronto del detto Modello vi ho osservate alcune variazioni, e notabili mancamenti a quali detti N[ostri] H[onorevoli] Padroni hanno tosto fatta eseguire la regolazione relativamente al Modello sudetto, e di quanto al miglior uso, e comodo di detta Fabbrica, ho creduto di suggerire, per renderla anche più sana di quello esser poteva, come piano per piano, colle sue regolazioni dimostro, col mio disegno.

Primo Piano a terra

In questo Piano li Magazzini per conserva delle Mercanzie, i quali si ritrovano ora in 19 – hano a Balconi tutti le loro Ferrate, ma mancano delle Trombe di larice volute nel 2.o Capitolo della Terminazione. Però queste non sarebbero assolutamente necessarie per l'oggetto dello stesso Capitolo perche li Balconi sono situatti molto alti dal piano, ed ordinario orizzonte della nostra vista, e riguardano per la maggior parte li Pubblici Magazzini del Miglio.

Esaminata avendo la situazione di detti Magazzini del Fondaco, l'ho riconosciuti in parte molto umidi, effetto, che reca patimento alle Mercanzie, e perciò avendo creduto di suggerire a detti NN HH Padroni di detto Fondo di siolare i più bisognevoli per renderli più sani, e più comodi al loro uso, e così sollecitamente ne furono siolati sei, considerati dal custode di detto Fondaco, sufficienti al Comercio de' Turchi, dai quali, per quanto dice detto Custode, vengono voluti anche gl'umidi per

interesse delle loro lane. Avvertendo inoltre, che tre dei detti Magazzini nel mio disegno segnati n. 9 – 10 – 15 – stanno occupati con materiali del Capo M[astr]o Brunelo Muraro.

Nell'entrata della parte del Canal Grande si ritrova una scala di legno non mostrata nel Modello, stata introdotta, dicono, per dar passaggio a quattro Mezzadi superiori 17 – 18 – 19 – 20 – per dar l'alloggio a Turchi Tripolini, ne quali luoghi alloggieranno persone n.o 15 – giusto alla nota del Custode.

Secondo Piano delli Mezzadi

Confrontato detto Pianto, gl'anditi, che circondavano, e davano passaggio agli Mezzadi si ritrovavano non corrispondere con il Modello, perche mancanti di comunicazione l'uno con l'altro, e con alcuni Mezzadi, che rimanevano abbandonati, e privi d' ingresso; oltredicchè restavano detti anditi per gran parte oscuri, e senza il salutare passaggio dell'aria. Però detto disordine fù immediatamente tolto, ed aperti furono anditi in modo, che danno ora passaggio, e comunicazione a tutti li Mezzadi ridotti in n.o di sedici nei quali alloggieranno Persone n. 70 – come nella inserta nota del detto Custode; e si trovano detti luoghi ora più chiari, e più sani.

Dal piano delli secondi rami delle scale principali della Corte ritrovai lungo tutto quel Portico continuato un Poggiuolo di legno, come dimostro nel mio disegno, ma non indicato nel Modello, dal quale rilevasi, che questo fù fatto per dar ingresso agli Mezzadi 13, 14, 15, 16 l'andito dei quali fù tolto per aggrandire detti Mezzadi, regolazione, che migliorando la condizione di detti luoghi crederei di approvarla.

Alli Balconi de' detti Mezzadi mancano egualmente, che a quelli de' Magazzini le Trombe di larice, e siccome sono per questi situati alti dal piano, ed riguardanti li Pubblici Magazzini del Miglio, così non rassaembra, che dette Trombe sijno anche in detto piano necessarie all'oggetto indicato del 2.o Capitolo.

Terzo Piano detto delle Camere

In questo Piano, siccome fù chiusa e interdotta per Pubblico comando la comunicazione della Loggia sopra del Canal Grande; così restarono separate le camere n.o 6, 7, 8, 9 con altra stanza assegnata nel Modello per deposito dell'Armi. Per non perdere detti cinque luoghi, viene ora formato l'andito di comunicazione D il quale lasciando segregata la Loggia da passaggio a tutte le dette stanze, delle quali il luogo segnato E nel mio disegno servirà per camera dell'Armi, alla quale vi si è formata una scala di comunicazione della Casa del Custode in maniera, che detta camera, e Loggia restino separate dalla comunicazione degl'altri luoghi destinati a Turchi.

Il luogo situato nel Modello per la riduzione si ritrovava in detto piano di verun'uso, e impraticabile, senza la divisione di una tressa, che separi le scale, che esser vi dovrebbero per

ascendere al quarto Piano delle sopra camere nel Modello accennate; ora detto luogo segnato n.o 16 fù ridotto praticabile, e per uso di camera, come altresì il n.o 8 che stava per luogo del Bagno riportato fuori del muro, come nel disegno dimostra, il che fù fatto per difendere dall'acqua la sottoposta Travattura: e in detto Piano vi sono Camere n.o 16 – non compreso il luogo della riduzione, quali alloggiarono Persone n.o 72 – come da nota del Custode.

Quarto Piano delle sopra Camere

Per salire a detto Piano mancano le scale nella situazione accennata dal Modello, e in detto Piano si ritrovano le stanze solamente divise da muri maestri, senza anditi, porte, scuri, ed altro occorrente stabilimento al comodo, ed uso di detti luoghi.

Un'avvertenza per ultimo si aggiunge, che ritrovandosi certa stanza nel mio disegno segnata F vicino alla Porta da terra per ritiro e vigilanza del Guardiano di detta porta in conformità dell'incombenze sue; detto luogo presentemente non si trova assegnato, ne destinato a detto Portoniero.

Questo è quanto col mio esame ho portato rilevare in conformità delle commissioni avute intorno a detta Fabbrica, la disposizione presente della quale colle praticate regolazioni dimostro co' miei disegni, i quali alla sapienza di V[ostre] E[ccellenze] umilissimamente rassegnò.

Bernardino Macaruzzi

Architetto aff[er]me con giuramento

Adi 2 Agosto 1768

Bibliography

A.A. “Fotografija stara više of 140 godina: Znete li priču o šibenskoj ubožnici i zgradi zvanoj ‘badžana’?” *Sibenski.hr, Slobodna Dalmacija* [internet portal], Feb. 23, 2022. <https://sibenski.slobodnadalmacija.hr/sibenik/kultura/bastina/fotografija-stara-vise-od-140-godina-znete-li-pricu-o-sibenskoj-uboznici-i-zgradi-zvanoj-badzana-1170147> (accessed Apr. 27, 2022).

AA. VV. *Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*. Vol. 1–4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Aikema, Bernard, and Dulcia Meijers. *Nel regno dei poveri: arte e storia dei grandi ospedali veneziani in età moderna, 1474–1797*. Venice: Istituzioni di Ricovero e di Educazione, 1989.

Aikema, Bernard. “Il famoso abondio’. Abbondio stazio e la decorazione a stucco nei palazzi veneziani: circa 1685–1750.” *Saggi e Memorie di storia dell'arte* 21 (1997): 85–122.

Alačević, Josip. “Le disgrazie del Dottor Girolamo Fasaneo.” *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata* 23 (1900): 182–185, 233–239.

Alverti, Maria Ines, Ronnie Mulryne, and Anna Maria Testaverde, eds. *Ceremonial Entries in Early Modern Europe: The Iconography of Power*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.

Anselmi, Sergio. *Venezia, Ragusa, Ancona tra cinque e seicento: un momento della storia mercantile del medio adriatico*. Ancona: Deputazione di storia patria delle Marche, 1969.

Arbel, Benjamin. “Translating the Orient for the Serenissima: Michiel Membrè in the Service of Sixteenth-Century Venice.” In *La frontiera méditerranéenne du XVe au XVIIe siècle*, edited by Albrech Fuess and Bernard Heyberger, 253–281. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.

Assereto, Giovanni. »Per La Comune Salvezza dal Morbo Contagioso« *I controlli di sanità nella Repubblica di Genova*. Novi Ligure: Città del silenzio, 2011.

Augé, Marc. *Non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity*. Paris: Le Seuil, 1992.

Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakkı. “Yugoslavya’da Türk abideleri ve vakiflari.” *Vakıflar dergisi* 3 (1957): 151–223.

Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakkı. *Avrupa’da Osmanli mimari eserleri*. Vol. 1. Istanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1977.

Backmann, Sybille. “Abitare e lavorare nel Fondaco dei Tedeschi di Venezia: L’arredo delle camera (1508–1650).” In *Spazi veneziani: Topografie culturali di una città*, edited by Sabine Meine, 59–89. Rome, Venice: Viella, Centro Tedesco di studi veneziani, 2014.

Bajić-Žarko, Nataša. *Split kao trgovačko i tranzitno središte na razmeđu istoka i zapada u 18. stoljeću*. Split: Književni krug, 2004.

Barnett, Eleanor. “Food and religious Identities in the Venetian Inquisition: ca. 1560–ca. 1640.” *Renaissance Quarterly* 74 (2021): 181–214.

Barzman, Karen-edis. *The Limits of Identity: Early Modern Venice, Dalmatia, and the Representation of Difference*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2017.

Bassano da Zara, Luigi. *I costumi et i modi particolari de la vita de’ Turchi*. Rome: Antonio Blado Asolano, 1545.

Bassi, Elena. *Architettura del Sei e Settecento a Venezia*. Naples: Edizione scientifiche Italiane, 1962.

Bassi, Elena. “Lorenzo Boschetti.” In *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, Volume 13 (1971). https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/lorenzo-boschetti_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/

Bazala, Vladimir. “Pomorski lazareti u starom Dubrovniku.” In *Dubrovačko pomorstvo: U spomen sto godina Nautičke škole u Dubrovniku*, edited by Jozo Luetić, Ivo

Gluhonja, Rudimir Rudolf Roter, and Špiro Savin, 293–308. Dubrovnik: Odbor za proslavu sto godina Nautičke škole u Dubrovniku, 1952.

Beck, Hans-Georg, Manoussos I. Manoussacas, and Agostino Pertusi, eds. *Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV-XVI): Aspetti e problemi. Atti del II Convegno internazionale di storia della civiltà veneziana (Venezia, 3-6 ottobre 1973)*, 2 vols. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1977.

Bejtić, Alija. *Spomenici osmanlijske arhitekture u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1953.

Bellingeri, Giampiero, and Nazan Ölçer. *Venezia e Istanbul in epoca ottomana / Osmanlı Doneminde Venedik ve İstanbul*. Milano: Electa, 2009. Exhibition catalogue (Sakıp Sabancı Museum, Istanbul 2009–2010).

Benedetti, Rocco. *Ragguaglio delle allegrezze, solennità e feste fatte in Venetia per la felice vittoria di Lepanto*. Venice: Gratoso Perchaccino, 1571.

Benvenuti, Angelo de. *Fortificazioni venete in Dalmazia*. Venice: Collana di ricerche storiche, 2006.

Beritić, Lukša. “Ubikacija nestalih građevinskih spomenika u Dubrovniku II.” *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 12 (1960): 61–84.

Bertoša, Miroslav. “La crisi economica di Venezia nei secoli XVI e XVII alla luce della recente storiografia italiana.” *Atti* [Centro di ricerche storiche, Rovigno] 8, no. 1 (1978): 188–219.

Biadene, Susanna. “Progetti per il ponte di San Giobbe a Cannaregio.” In *Le Venezie possibili: Da Palladio a Le Corbusier*, edited by Lionello Puppi and Giandomenico Romanelli, 116–118. Milano: Electa, 1985.

Bianchi, Carlo Federico. *Fasti di Zara: religioso-politico-civili dall'anno 1184 av. cr. sino all'anno 1888 dell'era volgare, compilati dal preposito capitolare Carlo Federico cav. Bianchi*. Zadar: G. Woditzka, 1888.

Bilić, Darka. *Inženjeri u službi Mletačke Republike: Inženjeri i civilna arhitektura u 18. stoljeću u mletačkoj Dalmaciji i Albaniji*. Split: Književni krug, 2013.

Bilić, Darka. "I protagonisti dell'edilizia militare in Dalmazia nei secoli XVII e XVIII." In *L'architettura militare di Venezia in Terraferma e in Adriatico fra XVI e XVII secolo*, edited by Francesco Paolo Fiore, 359–380. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2014. Conference proceedings (Palmanova, 2013).

Biow, Douglas. *The Culture of Cleanliness in Renaissance Italy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Blanks, David R., Michael Frassetto, eds. *Western Views of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

Boccaccio, Giovanni. *Il Decamerone*. Venice: Vincenzo Valgrisi, 1557.

Boccadamo, Giuliana. *Napoli e l'Islam: Storie di musulmani, schiavi e rinnegati in età moderna*. Naples: D'Auria, 2010.

Boerio, Giuseppe. *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*. Venice: Giovanni Cecchini, 1856.

Bonastra, Quim. "Recintos sanitarios y espacios de control. Un estudio morfológico de la arquitectura cuarentenaria." *Dynamis* 30 (2010): 17–40.

Bono, Salvatore. *Schiavi musulmani nell'Italia moderna: Galeotti, vu' cumprà, domestici*. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1999.

Borgherini Scarabellin, Maria. *Il magistrato dei Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia dalla istituzione alla caduta della Repubblica: Studio storico su documenti d'archivio*. Venice: Regia Deputazione, 1925.

Borg-Muscat, David. "Prison life in Malta in the 18th century – Valletta's Gran Prigione." *Storja* (2001): 42–51.

Bosis, Francesco de, Carisio Ciavarini, Gustavo Bevilacqua, Michele Maroni. *Ancona descritta nella storia e nei monumenti*, Ancona: Gustavo Cherubini, 1870.

Braudel, Fernand. *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Epoque de Philippe II*, Paris: Armand Colin, 1949.

Braudel, Fernand. *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIIIe siècle*. Vol. 2, *Les jeux de l'échange*. Paris: Armand Colin, 1979.

Braudel, Fernand. *Civilization and capitalism: 15th-18th century*. Vol. 3, *The perspective of the world*, translated by Siân Reynolds. New York: Harper & Row, 1984. [first edition: *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: Armand Colin, 1979]

Braunstein, Philippe. *Les Allemands à Venise (1380–1520)*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2016.

Brogini, Anne. “L’esclavage au quotidien à Malte au XVI^e siècle.” *Cahiers de la Méditerranée*, 65 (2002): 137–158.

Brummett, Palmira Johnson. *Ottoman seapower and Levantine diplomacy in the age of discovery*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Brummett, Palmira. *Mapping the Ottomans: Sovereignty, Territory, and Identity in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Brusatin, Manlio. *Venezia nel Settecento: stato, architettura, territorio*. Torino: Einaudi, 1980.

Brusegan, Marcello. *I Palazzi di Venezia*. Rome: Newton & Compton, 2007.

Buffardi, Adriana, ed. *Nunziature di Venezia*. Vol. 11, *18 giugno 1573–22 dicembre 1576*. Rome: Istituto storico italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea, 1972

Burke, Ersie. “Francesco di Demetri Litino, the Inquisition and the Fondaco dei Turchi.” *Thesaurismata* 36 (2006): 79–96.

Burke, Ersie. *The Greeks of Venice, 1498–1600: Immigration, Settlement, and Integration*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2016.

Burke, Peter. *Cultural Hybridity*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press, 2009.

Burns, Howard. “Leon Battista Alberti.” In *Storia dell’architettura italiana: Il Quattrocento*, edited by Francesco Paolo Fiore, 114–165. Milano: Electa, 1998.

Burratti, Bruno, ed. *Francesco Morosini (1619–1694): L’uomo, il doge, il condottiero*. Rome: Istituto poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato italiano; Libreria dello Stato, 2019. Conference proceedings and exhibition catalogue, Museo Correr, Venice: 2019.

Cadorin, Giuseppe. *Pareri di XV arhitekti e notizie storiche intorno al palazzo ducale di Venezia*. Venice: Pietro Milesi, 1858.

Calabi, Donatella. “Città e territorio nel dominio da mar.” In *Storia di Venezia*. Vol. 6, *Dal Rinascimento al Barocco*, edited by Gaetano Cozzi and Paolo Prodi, 943–977. Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1994.

Calabi, Donatella. “Le basi ultramarine.” In *Storia di Venezia*. Vol. 2, *Il Mare*, edited by Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci, 861–878. Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991.

Calabi, Donatella. “Magazzini, fondaci, dogane.” In *Storia di Venezia*. Vol. 2, *Il Mare*, edited by Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci, 761–817. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991.

Calabi, Donatella, and Paola Lanaro, eds. *La città italiana e i luoghi degli stranieri (XIV – XVIII secolo)*. Rome; Bari: Laterza, 1998.

Calabi, Donatella. “Stranieri nella capitale della Repubblica Veneta nella prima età moderna.” *Mélanges de l’Ecole française de Rome: Italie et Méditerranée* 111, no. 2 (1999): 721–732.

Calabi, Donatella. *Il mercato e la città: Piazze, strade, architetture d’Europa in età moderna*. Venice: Marsilio editori, 1993 [translated: *The Market and the City: Square, Street and Architecture in Early Modern Europe*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003].

Calabi, Donatella, Ludovica Galeazzo, and Martina Massaro, eds. *Venezia, gli Ebrei, e l'Europa 1516–2016*. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 2016.

Calabi, Donatella. *Venice and its Jews: 500 Years Since the Founding of the Ghetto*, translated by Leonore Rosenberg. Milano: Officina Libraria, 2017. [first edition: *Venezia e il ghetto: cinquecento anni del recinto degli Ebrei*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri, 2016].

Camerlengo, Lia. “Il lazaretto a San Pancrazio e l’ospedale della Misericordia in Bra: le forme dell’architettura.” In *L’ospedale e la città: cinquecento anni d’arte a Verona*, edited by Alessandro Pastore, Gian Maria Varanini, Paola Marini, and Giorgio Marini, 179–191. Verona: Cierre Edizioni, 1996.

Candiani, Guido. “Sanità e controllo mercantile alle Bocche di Cattaro: Il lazaretto di Castelnuovo, 1700–1797,” *Mediterranea – ricerche storiche* 48 (2020): 29–58.

Capriotti, Giuseppe, Francesca Coltrinari, and Jasenka Gudelj, eds. *Visualizing Past in a Foreign Country: Schiavoni/Illyrian Confraternities and Colleges in Early Modern Italy in comparative perspective* [special issue], *Il capitale culturale: Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage, Supplementi* 7 (2018).

Carboni, Stefano, ed. *Venice and the Islamic World, 828–1797*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2007. Exhibition catalogue (Institute du Monde Arabe, Paris, 2006–2007; Metropolitan Museum, New York, 2007; Palazzo Ducale, Venice 2007).

Cataneo, Pietro. *L’architettura, Libro sesto*. Venice: Paolo Manuzio, 1567.

Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Cavaciocchi, Simonetta, ed. *Le migrazioni in Europa: Secc. XIII-XVIII. Atti della venticinquesima settimana di studi, 3-8 maggio 1993*. Florence: Fondazione istituto internazionale di storia economica F. Datini, 1994.

Çelebi, Evliya. *An Ottoman Traveller: Selection from the Book of Travels of Evliya Çelebi*, translated and edited by Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim. London: Eland, 2011.

Cerasi, Maurice. "The Formation of Ottoman House Types: A Comparative Study in Interaction with Neighboring Cultures." *Muqarnas* 15 (1998): 116–156.

Chambers, David, and Brian Pullan, eds. *Venice: A Documentary History: 1450–1630*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Chiarot, Matteo. "L'idra dalle temerarie teste: Venezia e il contrabbando del sale istriano fra Cinque e Seicento." Master's thesis, Università Ca' Foscari, Venice, 2014–2015.

Čičin Šain, Ćiro. "Pisma Marka Kavanjina splitskog trgovca iz prve polovine XVII stoljeća." *Starine* 49 (1959): 105–226.

Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Čolak, Nikola. "Promet stoke u zadarskoj skeli u XVIII. stoljeću," *Radovi Zavoda povijesnih znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 37 (1995): 411–565.

Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus III annorum 1553–1571, edited by Šime Ljubić. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1880.

Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus IV annorum 1572–1590. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak IV. od 1572. do 1590. godine, edited by Grga Novak. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1964.

Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus V annorum 1591–1600. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak V. od 1591. do 1600. godine, edited by Grga Novak. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1966.

Commissiones et relationes venetae: tomus VI annorum 1588–1620. Mletačka uputstva i izvještaji: svezak VI. od 1588. do 1620. godine, edited by Grga Novak. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1970

Concina, Ennio. *Fondaci: Architettura, arte e mercatura tra Levante, Venezia e Alemagna*. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1997.

Concina, Ennio, and Elisabetta Molteni. «*La fabrica della fortezza*» *L'architettura militare di Venezia*. Verona: Banca Popolare di Verona; Banco S. Geminiano e S. Prospero, 2001

Concina, Ennio, ed. *Venezia e Istanbul: incontri, confronti e scambi*. Udine: Forum, 2006. Exhibition catalogue (Palmanova, 2006).

Constable, Olivia Remie. *Housing the Stranger in the Mediterranean World: Lodging, Trade, and Travel in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Contadini, Anna, and Claire Norton, eds. *The Renaissance and the Ottoman World*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2013.

Cortés, Hernán. *Fernando Cortes: his five letters of relation to the Emperor Charles V*, edited and translated by Francis Augustus MacNutt. Cleveland, OH: Arthur H. Clark, 1908.

Costantini, Massimo. “Le strutture dell’ospitalità.” In *Storia di Venezia: dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*. Vol. 5, *Il Rinascimento: Società ed economia*, edited by Alberto Tenenti, and Ugo Tucci, 881–911. Rome: Istituto dell’Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996.

Costantini, Vera. “Fin dentro il paese turchesco: stabilimento della scala di Spalato e potenziamento delle reti mercantili e diplomatiche veneziane nell’entroterra bosniaco.” *Studi veneziani* 67 (2014): 267–281.

Cozzi, Gaetano, ed. *Gli Ebrei a Venezia: secoli XIV–XVIII*. Milan: Edizioni di comunità, 1987.

Cozzi, Gaetano. “Dalla riscoperta della pace all’inevitabile sogno di dominio.” In *Storia di Venezia: dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*. Vol. 7, *La Venezia barocca*, edited by Gino Benzoni and Gaetano Cozzi, 3–104. Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1997.

Cresswell, Tim. *On the Move: Mobility in the Western World*. London: Taylor & Francis, 2006.

Dagnino, Anna. "Lazzaretto di Genova." In *Rotte mediterranee e baluardi di sanità*, edited by Nelli-Elena Vanzan Marchini, 272–277. Milan: Skira, 2004. Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 2004).

Dall'Aglio, Antonio. "Lorenzo Boschetti proto al Magistrato dei Savi ed Esecutori alle Acque, (1670–1750)." Master's thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1982.

Davies, Paul, and David Hemsoll. *Michele Sanmicheli*. Milano: Electa, 2004.

de Bosis, Francesco, Carisio Ciavarini, Canonico C. Gariboldi, Gustavo Bevilacqua, Michele Maroni. *Ancona descritta nella storia e nei monumenti*. Ancona: Gustavo Cherubini, 1870.

Debenedetti-Stow, Sandra. "The Etymology of 'Ghetto': New Evidence from Rome." *Jewish History* 6, no. 1 (1992): 79–85.

Delumeau, Jean. "Un ponte tra occidente e oriente: Ancona nel Cinquecento." *Quaderni Storici* 5 (1970): 26–47.

Dempsey, Charles, ed. *Quattrocento Adriatico: Fifteenth century Art of the Adriatic Rim*. Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Dictionnaire de la Méditerranée. Arles: Actes Sud, 2016.

Dollinger, Philippe. "Projets d'un 'Fondaco dei Tedeschi' à Gênes et à Milan au XVe siècle," *Byzantinische Forschungen* 12 (1987): 675–692.

Duplančić, Arsen. "Popisi državnih zgrada u Splitu iz godina 1789. i 1804." *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture* 13 (1987): 143–158.

Duplančić, Arsen. "Splitska bazana i njena uloga u zaštiti zdravlja." *Acta historiae medicinae, stomatologiae, pharmaciae, medicinae veterinariae* 28 (1988): 62–76.

Duplančić, Arsen. "Prilog poznavanju luke i pomorstva Splita u 18. i 19. stoljeću." *Adrias* 2 (1988): 69–88.

Duplančić, Arsen. "Neobjavljeni nacrti i opisi splitskog lazareta." *Adrias* 4–5 (1994): 167–190.

Duplančić, Arsen. "Prinos dokumentaciji urbanističkog razvitka Splita od 17. do 19. stoljeća," *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 20–21 (1994–1995): 143–154.

Duplančić, Arsen. *Splitske zidine u 17. i 18. stoljeću*. Zagreb: Uprava za zaštitu kulturne baštine, 2007.

Dursteler, Eric. *Venetians in Constantinople: Nation, Identity, and Coexistence in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Eco, Umberto. *Mouse Or Rat? Translation as Negotiation*. London: Phoenix, 2013. E-book.

Encyclopaedia of Islam. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1954–2005.

Encyclopedia of the Ottoman Empire. New York: Facts on File, 2009.

Fabris, Antonio. "Hasan 'il veneziano' tra Algeri e Costantinopoli." *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 15 (1997): 51–66.

Fabris, Antonio. "Il dottor Girolamo Fasaneo, alias Receb." *Archivio Veneto*, series 5, 23 (1989): 105–118.

Fattori, Niccolò. "The Greeks of Ancona (1510–1595): Migration and Community in the Early Modern Mediterranean." PhD diss., University of London, 2017.

Federico Seneca, *Il doge Leonardo Donà: La sua vita e la sua preparazione politica prima del dogado*, Padua: Antenore, 1959.

Fischer von Erlach, Johann Bernhard. *Entwurf einer historischen Architectur*. Leipzig, 1725.

Fisković, Cvito. "Splitski lazaret." In *Četiri priloga historiji grada Splita XVII i XVIII stoljeća*, 7–35. Split: Muzej grada Splita, 1953.

Fisković, Cvito. “Umjetnički obrt u Splitu 15.–16. stoljeća.” In *Zbornik Marka Marulića 1450.–1950.*, edited by Josip Badalić, 121–158. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1950.

Fisković, Cvito. “Spomenici grada Makarske.” In *Makarski zbornik: zbornik znanstvenog savjetovanja o Makarskoj i Makarskom primorju 28.–30. rujna 1969.*, edited by Jakša Ravlić, 213–277. Makarska: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1970.

Fontana, Vincenzo. *Fra Giovanni Giocondo architetto (1433 c.–1515)*. Vicenza: N. Pozza, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. “Des espaces autres.” *Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité* 5 (1984): 46–49.

Frattarelli Fischer, Lucia. “Il bagno delle galere in 'terra cristiana'.” *Nuovi Studi Livornesi* 8 (2000): 69–94.

Fumagalli, Cecilia. “A merchant’s travels in the Islamic World.” In *A History of Architecture and Trade*, edited by Patrick Haughey, 156–167. London: Routledge, 2018.

Fusaro, Maria. *Political Economies of Empire in the Early Modern Mediterranean: The Decline of Venice and the Rise of England, 1450–1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Gaggio, Roberto. *Tecnici ed ingegneri dell’Arsenale di Venezia – Sigismondo, Orazio, Hust’Emilio Alberhetti, 1660–1720*. Master’s thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1979–1980.

Gallicciolli, Giovanni Battista. *Delle Memorie Venete Antiche Profane Ed Ecclesiastiche*. Vol. 1. Venice: Domenico Fracasso, 1795

Gelder, Maartje van. *Trading Places: The Netherlandish Merchants in Early Modern Venice*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gentilcore, David. “The Cistern-system of Early Modern Venice: Technology, Politics and Culture in a Hydraulic Society.” *Water History* 13 (2021): 375–406.

Georgopoulou, Maria. *Venice's Mediterranean Colonies: Architecture and Urbanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Gianighian, Giorgio. "Scarichi veneziani in epoca moderna: canoni da aqua – canoni da necessario." *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 7 (1983): 161–182.

Gianighian, Giorgio. "La costruzione della casa doppia nella Venezia del Rinascimento." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome: Italie et Méditerranée* 120, no. 1 (2008): 77–107.

Gligo, Vedran, Marin Berket, Vladimir Rismondo, and Ljerka Šimunković, eds. *Zlatna knjiga grada Splita*. Vol. 1. Split: Književni krug, 1996.

Goldthwaite, Richard A. *The Economy of Renaissance Florence*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.

Greene, Molly. "The Early Modern Mediterranean." In *A Companion to Mediterranean History*, edited by Peregrine Horden and Sharon Kinoshita, 91–107. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2014.

Grenet, Mathieu. "Institution de la coexistence et pratiques de la différence: le fondaco dei turchi de Venise (XVIe–XVIIIe siècle)." *Revue d'Histoire maritime* 17, n.o 1 (2013): 273–301.

Grujić, Nada, and Danko Zelić. "Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranića u Dubrovniku." *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku*, 48 (2010): 47–132

Gudelj, Jasenka. "Lo Stato da Mar: l'architettura. Il Cinquecento in Istria e in Dalmazia." In *Storia dell'architettura nel Veneto: il Cinquecento*, edited by Donata Battilotti, Guido Beltramini, Edoardo Demo, Walter Panciera, 262–267. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 2015.

Günay, Reha. *Tradition of the Turkish House and Safranbolu Houses*, translated by Çelen Birkan. Istanbul: YEM Yayın, 1998.

Güran, Ceyhan. *Türk Hanlarının Gelişimi ve İstanbul Hanları Mimarisi*. Ankara: Vakıflar Genel Müdürlüğü, 1978.

Hakim, Basim Selim. *Arabic-Islamic Cities: Building and Planning Principles*. London; New York: Routledge, 2010 [first edition: 1986].

Headley, John M., and Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed. *Confessionalization in Europe, 1555–1700: Essays in Honor and Memory of Bodo Nischan*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2004.

Hill, George. *A History of Cyprus*. Vol. 3, *The Frankish Period, 1432–1571*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.

Hillenbrand, Robert. *Islamic Architecture: Form, Function, and Meaning*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1994.

Howard, Deborah. “Venice and Islam in the Middle Ages: Some Observations on the Question of Architectural Influence.” *Architectural History* 34 (1991): 59–74

Howard, Deborah. *Venice & the East: the Impact of the Islamic World on Venetian Architecture 1100–1500*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Howard, Deborah, and Henrietta McBurney. *The Image of Venice: Fialetti's View and Sir Henry Wotton*. London: Paul Holberton Publishing, 2014.

Howell, Jesse C. “The Ragusa Road: Mobility and Encounter in the Ottoman Balkans (1430–1700).” PhD diss., Harvard University, 2017.

Ilijanić, Boris. *Herceg Novi: Grad i graditeljsko nasljeđe*. Herceg Novi: Ilibo design architect, 2015.

Imhaus, Brühnehilde. *Le minoranze orientali a Venezia: 1300–1510*. Rome: Il Veltro, 1997.

Işıkşel, Güneş. “Managing Cohabitation and Conflict: Frontier Diplomacy in the Dalmatian Frontier, 1540–1646.” In *State and society in the Balkans before and after establishment of Ottoman rule*, edited by Srđan Rudić and Selim Aslantaş, 256–282. Belgrade: The Institute

of History, Yunus Emre Turkish Cultural Centre, 2017. Conference proceedings (Belgrade, 2016).

Israel, Uwe. "Fondaci: città nelle città sulle sponde del Mediterraneo." In *Il Rinascimento italiano e l'Europa*. Vol 6, *Luoghi, spazi, architetture*, edited by Donatella Calabi, and Elena Svalduz, 107–124. Treviso: Angelo Colla, 2010.

Jelić, Roman, and Ivan Zoranić. "Dalmatinsko-bosanski sanitarni kordon." In *Sanitarni kordon nekad i danas. Zbornik radova Simpozija održanog u povodu 250. obljetnice Sanitarnog kordona*, edited by Janko Vodopija, 33–67. Zagreb: Zbor liječnika Hrvatske, 1978. Conference proceedings (Zadar, 1978).

Jelić, Roman. *Zdravstvo u Zadru i njegovu području*. Zadar: Narodni list, 1978.

Jetter, Dieter. "Zur Typologie des Pesthauses." *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften* 47, no. 3 (September 1963): 291–300.

Juran, Kristijan. "Morlaci u Šibeniku između Ciparskoga i Kandijskog rata (1570.–1645.)." *Povijesni prilozi* 49 (2015): 163–210.

Jurin Starčević, Kornelija. "Islamsko-osmanski gradovi dalmatinskog zaleđa: prilog istraživanju urbanog razvoja u 16. i 17. stoljeću" [Islamic-Ottoman towns of the Dalmatian hinterland: a contribution to the research of 16th and 17th-century urban development], *Radovi zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 38 (2006): 113–154.

Jurin Starčević, Kornelija. "Osmanska graditeljska baština srednjega jadranskoga zaleđa u povijesnoj perspektivi." [The historical perspective on Ottoman built heritage of the central Dalmatian hinterland] In *Spomenica Josipa Adamčeka*, edited by Drago Roksandić and Damir Agičić, 167–186. Zagreb, Filozofski fakultet, 2009.

Kadić, Muhamed. *Starinska seoska kuća u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1967.

Kaer, Petar. *Makarska i Primorje*, Rijeka: Tiskarski umjetnički zavod "Miriam", 1914.

Kafadar, Cemal. "A Death in Venice (1575): Anatolian Muslim Merchants trading in the Serenissima." *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 10 (1986): 191–217.

Kaplan, Benjamin J. *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe*. London; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Karo, Joseph. *Shulchan Aruch*. Venice: Alvise Bragadin, 1565.

Katić, Lovre. "Iz knjiga oporuka splitskog kaptola." *Starine* 49 (1959): 81–104.

Katz, Dana E. *The Jewish Ghetto and the Visual Imagination of Early Modern Venice*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Kečkemet, Duško. *Židovi u povijeti Splita*. Split: Jevrejska općina, 1971.

Kečkemet, Duško. "Prilog opisu i povijesti splitskog lazareta." *Pomorski zbornik* 13 (1975): 377–401.

Kečkemet, Duško. "Zaštita od epidemija u Splitu i okolici u prošlosti." In *Sanitarni kordon nekad i danas, Zbornik radova Simpozija održanog u povodu 250. obljetnice Sanitarnog kordona*, edited by Janko Vodopija, 74–90. Zagreb: Zbor liječnika Hrvatske, 1978.

Kečkemet, Duško. "Plan i veduta Splita iz početka osmanaestoga stoljeća." *Kulturna baština* 11–12 (1981): 87–94.

Kečkemet, Duško. "Splitski lazaret." In *400 ljeta splitskog lazareta*, edited by Mladen Smoljanović, 1–10. Split: Zavod za zaštitu rada, 1992.

Kečkemet, Duško. *Kulturna i umjetnička baština u Dalmaciji, izabrani radovi*. Vol. 1. Split: Marjan tisak, 2004.

Kolovos, Elias. "Border(is)lands: The Ottoman-Venetian Frontier of the Ionian Islands (Late Fifteenth to Late Seventeenth Century)." *O Néos Ellhnišmós, oi kósmoi tou kai o Kósmos. Afieróma sthn Ólga Katsiardi-Hering* [Modern Hellenism: Its Worlds and the World. Festschrift in Honour of Olga Katsiardi-Hering], edited by Anastasia Papadia-Lala et al., 413–427. Athens: Eurasia Publications, 2021.

- Konstantinidou, Katerina. *Lazzaretti veneziani in Grecia*. Padua: Elzeviro, 2015.
- Kovačić, Joško. "Mjernik i graditelj Giovanni Battista Camozzini." *Kulturna baština* 24–25 (1994): 85–101.
- Kreševljaković, Hamdija. *Hanovi i karavansaraji u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Naučno društvo, 1957.
- Lalošević, Ilija. "Mletački lazareti Boke Kotorske," *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru* 59 (2017): 173–189.
- Lane, Frederic Chapin. *Venice: A Maritime Republic*. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
- Larkin, Brian. "The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 42 (2013): 327–343.
- Lenzo, Fulvio. *Memoria e identità civica: L'architettura dei seggi nel Regno di Napoli, XIII–XVIII secolo*. Rome: Campisano Editore, 2014.
- Leoni, Aron di Leone, and António Manuel Lopes Andrade. "Daniel Rodriga: um dos grandes protagonistas das Nações Portuguesas do mediterrâneo." *Revista Portuguesa de História* 38 (2006): 219–263.
- Livan, Lina ed. *Notizie d'arte tratte dai Notatori e dagli Annali del N.H. Pietro Gradenigo*. Venice: La Reale Deputazione, 1942.
- Luccheta, Giuliano. "Note intorno a un elenco di Turchi morti a Venezia," *Quaderni di Studi Arabi* 15 (1997): 133–146.
- Luther, Marthin. *Tischreden*. Eisleben: Urban Gaubisch, 1566.
- Luzzatto, Simone. *Discorso circa il stato de gl'Hebrei et in particolar dimoranti nell'inclita città di Venetia*. Venice: Gioanne Calleoni, 1638.

Mack, Rosamond E. *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art, 1300–1600*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.

Madsen, Peter. “Luigi Bassano.” In *Christian-Muslim Relations: A Bibliographical History. Volume 6. Western Europe (1500–1600)*, edited by David Thomas and John Chesworth, 501–505. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2014.

Magnusson, Roberta J. *Water Technology in the Middle Ages: Cities, Monasteries, and Waterworks after the Roman Empire*. Baltimore, London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Mahoney, Leonard. *5000 Years of Architecture in Malta*. Malta: Valletta Publications, 1996.

Mandalis, Giorgio. *I mori e il granduca: storia di un monumento sconveniente*. Livorno: Belforte, 2009.

Mandel, Gabriel. *I caravanserragli turchi*. Bergamo: Lucchetti Editore, 1988.

Manno, Antonio. “Il governo del cantiere: Istituzioni, patrizi, soldati, tecnici e operai durante la costruzione di Palmanova.” *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed arti: Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti* 151, no. 4 (1992): 1061–1102.

Martines, Vincenzo. “La trasformazione strategica dei lazzeretti: da baluardi di sanità a fortificazioni military.” In *Rotte mediterranee e baluardi di sanità*, edited by Nelli-Elena Vanzan Marchini, 183–189. Milan: Skira, 2004. Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 2004).

Martini, Egidio. *La pittura veneziana del Settecento*. Venice: Edizioni Marciane, 1964.

Martini, Francesco di Giorgio. *Trattati di architettura, ingegneria e arte militare*, edited by Corrado Maltese. Milano: Il Polifilo, 1967.

Matar, Nabil. *Europe through Arab Eyes, 1578–1727*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Matić, Tomo. "Hrvatski književnici mletačke Dalmacije i život njihova doba." *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti. Razreda historičko-filologičkoga i filozofičko-juridičkoga* 101 (1925): 192–283.

Matteoni, Dario. *Livorno*, Rome; Bari: Laterza, 1985.

Mayhew, Tea. *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule: Contado di Zara 1645–1718*. Rome: Viella, 2008.

Membré, Michiel. *Relazione di Persia (1542)*. Edited by Francesco Castro, and Gianroberto Scarcia. Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1969.

Milošević, Ante, ed. *Lazareti u Dubrovniku*. Dubrovnik: Zavod za obnovu Dubrovnika, 2018.

Minchella, Giuseppina. "Alterità e vicinanza: cristiani, turchi, rinnegati, ebrei a Venezia e nella frontiera orientale." *Giornale di storia*, 4 (2010). www.giornaledistoria.net.

Minchella, Giuseppina. *Frontiere aperte: Musulmani, ebrei e cristiani nella Repubblica di Venezia (XVII secolo)*. Rome: Viella, 2014.

Miović, Vesna. *The Jewish Ghetto in the Dubrovnik Republic (1546–1808)*. Dubrovnik, Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zavod za povijesne znanosti, 2005.

Mitić, Ilija. "Imigracijska politika dubrovačke republike s posebnim obzirom na ustanovu svjetovnog azila." *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 17 (1979): 125–163.

Molà, Luca. "Fondaci, mercanti, artigiani: le comunità dei Tedeschi e dei Turchi a Venezia." In *Le Venezie e l'Europa: testimoni di una civiltà sociale*, edited by Giuseppe Barbieri, 229–243. Cittadella: Biblos, 1998.

Molà, Luca. *La comunità dei lucchesi a Venezia. Immigrazione e industria della seta nel tardo Medioevo*. Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, 1994.

Molteni, Elisabetta. "Pubblico e architettura a Venezia nel Settecento." In *L'edilizia pubblica nell'età dell'illuminismo*, vol. 2, edited by Giorgio Simoncini, 319–371. Florence: Leo S. Olschki editore, 2000.

Molteni, Elisabetta. "Venezia, Fondaco dei Tedeschi. Le ricostruzioni di un edificio nel cuore della città." In: *Il fondaco dei Tedeschi, Venezia, OMA. Il restauro e il riuso di un monumento veneziano*, edited by Francesco Dal Co, Elisabetta Molteni, 12–79. Milano: Electa, 2016.

Molteni, Elisabetta. *Francesco Morosini in guerra a Candia e in Morea: Guida alla mostra e catalogo degli oggetti esposti*. Venice: Ente editoriale per il Corpo della Guardia di Finanza, 2019. Exhibition catalogue (Guardia di Finanza – Palazzo Corner Mocenigo, San Polo, Venice, 2019).

Monumenta historica Slavorum meridionalium vicinorumque populorum e tabulariis et bibliothecis Italicis deprompta, edited by Makušev, Vikentij. Warsaw: Srpsko naučno društvo, 1874.

Morpurgo, Viktor. "Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje splitske skele u XVI stoljeću." *Starine* 52 (1962): 185–248.

Morpurgo, Viktor. "Daniel Rodriguez i osnivanje splitske skele u XVI stoljeću (nastavak)." *Starine* 53 (1966): 363–415.

Mortada, Hisham. *Traditional Islamic Principles of Built Environment*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Müdürrisoğlu, Fatih. "Menzil Roads and Menzil Complexes in the Ottoman Empire." In *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilisation*. Vol. 4, *Culture and Arts*, edited by Kemal Çiçek, 380–388. Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 2000.

Muslim ibn al-Hajjaj, Abu al-Husayn. *Sahih Muslim*, vol. 1, translated by Nasiruddin al-Khattab, edited by Abu Tahir Zubair 'Ali Za'I. Riyadh: Darussalam, 2007.

Nadalo, Stephanie. "Negotiating Slavery in a Tolerant Frontier: Livorno's Turkish Bagno (1547–1747)." *Mediaevalia* 32 (2011): 275–324.

Nadalo, Stephanie. *Constructing Pluralism in Seventeenth Century Livorno: Managing Religious Minorities in a Mediterranean Free Port (1537–1737)*. PhD diss., Northwestern University, 2013.

Necipoğlu-Kafadar, Gülru. "Plans and Models in 15th and 16th-Century Ottoman Architectural Practice." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 45, no.3 (1986): 224–243.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. *The Age of Sinan: Architectural Culture in the Ottoman Empire*. London: Reaktion Books, 2005.

Nevola, Fabrizio. *Street Life in Renaissance Italy*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2020.

Niero, Antonio. "Architetti e pittori nell'isola di S. Servolo: precisazioni e recuperi." *Arte Veneta* 35 (1981): 237–240.

Novak, Grga. *Split u svjetskom prometu*. Split: Hrvatska štamparija, 1921.

Novak, Grga. *Prošlost Dalmacije*. Vol. 1–2. Zagreb: Izdanje hrvatskog izdavačkog bibliografskog zavoda, 1944.

Novak, Grga. *Povijest Splita*. Vol. 2. Split: Matica Hrvatska, 1957.

Novak, Grga. "Presjek kroz povijest grada Zadra," *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11–12 (1965): 7–76.

Novak, Grga. "Šibenik u razdoblju mletačke vladavine 1412.–1797. godine." In *Šibenik. Spomen zbornik o 900. obljetnici*, edited by Slavko Grubišić, 133–288. Šibenik: Muzej Grada Šibenika, 1976.

Oakes, Simon P. “‘Hieronymo Thodesco’ and the Fondaco dei Tedeschi: A Reappraisal of the Documents and Sources Relating to a German Architect in Early Sixteenth-Century Venice.” *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 72, n.o 4 (2009): 479–496.

Omašić, Vjeko. *Povijest Kaštela*, Split: Logos, 1986.

Ortega, Stephen. “Across Religious and Ethnic Boundaries: Ottoman Networks and Spaces in Early Modern Venice.” *Mediterranean Studies* 18 (2009): 66–89.

Ortega, Stephen. *Negotiating Transcultural Relations in the Early Modern Mediterranean: Ottoman-Venetian Encounters*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

Othmann, Zulkeplee, Rosemary Aird, and Laurie Buy. “Privacy, modesty, hospitality, and the design of Muslim homes: A literature review.” *Frontiers of Architectural Research* 4 (2015): 12–23.

Özkaya, Belgin Turan. “Theaters of Fear and Delight: Ottomans in the Serenissima.” In *Thamyris/Intersecting: Place, Sex and Race*. Vol. 10, *After Orientalism: Critical Entanglements, Productive Looks*, edited by Inge E. Boer, 45–61. Amsterdam, New York: Editions Rodopi, 2003.

Paci, Renzo. *La “scala“ di Spalato e il commercio veneziano nei Balcani fra cinque e seicento*. Venice: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1971.

Paci, Renzo. “La rivalità commerciale tra Ancona e Spalato (1590–1645).” *Atti e memorie della Deputazione di storia patria per le Marche* 82 (1977): 278–286.

Pagliara, Pier Nicola. “‘Destri’ e cucine nell'abitazione del XV e XVI secolo, in specie a Roma.” In *Aspetti dell'abitare in Italia tra XV e XVI secolo: distribuzione, funzioni, impianti*, edited by Aurora Scotti Tosini, 39–92. Milan: Unicopli, 2001.

Palladio, Andrea. *I quattro libri dell'architettura*. Venice: Domenico de' Francheschi, 1570.

Pancierera, Walter. “Building a Boundary: The First Venetian-Ottoman Border in Dalmatia, 1573–1576.” *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 45 (2013): 9–37.

Panzac, Daniel. *Quarantaines et lazarets: L'Europe et la peste d'Orient (XVIIe-XXe siècles)*. Aix-en-Provence: Edisud, 1986.

Pašić, Amir. *Prilog proučavanju islamskog stambenog graditeljstva u Jugoslaviji na primjeru Mostara, koliko je stara stambena arhitektura Mostara autohtona pojava*. PhD diss., University of Zagreb, 1989.

Payne, Alina, ed. *Dalmatia and the Mediterranean: Portable Archaeology and the Poetics of Influence*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2014.

Pedani, Maria Pia. *In nome del Gran Signore: inviati ottomani a Venezia dalla caduta di Costantinopoli alla guerra di Candia*. Venice: Deputazione Editrice, 1994.

Pedani, Maria Pia. "Ottoman merchants in the Adriatic: trade and smuggling," *Acta Histriae* 16, no.2 (2008): 155–172.

Pedani, Maria Pia. *Venezia Porta d'Oriente*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 2010.

Pedani, Maria Pia. *The Ottoman-Venetian Border (15th– 18th Centuries)*. Venice: Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 2017.

Pedani, Maria Pia. "The Interpreter Michele Membrè's Life in Venice." In *Cultures of Empire: Rethinking Venetian Rule 1400–1700*, edited by Georg Christ and Franz-Julius Morche, 383–413. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Pelizza, Andrea. "Il riscatto degli schiavi a Venezia." *Storicamente* 6 (2010). E-journal, DOI: [10.1473/stor453](https://doi.org/10.1473/stor453)

Pérez, Joseph. *Los judíos en España*. Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2009.

Peričić, Šime. "Prilog poznavanju brodarstva i pomorske trgovine šibenske regije u XVIII stoljeću." *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 7, no. 1 (1975): 187–218.

Peričić, Šime. "Prinosi povijesti Zadra XVII. i XVIII. stoljeća." *Zadarska smotra* 4–5 (1993): 65–74.

- Perojević, Snježana. "Izgradnja lazareta u Splitu." *Prostor* 24, no. 2 (2002): 119–134.
- Perojević, Snježana. "Nova saznanja o splitskom lazaretu iz nacrtu Napoliona Erauta." *Kulturna baština* 33 (2006): 99–116.
- Petricioli, Ivo. "Han Jusufa Maškovića." *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 18 (1971): 379–388.
- Piombanti, Giuseppe. *Guida storica ed artistica della città e dei dintorni di Livorno*. Livorno: Gio. Marini, 1903.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. *Venezia e i Turchi: scontri e confronti di due civiltà*. Milano: Electa 1985.
- Pistarino, Geo. "Les symboles de Gênes dans les établissements d'outre-mer." In *Coloniser au Moyen Âge. Méthodes d'expansion et techniques de domination en Méditerranée du 11e au 16e siècle*, edited by Michel Balard, and Alain Ducellier, 299–309. Paris: Armand Colin, 1995.
- Popović, Tomo Krstov. *Herceg-Novci: Istorijske bilješke*. Vol. 1. Herceg Novi: Orjen, 1924.
- Preto, Paolo. *Venezia e i Turchi*, Florence: G.C. Sansoni, 1975.
- Preto, Paolo. "Venice and the Ottoman Empire: from war to turcophilia." *La Mediterranee au 18. siecle. Actes du Colloque international tenu a Aix-en-Provence les 4-6 septembre 1985*. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence, 1987, 135–161.
- Pugliese, Orazio, ed. *Venezia e la peste 1348–1797*. Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1979. Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 1979).
- Puppi, Lionello. *Michele Sanmicheli: architetto di Verona*. Padova: Marsilio, 1971.
- Puppi, Lionello, and Giandomenico Romanelli, ed.. *Le Venezie possibili*. Milano: Electa, 1985.

Pust, Klemen. “Le genti della citta, delle isole e del contado, le quale al tutto volevano partirsi’. Migrations from the Venetian to the Ottoman Territory and Conversions of Venetian Subjects to Islam in the Eastern Adriatic in the Sixteenth Century.” *Povijesni prilozi* 40 (2011): 121–159.

Raukar, Tomislav, “Venecija i ekonomski razvoj Dalmacije u XV i XVI stoljeću.” *Radovi [Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu]* 10 (1977): 203–225.

Raukar, Tomislav, Ivo Petricioli, Franjo Švelec, and Šime Peričić. *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom 1409.–1797*. Zadar: Filozofski fakultet, 1987.

Ravid, Benjamin. “The First Charter of the Jewish Merchants of Venice, 1589.” *AJS Review* 1 (1976): 187–222.

Ravid, Benjamin. “The Religious, Economic and Social Background and Context of the Establishment of the Ghetti of Venice.” In *Gli Ebrei e Venezia*, edited by Gaetano Cozzi, 212–259. Milan: Edizioni Comunità, 1987.

Rothman, E. Natalie. *Brokering Empire: Trans-Imperial Subjects between Venice and Istanbul*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Rothman, E. Natalie. *The Dragoman Renaissance: Diplomatic Interpreters and the Routes of Orientalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2021.

Rublack, Ulinka. *Dressing Up: Cultural Identity in Renaissance Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Sagredo, Agostino, and Federico Berchet. *II Fondaco dei Turchi in Venezia: Studi storici ed artistici*, Milano: Giuseppe Civelli, 1860.

Salzberg, Rosa. “Mobility, Cohabitation, and Cultural Exchange in the Lodging Houses of Early Modern Venice.” *Urban History* 46, n.o 3 (2019): 398–418.

Sansovino, Francesco. *Dell'istoria universale dell'origine et imperio de Turchi libri tre*. Venice, 1564.

Sarti, Raffaella. *Živjeti u kući: stanovanje, prehrana i odijevanje u novovjekovnoj Europi (1500.–1800.)*, translated by Ana Badurina. Zagreb: Ibis grafika, 2006. [First edition: *Vita di casa: abitare, mangiare, vestire nell'Europa moderna*, Rome: Laterza, 1999].

Sartori, Alessandra. “Spalato rinascimentale: la fortezza e la città a dal sec. XV al sec. XVIII.” Master's thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1986–1987.

Saterini, Marco. “Domenico Rossi, l'architetto principe alle origini della committenza Manin: l'ultimo grande progetto culturale dell'aristocrazia della Serenissima.” Master's thesis, IUAV, Venice, 1993.

Scaglia, Giustina. “‘Stanze-stufe’ e ‘stanze-camini’ nei ‘trattati’ di Francesco di Giorgio da Siena,” *Bollettino d'arte* 39–40 (Sept.–Dec. 1986): 161–184.

Scamozzi, Vincenzo. *Idea dell'architettura universale*. Venice: Giorgio Valentini, 1615.

Scarpa, Chiara. “Venezia a Roma: il palazzo di San Marco.” In *La storia del Palazzo di Venezia: dalle collezioni Barbo e Grimani a sede dell'Ambasciata veneta e austriaca*, edited by Maria Giulia Barberini, Matilde de Angelis d'Ossat, and Alessandra Schiavon, 79–244. Rome: Gangemi, 2011.

Schulz, Juergen. “The Restoration of the Fondaco dei Turchi.” *Annali di Architettura* 7 (1995): 19–38.

Schulz, Juergen. “Early Plans of the Fondaco dei Turchi.” *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 42 (1997): 149–159.

Schulz, Juergen. *The New Palaces of Medieval Venice*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.

Seražin, Helena. “Lo stato da Mar.” In *Storia dell'architettura nel Veneto: Il Settecento*, edited by Elisabeth Kieven, Sussana Pasquali, 202–213. Venezia: Marsilio Editori, 2012.

- Serlio, Sebastiano. *Il settimo libro d'architettura*. Frankfurt: Jacopo Strada, 1575.
- Serlio, Sebastiano, and Myra Nan Rosenfeld. *Sebastiano Serlio on domestic architecture: different dwellings from the meanest hovel to the most ornate palace: the sixteenth-century manuscript of book VI in the Avery Library of Columbia University*. New York: Architectural History Foundation, 1978.
- Setton, Kenneth M. *Venice, Austria and the Turks in the Seventeenth Century*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1991.
- Sexton, Kim Susan. "A History of Renaissance Civic Loggias in Italy from the Loggia dei Lanzi to Sansovino's Loggetta." PhD diss., Yale University, 1997.
- Simonsfeld, Henry. *Der Fondaco dei Tedeschi in Venedig und die Deutsch-Venetianischen Handelsbeziehungen*. Vol. 1–2. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1887.
- Sims, Eleanor. "Markets and Caravanserais." In *Architecture of the Islamic World: Its History and Social Meaning, with a Complete Survey of Key Monuments*, edited by George Michell, 80–111. London: Thames and Hudson, 1984.
- Šimunković, Ljerka. "Prehrana osmanskog izaslanika Omer-bega Babića i njegove pratnje u splitskom lazaretu." *Grada i prilozi za povijest Dalmacije* 16 (2000): 287–315.
- Slukan Altić, Mirela. "Povijest sanitarnih kordona i njihova uloga u razvoju dalmatinskih gradova." *Ekonomika i ekohistorija* 2, n.o 2 (2006): 55–64.
- Smith, Virginia. *Clean: A History of Personal Hygiene and Purity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Soldo, Josip Ante. "Skradin pod Venecijom." *Radovi Zavoda HAZU u Zadru* 33 (1991): 131–183.
- Soldo, Josip Ante. *Sinjska krajina u 17. i 18. stoljeću*. Vol. 2. Sinj: Matica hrvatska, 2011 [1997].
- Soranzo, Lazzaro. *L'Ottomanno*. Ferrara: Vittorio Baldini, 1599.

Stagno, Laura, and Borja Franco Llopis, eds. *Lepanto and Beyond: Images of Religious Alterity from Genoa and the Christian Mediterranean*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2021.

Stanojević, Gligor. *Jugoslavenske zemlje u mletačko-turskim ratovima XVI-XVIII vijeka*. Beograd: Istorijski institut, 1970.

Stanojević, Gligor. "Novska skela u XVIII vijeku." *Spomenik SANU* 127 (1986): 85–138.

Stanojević, Gligor. "Popis građevina Boke Kotorske iz 1788. godine." *Spomenik SANU* 127 (1986): 139–178.

Stefani, Giuseppe. *L'assicurazione a Venezia: dale origini alla fine della Serenissima*. Vol. 1. Trieste: Assicurazioni Generali di Trieste e Venezia, 1956.

Stevens Crawshaw, Jane L. *Plague Hospitals: Public Health for the City in Early Modern Venice*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2012.

Stojanovic, Trajan. "The Conquering Balkan Orthodox Merchant." *The Journal of Economic History* 20, n.o 2 (1960): 234–313.

Stow, Kenneth. "Was the ghetto cleaner...?" In *Rome, Pollution and Property: Dirt, Disease, and Hygiene in the Eternal City from Antiquity to Modernity*, edited by Mark Bradley, 169 – 181. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Strika, Zvezdan. "Zadarska dijecezanska sinoda 1598. godine." *Croatica Christiana periodica* 83 (2019): 41–57.

Strika, Zvezdan. "Pokrajinski sabor južnohrvatskih biskupa u Zadru 1579. godine." *Croatica Christiana periodica* 87 (2021): 139–163.

Strunje, Petar. "Blagajnički spisi mletačke Općine Split kao izvor za građevinsku povijest." *Vjesnik dalmatinskih arhiva* 2 (2021): 247–264.

Strunje, Petar. *Splitski lazaret i trgovačka skala*. Zagreb: FF Press, 2022.

Svalduz, Elena. "Al servizio del magistrato. I protti alle acque nel corso del primo secolo d'attività." In *Architetto sia l'ingegnere che discorre: Ingegneri, architetti e protti nell'età della Repubblica*, edited by Giuliana Mazzi and Stefano Zaggia, 233–268. Venice: Marsilio, 2004.

Tadić, Jorjo. *Promet putnika u starom Dubrovniku*. Dubrovnik: Izdanje Turističkog saveza u Dubrovniku, 1939.

Tenenti, Alberto. *Venezia e i corsari: 1580–1615*. Bari: Laterza, 1961.

The clear Quran: a thematic English translation of the message of the Final Revelation, translated by Mehmed Khattab. Lombard, IL: Book of Signs Foundation, 2016.

Thornton, Peter. *The Italian Renaissance Interior: 1400–1600*. New York: Harry N. Abrams Inc., 1991.

Tolan, John, Henry Laurens, and Gilles Veinstein. *Europe & the Islamic world: A History*, translated by Jane Marie Todd. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Toledano, Ralph. *Michele Marieschi: catalogo ragionato*, Milan: Leonardo, 1995.

Tomasović, Marinko. *Uklesani i urezani simboli na arhitekturi Makarske i njenog rubnog područja*, Makarska: Gradski muzej Makarska, 2019.

Tracy, James. "Il commercio italiano in territorio ottoman." In *Il Rinascimento italiano e l'Europa*. Vol. 4, *Commercio e cultura mercantile*, edited by Franco Franceschi, Richard A. Goldthwaite and Reinhold C. Mueller, 425–454. Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca; Costabissara: Colla, 2007.

Traljić, Seid. "Trgovina Bosne i Hercegovine s lukama Dalmacije i Dubrovnika u XVII i XVIII stoljeću," *Pomorski zbornik: povodom 20-godišnjice Dana mornarice i pomorstva Jugoslavije: 1942–1962*. Vol. 1, edited by Grga Novak, Vjekoslav Maštrović, 341 – 371. Zadar: Institut za historijske i ekonomske nauke, 1962.

Traljić, Seid. “Zadar i turska pozadina od XV. do potkraj XIX. stoljeća.” *Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru* 11–12 (1965): 203–227.

Trincanato, Egle Renata. *Venezia minore*. Milano: Edizione del milione, 1948.

Troeltsch, Ernst. “Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt.” *Historische Zeitschrift* 97 (1906): 1–66.

Turan, Şerafettin. “Venedik’te Türk Ticaret Merkezi.” *Belleten* 23 (1968): 247–283.

Urban, Lina. *Locande a Venezia*. Venice: Centro Internazionale della Grafica, 1989.

Urban, Lina. *Venezia e il "foresto": situazioni avventure, meraviglie, quando anche i re alloggiavano in locande: hosterie, locande e alberghi dal XIII al XIX secolo*. Venice: Centro internazionale della grafica, 1990.

Vanzan Marchini, Nelli-Elena, ed. *Rotte Mediterranee e baluardi di sanità: Venezia e i lazzaretti mediterranei*. Milan: Skira, 2004. Exhibition catalogue (Venice, 2004).

Varriale, Gennaro. “Tra il Mediterraneo e il fonte battesimale: Musulmani a Napoli nel XVI secolo.” *Revista de historia moderna*, 31 (2013): 91–108.

Vasari, Giorgio il Giovane. *La città ideale: Piante di chiese (palazzi e ville) di Toscana e d’Italia*. Edited by Virginia Stefanelli. Rome: Officina Edizioni, 1970.

Vasari, Giorgio. *Lives of the painters, sculptors and architects*, vol 2. London: Everyman's Library, 1996.

Vecellio, Cesare. *De gli habitanti antichi, e moderni di diverse parti del mondo libri due*. Venice: Damiano Zenaro, 1590.

Vercellin, Giorgio. “Mercanti Turchi e Sensali a Venezia.” *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 4 (1980): 45–78.

Vocabolario Treccani on line, s.v. “ridotto²” <https://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/ridotto2/>

Vrandečić, Josip. “Had an Ottoman combatant any chance to win the love of the daughter of the rector of the Dalmatian town Zadar? (Islam in Ottoman Dalmatia in the 16th and 17th century and its coexistence with the Christian world of neighboring Venetian Dalmatia).” *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru* 33 (1994–1995): 163–184.

Vulić, Ivan, and Šime Vulić, *Zgrada na Štaliji u Sinju – konzervatorski elaborat* [conservation report], Sinj: Grad Sinj, 2016.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System*. Vol. 1, *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Wettinger, Godfrey. *Slavery in the Islands of Malta and Gozo ca. 1000–1812*. Malta: Publishers Enterprises Group, 2002.

Wiel, Alethea. “The demolition of the Warehouse of the Persians in Venice.” *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs* 13, no. 64 (July 1908): 221–222.

Zammit, Themistocles. “The Water Supply of the Maltese Islands.” *Archivium Melitense* 7, no. 1 (1922): 1–47.

Zannini, Andrea. *Venezia città aperta: Gli stranieri e la Serenissima XIV-XVIII sec.* Venice: Marcianum Press, 2009.

Zenobi, Luca. “Mobility and Urban Space in Early Modern Europe: An Introduction.” *Journal of Early Modern History* 25 (2021): 1–10.

Žmegač, Andrej. *Bastioni jadranske Hrvatske*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga; Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2009.

Zucconi, Guido. “Il rifacimento del Fondaco dei Turchi nella Venezia del secondo Ottocento.” *Territorio (nuova serie)* 68 (2014): 99-107.

Archival sources

BELGRADE

Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts – Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti

Arhiv, Istorijska zbirka, Zaostavština Jovana Tomića, 8711

HVAR

Hvar Heritage Museum – Muzej hvarske baštine

Fond Bučić, kutija 1

MODENA

Archivio di Stato di Modena

Mappario Estense, n. 329

NEW YORK

Columbia University Library

Avery Manuscript – AA520 SE619F, Sebastiano Serlio, *Sesto libro dell'architettura*, c. 1550.

ŠIBENIK

State Archives in Šibenik – Državni arhiv u Šibeniku (HR-DAŠI)

HR-DAŠI-1 (*Općina Šibenik*), kutija 67

VENICE

Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASVe)

Cinque Savi alla mercanzia, 1. serie, busta 63

busta 142

busta 146

busta 151

busta 372

busta 492

2. serie, busta 162

busta 187

Registri, registro 155

Collegio, Notatorio, filza 237

regesta 81

Relazioni (finali di ambasciatori e pubblici rappresentanti),

busta 62

busta 65

busta 66

busta 67

busta 69

busta 72

Compilazione delle leggi, busta 210

Deputati e aggiunti alla provision del denaro pubblico, busta 990

Giudici del Piovego, busta 168

Lettere e scritture turchesche, busta 3 – filza 3

Miscellanea mappe, number 571

Provveditori e sopraprovveditori alla sanità, busta 391

busta 417

busta 452

busta 455

disegni 4

disegni 8

disegni 9

disegni 11

disegni 24

Savi ed esecutori alle acque, Disegni, Adige, disegno 28

disegno 33

disegno 34

Secreta, Materie miste e notabili, busta 55

Senato, Deliberazioni, Costantinopoli, regista 16

Mar, filza 69

filza 87

filza 104

filza 178

Secreta, registro 82

Terra, filza 67

filza 152

filza 1917

filza 2128

filza 2134

Dispacci, Provveditori da Terra e da Mar e altre cariche,

busta 272

busta 384

busta 414

busta 415

busta 478

Biblioteca del Museo civico Correr (BMC)

Codici Cicogna, 978

3112

PDc, 740

Biblioteca nazionale Marciana (BNM)

Ms.It.IV.28, Napoleone Francesco Eraut, *Racolta delle piante d'alquante delle più considerabili et forti piazze dello Stato tanto di terra ferma quanto da mar della Serenissima Republica di Venetia*, 1682.

Ms.It.VI.195, Faustino Brascuglia, *Atlante della Dalmazia*, 1745.

Ms.It.VII.94, *Carte topografiche e piante di città e fortezze per la guerra di Morea (1684–1697)*.

Ms.It.VII.200, *Carte topografiche, piante di città e fortezze, disegni di battaglie della guerra di Candia (1645–1669)*.

ZADAR

State Archives in Zadar – Državni arhiv u Zadru (HR-DAZD)

- HR-DAZD-1 (*Generalni providuri za Dalmaciju i Albaniju*), kutija 11
kutija 12
kutija 15
kutija 37
kutija 70
kutija 98
kutija 105
kutija 107
kutija 114
kutija 121
kutija 124
kutija 135
kutija 167
kutija 190
kutija 192
kutija 194
kutija 197
kutija 203
kutija 204

HR-DAZD-5 (*Mletački katastar. Katastarske knjige*), kutija 36

HR-DAZD-16 (*Općina Split – Civitas et districtus Spalati*), kutija 317

kutija 320/a

kutija 323

HR-DAZD-377 (*Miscellanea*), svezak 1.