

Trade Along the Ottoman Border in Post-War Era: Commerce in Mitrowitz According to the Austrian Customs Registers (1719-1723)*

Numan Elibol**

Eskişehir Osmangazi University (ESOGU), Department of History

ABSTRACT

The trade in Mitrowitz in the period following the signing of the commercial treaty of Passarowitz between Austria and the Ottoman Empire in 1718 was lively. It reflected the characteristics of both domestic and border trade, but Mitrowitz also served as a transit region. Commercial activities were conducted by the Austrian and Ottoman subjects, but the Ottoman merchants outrivaled the Austrians in merchant numbers, tax amount, and total value of the goods. Ottoman merchants also differed from the Austrian subjects in terms of their ethnic and religious identities. The trade of the Austrian subjects was centered in Austria and in indigenous commercial articles, whereas the Ottoman subjects engaged more in border trade and in the trade of conventional articles exchanged between Austria and the Ottoman provinces.

Introduction

It is well illustrated that the Austrian administration, in line with the era's mercantilist policies, has made concrete attempts to im-

* The author would like to thank Prof. Dr. A. Mesud Küçükcalay for his assistance in editing the tables and in revising the figures. The author would also like to thank Dr. Himmet Taşkömür for his critics and suggestions, both regarding the subject matter of the research and the language of the text.

** Some of the source material of the research was used in the paper titled "Avusturya Gümrük Kayıtlarında Osmanlı Tüccarları: Mitroviç (1719-1724)" and presented in the International Symposium of *Harp ve Sulh: 300. Yılında Pasarofça Antlaşması*, 28 June 2018, İstanbul.

prove its commercial relations with the Ottoman Empire. Austria tried to change the course of trade in its favor starting in the second half of the 17th century.¹ These attempts were marked by the first Oriental Company's foundation in 1667 and reached a turning point with the signing of the Commercial Treaty of Passarowitz with the Ottoman Empire in 1718. Next year, a second Oriental Company granted crown privileges was founded. The latter focused mainly on the Balkan Peninsula and controlled the Danube trade.² The activities of trade in the region, including the overland trade, were made a monopoly by the company. The transactions of other merchants operating in the same region were regarded as illegal, and they were banned from trading.³

Despite its commitment, Austria failed to attain the goals it aimed at in the aftermath of the Commercial Treaty of Passarowitz. It was unable to overcome the competition of the local merchants in Belgrade, one of the company's leading commercial centers, along with Istanbul⁴ and exports to the East fell short of expectations.⁵ Besides, the customs concessions granted to Ottoman merchants could not be extended to Austrian subjects. This was mainly because the duties paid by the Ottoman merchants were less than those of the Austrians, which consisted of a customs tax of 3% and the *masdariye* collected at the rate of 2%.⁶

The Ottoman merchants seemed to have made good use of the advantages occasioned by the Passarowitz Commercial Treaty and

¹ See: B. Bronza, "Austrian Trade Towards the Ottoman Empire and Asia During the 18th Century", in *Journal of Historical Researches*, 27, 2016, pp. 141-149; N. Elibol, "XVI-XVII. Yüzyillarda Avusturya'nın Doğu Ticareti", in *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 12, 2005, pp. 23-50.

² Bronza, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-142.

³ Othmar Pickl, "Österreichs Stellung im West-Ost Handel vom 16. bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Handels mit dem Südosten", in *Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich*, IV/2, 1981, p. 46.

⁴ J. Pešalj, "Making a Prosperous Peace: Habsburg Diplomacy and Economic Policy at Passarowitz", in C. Ingrao et. al. (eds.), *The Peace of Passarowitz, 1718*, Purdue Univ. Press, 2010, p. 148.

⁵ H.R. von Srbik, *Der Staatliche Exporthandel Österreichs*, Wien und Leipzig, 1907, p. 306.

⁶ Pickl, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

intensified their activities in Austrian lands. As expected, soon after the enforcement of the treaty, more and more Ottoman merchants poured into Habsburg territories and began to exercise control over Austrian internal trade.⁷ The Habsburg administration, on the other hand, in order to protect its own merchants, attempted to ban the retail trade of the Ottoman merchants and restricted their activities to particular trading sites in 1725, with those who acted against the rules being punished by confiscation of their goods.⁸ But this time, the Ottoman merchants began to control the wholesale trade in the country. Furthermore, their import of Turkish and Italian goods to the Habsburg territories increased, whereas their export of Austrian merchandise to the Ottoman Empire remained limited. And the trade, as it is, worked to the detriment of Austria.⁹

The current research shows how the overall picture described above was compatible with the Austrian border lands acquired from the Ottoman Empire after the Peace Treaty of Passarowitz and how it was reflected in Austrian customs registers during the period following the Commercial Treaty of Passarowitz. The research region is Mitrowitz, the former seat of the Ottoman *sandjak* of Syrem and the current Austrian border town within the military zone of Slavonia.¹⁰ Other quarters located within the military zone and the subject of separate research were Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha. The supplementary data obtained from the latter was utilized in comparisons

⁷ See N. Elibol, "XVIII. Yüzyılda Avusturya Topraklarında Faaliyet Gösteren Osmanlı Tüccarları", in *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15, 2004, pp. 59-112.

⁸ H. Petrić, "The Navigation and Trade Agreement of 1718 and Ottoman Orthodox Merchants in Croatia and the Military Border", in C. Ingrao et. al. (eds.), *The Peace of Passarowitz, 1718*, Purdue Univ. Press, 2010, p. 184.

⁹ Srbik, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

¹⁰ The Austrian military zone was set up along the Ottoman border through the 16th and 18th centuries progressively and stretched down the southern and eastern frontiers of the country. In addition to military and defensive functions, it had the task of checking the spread of contagious diseases likely to occur through trade or wartime contacts. The military zone took its ultimate form after the Treaty of Passarowitz, when new frontier regulations were made against the Turks along the Una, Sava and Danubian river routes: X. Havadi, "Die Österreichische Militärgrenze: Staatliche Kontrolle der Grenze im Absolutischen Zeitalter", in *Geographia Napocensis*, III/2, 2009, pp. 69, 74-75.

made with Mitrowitz throughout the research. For a short interval, the figures from Szerna Bara, another customs station subordinate to Mitrowitz, were also employed.

The findings of the research suggest that the trade in Mitrowitz in the aftermath of the Commercial Treaty of Passarowitz was not stagnant. The participants in the activities of trade included both Austrian and Ottoman subjects, but the latter had supremacy over the former. The trade conducted by Austrian and Ottoman subjects differed in terms of geographical scope, commercial articles, and merchant ethnic-religious composition. The trade of the Austrian subjects was generally confined to Habsburg territories and bore the characteristics of a domestic trade consisting of traditional indigenous products. The Ottoman subjects' situation was typical of border trade between Austrian and Ottoman provinces. Regardless of its domestic or international nature, Mitrowitz emerged from these commercial activities as an important commercial center, a transit region, and a significant hub for transborder trade.

1. Customs under Austrian Rule

The source data of the research belongs to one of the thirtieth customs houses located across the military border zone of Austria. Thus, it would be useful to briefly present the Austrian customs in the 18th century and to mention the emergence and implementation of the thirtieth tax.

At the beginning of the 18th century, the Austrian administration attempted to restructure the fragmented customs organization. Karl VI (r. 1711-1740) inaugurated a process of centralization, a policy further continued by Maria Theresa (r. 1740-1780). In former times, the customs duties in Austria were collected along inner commercial routes, waterways, important passes, military routes, or market-places rather than on border land. Some of these duties had been monopolized by certain private houses, a couple of which survived well into the mid-18th century. Under the reign of Leopold I (r. 1658-

1705), Joseph I (r. 1687-1711; 1690-1711), and Karl VI, these customs duties were either gradually abolished or their rates were reduced, while occasionally, in order to establish a distinct customs zone, the feudal taxes were incorporated into royal taxes. In the 18th century, the customs regions within hereditary lands of Austria, namely Lower- and Upper Austria, Bohemia and Glatz, Moravia, Silesia, Inner-Austria (Styria, Carinthia, Carniola, and Austrian Littoral), and Tyrol, had their own customs regulations, each drawn up during the 18th century. Trieste and Fiume, meanwhile, had already been declared free ports in the 17th century.¹¹

The customs zones of Hungary, on the other hand, had already been separated from Austrian customs zones in the second half of the 15th century, at the time of Emperor Friedrich III (r. 1452-1493) and King Mathias Corvinus (r. 1458-1490). The “intermediate customs” instituted between Austria and Hungary, however, were different from the ones in force between different customs regions of Austria. The goods to be exported from Austria to Hungary, for instance, had to be taxed both in Austria and Hungary. It was also the case with the goods imported from Hungary to Austria. This was due to a customs duty in force in Hungary, called thirtieth and levied at the rate of the value of the goods regardless of whether they were imported, exported, or transited.¹² The thirtieth tax had been introduced by Hungarian kings in the Medieval Ages. Supposedly, the first Hungarian ruler to impose this tax was Karl I (Károly Róbert, b. 1288-d. 1342), who, in order to increase the revenues of the kingdom, decided to reinforce his regalia rights and charged a new toll on foreign trade, which was to replace the old bridge and road tolls.¹³

¹¹ R. Sieghart, *Zolltrennung und Zolleinheit: Die Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Zwischenzoll-Linie*. Manzsche K.u.K. Hof-Verlags- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung, Wien 1915, p. 5.

¹² Sieghart, *ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

¹³ C.E. Fischamend, “Der Grenzüberschreitende Wirtschaftsraum in der frühen Neuzeit dargestellt am Weinbau der Stadt Bruck a.d. Leitha”, in *Burgenländische Heimatblätter*, 61/2, 1999, p. 111.

Initially, the location of the thirtieth customs was not restricted to border zones. In the early 13th century, the thirtieth toll was paid mainly on the articles of inland trade and the toll stations were scattered throughout Hungary, some of them being in the towns deep inside the country. But starting from the second half of the century, the range of the toll was extended to foreign trade.¹⁴ At first, only the commercial goods imported to Hungary were subject to the thirtieth toll, but a law of Sigismund in 1405 extended the toll to export goods. Still, however, the personal property of the nobles and of the residents of royal towns was exempt from it. Likewise, the towns, the markets, the dominions of feudal lords, the military groups in charge of the security of the Danube etc. were excluded from this tax liability.¹⁵

The major commercial roads and busy trade routes were essential in the formation of thirtieth customs, as seen in the establishment of the customs stations in Estergon (Gran), Győr (Raab), Buda (Ofen), Trnava, and Zagreb.¹⁶ By the late 17th and early 18th centuries, a multitude of thirtieth customs houses had been scattered to the west of Hungary on both sides of the Danube, i.e., across Cisdanubia and Transdanubia. Similar customs houses began to emerge on Austrian soil from the 17th century onward, possibly to ensure the safety of the borders and to check trade with Hungary. These houses were set up both along the borderline and in the interior of the country.¹⁷ Similarly, the thirtieth customs houses set up within the military zone in the second half of the 18th century were assigned, in addition to tax collection, the task of curbing the illegal trade.¹⁸

In the course of time, the rate of the thirtieth tax increased. According to the customs registers of Rudersdorf, for example, the av-

¹⁴ B. Nagy, "Old Interpretations and New Approaches: The 1457-1458 Thirtieth Customs Register of Bratislava", in R. Zaoral (ed.), *Finance in Central Europe during the Later Middle Ages*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2016, s. 192.

¹⁵ Fischamend, *op.cit.*, pp. 111-112.

¹⁶ Nagy, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

¹⁷ Fischamend, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

¹⁸ Havadi, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

average rate of tax levied at the customs house between 1538 and 1544 was 4%, while it amounted to 5% for the season of 1553-1554.¹⁹ Around 1600, the rate was one-twenty-fifth of the value of the goods, whereas in Transylvania it ran at 5% and the toll was called twentieth.²⁰ Through the 17th century this rate remained mostly unchanged, but the attempts to increase it due to mercantilist concerns continued, which were accompanied by simultaneous increases in the “intermediate” or consumption duties to be paid in Austria for the goods imported from Hungary.²¹

Early in the 18th century, as part of Karl VI’s policy of unity in customs administration, exemptions from the thirtieth tax liability were revoked, and customs stations other than those established on border zones were dissolved in Hungary. Similarly, trade between Vienna and Hungary was restructured. Concerning trade with predominantly Slavic territories, the latter were separated from Hungary by intermediate customs lines established in Banat, Croatia-Slavonia, and Serbia, which were under Habsburg rule between 1718 and 1739.²²

Austrian border customs along the Ottoman border had a consistent structure and paralleled inland customs. After the Treaty of Passarowitz brought the Serbian territories under Habsburg rule and a new regime was established in the region, Belgrade became the regional center of customs administration. Serbian customs taxes were similar to those collected in the rest of Austria’s dominions, whether they were old crown lands or newly captured territories. Throughout the Habsburg monarchy, the average tax rate ranged from 1% to 40%, depending on the value of the commercial good and the needs of Austrian finance and commerce. But this rate was fixed at 3% for the Ottoman merchants. In the period following the commercial

¹⁹ H. Prickler, “Die Rudersdorfer Dreissigstregister von 1538 bis 1555. Eine Quelle zur Geschichte des ungarisch-steirischen Grenzhandels im 16. Jahrhundert”, in *Mitteilungen des Steiermärkischen Landesarchivs*, 28, 1978, pp. 41-135.

²⁰ Fischemand, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

²¹ Sieghart, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

²² *Op. cit.*, pp. 5, 7.

Treaty of Passarowitz (1718), the Habsburg merchants paid 1-2% less than the Ottoman merchants, but in case of transporting their goods to another destination – to a fair outside the territory of Serbia, for example – they had to pay extra duties. Thus, by 1731, the current varying-rate taxes in Hungary and the territories annexed by Austria in recent times, whether collected on import or export goods, had been replaced by a standard 6-percentage-point tax.²³

2. Source Material

The sources of the research are the thirtieth customs registers of Mitrowitz, now under Austrian control, and the source material utilized throughout the research is the archival work of Slavko Gavrilović, titled *Materialien zu Balkanhändlern in Ungarn im XVIII Jahrhundert. Zollhäuser* (vol. II, Beograd 1996). This work has been compiled, possibly in accordance with its original setup, by a chronological arrangement of the customs registers of the regions populated mostly by Hungarian and Slavic peoples in the second half of the 17th and the first half of the 18th centuries. It was made clear by the author that the bulk of these registers were kept in Hungarian State Archives, while a small part belonged to the *Hofkammerarchive* in Vienna.

According to the information provided by the author at the end of the second volume, the source material sheds light primarily on the trade of commercial articles imported either from the Ottoman Empire to Habsburg lands or from Habsburg lands to Serbia and Bosnia, which involved cattle, beverages, leather, industrial products, works of handicraft, foodstuffs, tobacco, wax, honey, fish, and various other articles. Major agents of this trade were mainly Turkish subjects of Balkan origin, consisting of *Sinsar* brokers, Greeks, Slavic Muslims, and the members of the Jewish, Armenian, and Serbian or-

²³ M. Đorđević and S. Nedeljković, "Commerce and Customs Service on the Ottoman-Habsburg Border in the First Half of the 18th Century", in *Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and History*, 17/2, 2018, pp. 128-29.

ders. With the exception of the Muslims, these merchant groups remained the primary mediators of the commerce on the Austrian side, among whom there were no Austrian subjects. Nonetheless, the Serbs dominated commercial activities on the Austrian side from the late 17th to the mid-18th centuries, while the *Sinsars*, along with other orthodox merchant groups, came into prominence later.

In the third chapter of the second volume of the source book, the author states that the registers comprised the protocols of the thirtieth customs of Mitrowitz, Racza and Brod, all located along the Sava River, and that the trade revealed by these protocols pointed to the prominence of Serbia and Bosnia, although the center of activities was occasionally shifted to Macedonia.

Gavrilović opened a separate topic about the characteristics of the registers and described the difficulties he experienced in detail: "With respect to the publication of the current documents, it should be underlined that the German customs authorities had trouble giving the Serbian and Muslim names in their proper forms, and thus most of the time these names were incorrect. Their little acquaintance with geography and inadequate command of toponymy made the recognition of the German and Latin versions of place and person names difficult. In this connection, the incompetence of the customs officials to recognize the scripture, their use of different German dialects, inconsistencies of writing, excessive use of different writing styles, arbitrary orthography, non-standard combination, separation of words, etc. are noticeable. In addition to these problems, one must mention the difficulty of reading the hand scriptures, which requires extra effort in the solution of the texts as well in dealing with abbreviations and ligatures."²⁴

Seemingly, for those who are studying similar materials and working on the archival documents, the problems noted above are not surprising and can be traced back to earlier periods, as attested by the statements of Harald Prickler in his research on the border

²⁴ Slavko Gavrilović, *Materialien zu Balkanhandlern in Ungarn im XVIII Jahrhundert. Zollhäuser*, Band II, Beograd 1996, p. 548.

commerce between Hungary and Styria in the 16th century: “As for the merchants’ origins, the registers for the the years between 1538-1544 and 1553-1555 are said to have been written in “Latin accent” by customs officer Gáspár Gereb and his successor. So, the names are frequently recorded in Latin and Hungarian forms. In the event that the names of the merchants could not be accurately translated, the officers of the thirtieth customs seem to have made use of German version. But even then, they prefer to use a conventional Hungarian spelling.”²⁵

Concerning the current research,²⁶ the names of the regions, towns, and villages mentioned throughout the text and shown on the maps were given in their original forms. But the use of different spelling forms and the preference for German variants of orthography made it difficult to locate some of the towns and villages during the research. At that point, the guidance of Gavrilović, who often cited other alternative usages for the same place names, proved invaluable. But there were still other instances where multiple locations were recorded under the same name within the same neighborhood.²⁷ In this case, to decide the right location, the routes followed by the merchants, their departures, and their destinations were taken into consideration.

3. Findings of the Research

The customs registers of Mitrowitz provide information on the merchants and their activities, the articles of trade, and the tax figures.

²⁵ Prickler, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

²⁶ The current research is not the first to be based on the documentary work of Gavrilović. A recent investigation of Milan Vrbanus and Robert Skenderović titled *Trgovački Promet na Tridesetnici Brod od 19. Studenoga 1719. do Kraja Lipnja 1721* (*Scrinia Slavonica*, 16, 2016, pp. 91-146) utilizes the same material. It particularly makes use of the thirtieth customs registers of Brod for the period between 1719-and 1721, contained in the second volume of the work. It bears some parallels with the current research in regard to its methodology but differs from the latter with respect to its extent and volume.

Similarly, they contain precious information on the means and facilities of transportation, the units of weight and measurement, and the prices of commercial goods, even though gleaning such information requires meticulous and exhausting work. Above all, they lend themselves to quantitative analysis and statistical surveys. The current study focuses on the first category of assets, namely merchants, taxes, and goods, due to the scope and volume of the source material.

Throughout the research, tax and value (price) figures are given either in terms of *forint* (f.)²⁸ or *denarius* (d.). During this period 1 *forint* was equal to 100 *denarii*. It should be remembered that the totals given in the source material sometimes differed from the totals attained by manual calculations. Some of the differences may be rooted in the errors likely to result from the incomplete and inaccurate recordings in the original material or the mistakes that might occur during printing.²⁹

Regarding the merchant figures, the total number of the merchants exceeded the number of the commercial enterprises liable to tax, this was because some of the merchants taking part in these enterprises were accompanied by their partners.

The registers record the names of the merchants, the merchandise, and the total tax amount paid, but sometimes they also supply

²⁷ This was the case, for example, for Brestovac (Bristovaz/Berstofze) and Jasenovac (Jessenoviz/Jessenovitz/Jessenovaz), the former located both in present day Serbia and Croatia while the latter existed in Slavonia and Bosnia.

²⁸ It was also recorded as *floring*, *gulden* and *fr*. Its parity was about 1-1,5 Turkish piasters for most of the 18th century.

²⁹ The official tax rates and the unit price of any given good allow the explorers to check the original figures. Sometimes simple calculations may suffice to conclude that a figure, let's say "50", must have been recorded as "5" by mistake, and "80" as "8", as was the case for the "*Slavonische oxen*" of Bellio undt Marian v[on] Nestin undt Susseck, on April 1720 (p. 290). Comparably, the total number of the sheeps and goats of Carolus Maria, a blacksmith from Orsova, must be registered as "70" instead of "20" (p. 312). Similar faults can be extended to Ottoman merchants as well, as was true for Allia exporting cattles to Szvornik on July 1723, whose tax amount reads as "117" fr. instead of "111" fr. (p. 382). The list can be further extended to the case of Mosto of Seralien in p. 384, Kara Mustafa of Seralien in p. 386, Juro of Seralia in p. 387, Mehmet Bassa of Svornik in p. 388 and so on.

data on the value of commercial goods, which could either be specified for individual trade articles or for a set of goods. In many cases, the data on the units of weight and measurement go along with the trade article. Thus, if the unit price of these articles could be determined, they can be classified on the basis of value. Yet, in some cases, the data on the quantity or amount of the article might be missing, or the units of weight and measurement for the same good could differ from each other. Besides, even if these units could be standardized and a common unit for each article could be decided, the values for the same unit could also vary. Therefore, in some cases, the value of the merchandise was established by simply dividing the total amount of value by the number of commodity types.

3.1 Merchants and taxes: figures in outline

The customs registers of Mitrowitz for the period of 1719-23 inform us both on the merchants and the taxes they paid. The figures for this period are as follows.

These figures might seem to be controversial at first sight, taking

TABLE 1
Merchants Operating in Mitrowitz (1719-1723), (fr.)

Years	Austrian Subjects		Ottoman Subjects		Total	
	Merchant Number	Tax Amount	Merchant Number	Tax Amount	Merchant Number	Tax Amount
1719*	82	172,47	15	66,96	97	239,43
1720	272	828,27	294	1.019,15	566	1.847,42
1721	224	998,42	-	-	224	998,42
1722	-	-	572	1.842,34	572	1.842,34
1723	144	590	360	1.199,56	504	1.789,56
Total	722	2.589,16	1.241	4.128,01	1963	6.717,17

* Covers the last four months of the year.

into account that the first year comprised only four months while the consecutive years of 1721 and 1722 involved only one group of merchants alternately. The figures for the years of 1720 and 1723, on

the other hand, are regular, and their totals and averages are more reasonable to take as a basis. The totals for these two years are close to each other both in terms of merchant numbers and tax amounts. The averages count as 535 in merchant numbers and run to 1.844,91 fr. in tax amount. These figures make Mitrowitz one of the centers capable of portraying the commercial life along the Sava route at that time. Compared with Mitrowitz, other locations were subject to the same customs taxes, and the yearly averages they revealed around 1720's were as follows:

TABLE 2
Yearly Averages for Mitrowitz, Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha, 1719-24 (d.)

Mitrowitz 1720 & 1723		Pakratz, 1719-20		Brodt 1720		Ratscha, 1723-24	
Merchant number	Tax amount (d.)	Merchant Number	Tax amount (d.)	Merchant Number	Tax amount (d.)	Merchant Number	Tax amount (d.)
535	184.491	208	80.881,75	159	73.230,5	62	18.333,5

Despite being significant in comparison to other customs stations' figures, Mitrowitz's figures for the period prior to 1719 and after 1723 are either unavailable or inconsistent. Thus, the potential change in the figures likely to occur after 1718 and the general trend for the rest of the 1720's are hard to determine. This handicap in part applies to the other locations listed above. The figures for Pakratz, exceptionally, go back to the year 1714 and survive into 1726. These figures, which accounted for 127 merchants and 61.383,5 d. in 1714, increased by 40 to 25% by 1719-20. However, in 1726, this rate drops by 25 to 23%, corresponding to 170 merchants and 79.488,5 d., respectively. The case with Ratscha, on the other hand, is much more different. Here, the averages of 1723-24 increase over sixfold in merchant numbers and more than ninefold in tax amounts by 1727. Findings from other regions to the north of Mitrowitz point to a revival of trade at the beginning of the 18th century. According to the customs records of Budin, for example, the trade of certain articles, particularly wool, cotton, oil, salt, sugar, coffee, spices, leather, linen, and various

clothes, flourished from the late 17th century to the early 1720's.³⁰ The registers of other customs stations located along the Drava and Danube rivers suggest that the trade confined to agricultural and animal products in 1690's developed into a wide-ranging trade by the turn of the century, which involved leather, tobacco, honey, wax, textiles and drapery, earthen and woodenware, livestock, farm animals, fruits, nuts, vegetables, cheese, fat, and fish.³¹

One of the basic characteristics of the figures pertaining to the merchant numbers in Mitrowitz is their distribution between the Austrian and Ottoman subjects. In this distribution the totals point out to the supremacy of the Ottoman merchants. They represent more than 60% of the total merchant numbers, and the rates in tax figures are alike. A similar correspondence can only be observed in Brodt, where during the period of 1719-1720 the number of the Turkish subjects slightly surpassed that of the Austrians.

The numbers of Ottoman subjects in Mitrowitz between 1720 and 1723 are relatively stable, while those of the Austrians tend to decrease slightly. Other examples yield diverging results. In Ratscha, for example, a moderately decreasing trend between 1723 and 1725 is followed by a dramatic increase by 1727, observed among both the Austrian and Ottoman subjects. In contrast, the number of Austrian merchants in Pakratz increased by more than two and a half times in 1719, while the number of Ottoman merchants decreased by four and a half times.

The relatively high number of Ottoman merchants implicates a lively trade with Ottoman provinces. The current figures still do not tell much about the balance of trade with the Ottoman Empire. But it is generally known that, during the 1730's the trade of Slavonia with the Turkish provinces was passive, as was the case with Transylvania, Serbia, and Austrian Walachia.³²

³⁰ Gavrilović, *op. cit.*, p. 546.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Sonia Jordan, *Die Kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat im 18. Jahrhundert*, Buchreihe der Südostdeutschen Historischen Kommission, v. 17, München 1967, p. 71.

3.2 Merchant groups

3.2.1 Ottoman Merchants

The basic criterion to discern the Austrian merchants from the Ottomans is the customs rates they were subject to. Together with the taxes they paid, the differentiation between the Austrian and Ottoman merchants can be seen in the commercial articles they dealt in and the regions they traded with, but the difference between them can also be extended to their homelands. The disposition of the homelands of the Ottoman merchants is shown in Map 1.

MAP 1
The Provenance of the Ottoman Merchants
Operating in Mitrowitz (1719-1723)



The map 1 indicates that the merchants' homelands were centered in areas to the south of Sava River, i.e., in Bosnia, as well as western Serbia, where a Muslim Slavic population predominated. However, in order to gain a better understanding of this geographical distribution, the religious and ethnic affiliations of the Ottoman subjects must also be investigated.

The Ottoman merchants are divided within themselves, principally between Muslims and non-Muslims. A further division within the non-Muslims takes place according to their ethnic, religious, or sectarian affiliations. Table 3 shows the general composition of the Ottoman subjects in Mitrowitz during the research period. According to the data in the table, the supremacy of the Muslim merchants over non-Muslims is undeniable. But the difference between the rates of merchant numbers and tax figures of the non-Muslims is also eye-catching, which implies that the trade of non-Muslims consisted rather of precious commodities. As for the distribution of the non-Muslim among themselves and the connection between the Greeks and other non-Muslims, it requires a separate explanation.

TABLE 3
Ottoman Subjects Operating in Mitrowitz (1719-1723)

Years	Muslims		Non-Muslims		Greeks		Jews		Total	
	No.	Tax(d.)	No.	Tax(d.)	No.	Tax(d.)	No.	Tax(d.)	No.	Tax(d.)
1719*	9	3465	5	2175	1	1056	-	-	15	6696
1720	226	57914	32	15312	35	28539	1	150	294	101915
1722	472	146177	61	23892	37	14105	2	60	572	184234
1723	306	91999	21	13440	32	14472	1	45	360	119956
Total	1.013	299555	119	54819	105	58172	4	255	1.241	412801
%	81,63	72,57	9,59	13,28	8,46	14,09	0,32	0,06	100	100

* Covers the last four months of the year.

Considering that all the Ottoman subjects paid the same taxes and traded with similar articles, the Muslims merchants are not always easy to distinguish from non-Muslim. Furthermore, the regions with which they traded and the homelands to which they

belonged frequently overlapped. In this case, the only criteria to discern the Muslims from the non-Muslims are the names they bore and the ethnic or religious labels (Türckh, Griech, Jud etc.) attached next to their names. But the use of these labels is inconsistent, and some of them could be misleading.³³ Nonetheless, distinguishing non-Muslims from each other ethnically or religiously is more difficult than distinguishing them from Muslims.

It so happens that, a merchant bearing a non-Muslim name but lacking any other label in one instance may appear as a “Griech” in another, or vice-versa. Thus, many of the non-Muslim merchants can be regarded either as Greek or non-Greek, depending on perspective. Besides, the *Greekness* of the non-Muslims might be doubtful. Regarding their homelands, there is no reference to Greece, and *Macedonia*, cited for the Greek merchants Stojan and Obrat in late 1719, for example, is replaced with *Fotscha*, *Seralien*, and *Bodvoicza* between 1722 and 1723. In fact, apart from Dischka, Dima, Stoiko, and Risto, who all were importing the woolen *aba* and *schaika* cloth in 1720, the remaining Greek merchants³⁴ were either from Sarajevo or Bosnia. Those from *Moscopoli* and *Sallonick*, namely Philip and Juruka, meanwhile, were mentioned only with their bare names.³⁵

The composition of the Ottoman merchants described above partially changes in areas in the vicinity of Mitrowitz. According to the registers of Szerna Bara, a customs station located to the south of Sava and subordinate to the Mitrowitz customs administration,

³³ Some of non-Muslims are described as “Turkish subjects”, without any reference to their ethnic or religious affiliations.

³⁴ These merchants included Jovan, Peter, Gabriel, Stephan, Woin, Gligori, Jurcko, Bossa (Boso), Jura, Radel, Rista, Georgo, Jeremie, Jeften, Demnas, Jessa, Andria, Milotie (Milutin), Vuckosav, Damian, Jesdimir, Jacob, Jancko, Mittar (Miter/Mitra), Jestim, Rodoiza, Nicola and Simo. Most of them were recorded at least twice or more.

³⁵ Some of the scholars maintained that there were cases in which the “Macedonians” were recorded as Albanian rather than Greek. But this was a rarity, and the majority of the Macedonians were most likely Greeks both culturally and ethnically. As for the Serbians and Bulgarians, they could be differentiated from the Greeks by the authorities.: Anton Špiesz, “Die Orthodoxen Handelsleute aus dem Balkan in der Slowakei”, in *Balkan Studies*, 9/2, 1968, pp. 412-413.

the arrangement of the Ottoman subjects and the total value of their merchandise taxed from March to July in 1724 was as follows:

TABLE 4
Ottoman Merchants taxed in Szerna Bara from March to July in 1724

	Turks		Greeks		Rätz		Total	
	No.	Value (d.)	No.	Value (d.)	No.	Value (d.)	No.	Value (d.)
	37	6481000	46	2843150	13	219500	96	3710750
%	38,54	17,47	47,92	76,62	13,54	5,92	100	100

What is striking in this table is not only the inferior figures of the Muslims or the preponderance of the Greeks among non-Muslims. It is rather a sharp contrast between the rates of merchant numbers and value figures. These figures suggest that, unlike what we saw in Mitrowitz, the non-Muslims, or rather the Greeks, were in full control of the trade in the region. As for the emergence of *Rätz* merchants, seemingly the local orthodox Slav merchants, they resembled the Muslims in respect of the low rates in total value figures. Other non-Muslim merchants encountered incidentally in Mitrowitz customs registers, namely Jews, ceases to exist in Szerna Bara.

The ambiguity in the ethnic origins of the non-Muslims merchants venturing into Mitrowitz seems to have been partly eliminated in Szerna Bara. Here, except for Schaban from Bosnia, all the Greek merchants³⁶ are specified to have been either from Macedonia or Salenik, but there is still no reference to Greece. The case with the *Rätz* merchants is less clear. All of them were reported to have been from Sarajevo, but oddly enough, all of them³⁷ actually were the *Greek* merchants we encounter in Mitrowitz customs records.³⁸

³⁶ The names cited for these merchants are: Tomas, Nicola, Apostol, Simo, Gorgo/Gorgio/Georgio, Dimitar/Dimitor, Obrad, Quasen, Palko, Manoilla, Dasko, Dimo Sabil, Jurdia, Palko, Daniel, Dimo, Peter, Tymuka, Slave, Wögel, Achschidimer, Ahschi Jura, Marcko/Marco, Malin, Schaban, Voin, Stancko, Schifko, Ruza, Christoph, Spasoe, Andria and Jesso.

³⁷ They were Vuck, Jovan, Rista, Petar, Jeremia, Voin.

³⁸ Concerning the Greeks active in Transylvania in the early 17th century, some scholars

A similar pattern concerning the make-up of the Ottoman subjects and the composition of the non-Muslim merchants can be seen in Ratscha. According to the registers of the year 1727, here, as in Mitrowitz, the Greeks were inferior numerically, but the tax amount they paid was higher than that of the *Turks*. This superiority was also reflected in the total value of the commercial articles, implying that the Greeks were more engaged in the trade of high-value goods.

TABLE 5
Ottoman Merchants taxed in Ratscha in 1727

	Turks		Greeks		Total	
	Number	Tax (d.)	Number	Tax (d.)	Number	Tax (d.)
	115	60669,75	66	74934,75	181	219500
%	63,54	42,15	36,46	55,26	100	100

As to the *Greekness* of the non-Muslim merchants, the vagueness observed in Mitrowitz and Szernabara still persists in Ratscha. This vagueness can be cleared to some measure by looking at the homelands and the names of the merchants. The homelands of 47 merchants³⁹ were registered as *Macedonia* in Ratscha, while those from *Sarajevo* numbered 17⁴⁰. Two of them, namely Andria and Alexa, were from *Peterwardeiner Schanz*. This supplementary information, however, fails to eliminate the confusion regarding the ethnic origin

believed that many of them were actually of Bulgarian origin. But the confusion regarding the ethnic origin of the non-Muslims was also visible among the commercial articles, which were being sold either as Greek and Turkish good. See Sneschka Panova, "Einige Aspekte in der Entwicklung des Handels in den Bulgarischen Ländern im 17. und 18. Jhr. und die Bedeutung Österreichs", *Österreichischer Handel mit Südosteuropa und die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Forschungsgespräch 9-10 Dezember 1980), Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, 1982, pp. 86-87.

³⁹ They were Andria, Schivko, Mihaillo, Stancko, Jovan Popovich, Marcko, Nicola, Stanischa, Kosta, Palko, Martin, Jancko, Georgy Rossy, Georgy Dimittri/Dimittria, Thodor, Mittar, Petar, Pandazy, Risto, Lasso, Jescha, Jackschin, Manolly, Antoni, Stojan, Jany Haczy, Lambo, Dimla, Matho and Jany Popovich.

⁴⁰ They were named Guro, Georg, Jovan Popovich, Pulya Paulovitch, Haczy Manoely, Jefftan, Peter, Risto Hagirach, Simo, Andria, Ivan, Marco, Nicola.

of the merchants. The problem encountered elsewhere is repeated here, and the merchants bearing the same names turn out to be from different homelands. The potential Slavic origin of many of these names is another problem. Actually, a few simple questions suffice to conclude that, under current situation, the question regarding the merchants' ethnic roots is insurmountable: how can Jovan Popovich, apparently a merchant of Slavic origin, be a Greek from Macedonia, and how can Andria, recorded as a *Gryh*, can be from both Sarajevo and Macedonia at the same time?

The problem regarding the ethnic origin of the Greek merchants trading between the Austrian and Ottoman territories or in Hungary is largely solved by researchers specialized in the Balkans. They suggested that the term "Greek", attributed to the merchants from Macedonia and Epirus, actually signified a cultural identity that involved Vlachs, orthodox Albanians, and Greeks.⁴¹ Contrary to the view maintained by others,⁴² by the mid-eighteenth century, the merchants who dominated Hungary and controlled trade between German and Turkish lands were primarily Slavs, Armenians, and Jews, rather than Greeks. It was also possible that some of the Greeks preferred to use Slavic names. But in any way, from the middle of the 18th century, *Greek* became the principle commercial language among the Balkan merchants, and these merchants tended to adopt Greek names. Thus, any "non-Latin" Macedonian-Vlach, Macedonian-Slav, Greek, Vlach, Bulgarian, Serbian, and Orthodox Serbs active in Hungary, Croatia, Syrem, and Bačka could be Greeks. The term "Greek" even came to denote the peddlers and traders. Thus, even a Jew engaged in trade could be Greek.⁴³

3.2.2 Austrian Merchants

Austrian merchants, like Ottoman merchants, can be divided into

⁴¹ Traian Stoianovich, (1967), "The Conquering Balkan Merchant", in *Journal of Economic History*, 20, 1960, p. 290.

⁴² August v. Fournier, *Handel und Verkehr in Ungarn und Polen um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*. *Archive für Österreichische Geschichte*, 96. Band, Wien 1887, pp. 384-385.

⁴³ Stoianovich, *op. cit.*, pp. 290-291.

sub-groups, but they are small in number and are exclusively Jewish. Only 22 of the 722 merchants in Mitrowitz between 1719-1723 were Jewish, mostly from Belgrade, with no *Greek* or *Ratz* merchants among the rest. The Jewish merchants were almost always identified with the term of *Jud*, despite the fact that their numbers appear to be greater. Apart from Jews, two other merchants should be mentioned: *Hayduck* and *Achmet*, the latter a *Turk* from Bosnia who appears to be acting in the name of the Imperial Banat Company and trading around Temesvar.

Perhaps more interesting about the Austrian merchants was that they were comprised of female entrepreneurs. At least seven of them, all from Mitrowitz but sometimes with no mention of any names, were recorded as female, while *Johanna*, *Rosazina*, and *Urschal* were among the names mentioned. All of these entrepreneurs were dealing with the trade of tortoiseshell, usually exported from Mitrowitz to Esseg.

The ethnic roots of the merchants, setting aside the Jews, are not easy to determine. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that they consisted chiefly of indigenous merchants from neighboring regions, and a substantial number of Germans took part in the commercial activities in the region. At that point, the location of the homelands of the merchants, as indicated in map 2, may be helpful.

The pattern seen in Mitrowitz is much the same as what we see in Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha, with seldom mention of the Jews but no reference to the Greek or Ratz merchants among the Austrian subjects. The registers of Ratscha for the year 1727, however, are an exception. Here, 64 merchants out of a total of 221 were described as *Rüz*. The majority of them were from Ratscha's immediate vicinity, with *Brodaz* serving as a hometown for roughly half of the merchants. But a closer look at their names,⁴⁴ which were almost the

⁴⁴ Their names were as follows: Czyro, Vuk/Vuck, Jovan, Petar, Györga, Alexa, Wuckaschin, Stanimier, Subotha, Boschko, Schiffko, Thomo, Matho, Wuyzich, Milisav, Wuyin, Jovan, Jovan Widlescha, Stojan, Lasso, Goja, Millosch, Radoicza, Obrath, Mihat, Stanischa, Nicola, Schivan, Mihailo, Pavol, Illia, Marcko, Jancko, Mircko, Millutin, Christyvoy, Stephan, Borisav, Ivan, Milincko, Mischlen, Mischko,

MAP 2
The Provenance of the Austrian Merchants
Operating in Mitrowitz (1719-1723)



same of those born by the Ottoman Greeks and Ratz merchants in Mitrowitz and Szerna Bara, exposed their inter-regional and international character.

The practice of posing either as Turkish and Austrian subject is not a phenomenon of the 1720's, and it is not limited to Greek and Ratz merchants. Some of the Armenians, for example, already in the second half of the 17th century were taking Turkish names and pretending to be Turkish subjects in Belgrade, although they passed for Austrian subjects in Vienna.⁴⁵

Similar customs records for the Hungarian towns to the North of Mitrowitz expose further details on the activities of Ratz merchants. According to the customs records of Baja, for instance, Ratz merchants (Ratz denoting a Serbian from Raska) active there were in the majority in the last decade of the 17th and the early years of the 18th century. The evidence from Budin customs records is not much different and documents their activities in a wide area em-

⁴⁵ Carl v. Peez, "Alte Serbische Handelsbeziehungen zu Wien", in *Mitteilungen des Institutes für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXVI, 3. Heft, Wien 1915, p. 506.

bracing Hungarian, Transylvanian, Wallachian, and Serbian territories from the end of the 17th century to 1723. But here also, as in the case of the Greeks, the ethnic roots of the Ratz merchants could be open to question. Because the designation “Ratz” was seen to have been attached next to the forenames of Hungarian and German merchants as well, which made the Serbian origin of the Ratz merchants disputable and caused it to be regarded as a synonym for the merchants operating in these regions.⁴⁶

3.3 Taxes

The taxes paid by the Austrian and Ottoman subjects differed from each other both in kind and in rate. Ottoman subjects only paid the thirtieth tax, collected at the rate of 3% and levied on the value of the commercial good. Unlike the Ottoman subjects, the Austrian merchants were subject to both ad valorem and specific taxes. The customs registers specified the amount of the tax they paid, either for a set of goods or for separate articles.

The tax rate for the Austrian subjects differed depending on the nature of the commercial goods and the course of trade they adopted. Ad valorem taxes were customarily levied at the rate of 7,5%,⁴⁷ which was the sum of the thirtieth tax (3%), *mauth* toll (2,5%) and land charge (2%). However, in practice, this customary rate remained relatively low, averaging 4,3% over the entire research period (See Table 6). This should be associated with the transit trade in Mitrowitz and the collection of the thirtieth tax in other customs stations. In such a case, the customs taxes to be received from im-

⁴⁶ Gavrilovic, *op. cit.*, p. 546.

⁴⁷ Exceptionally, there could be deviations from customary rates. The tax rate for the wine and victuals transported by Jacob Knes from Mitrowitz to Belgrade in June 1719, for example, turned out to be 8,75% instead of 7,5%. For his goods worth of 6 fr. Jakob Knes paid 52.5 d. in total. Similarly, the total tax amount paid by Jovan Kanisack for the hazelnut which was worth of 40 fr. and imported into Mitrowitz over Sava, totaled 1,54 fr. Kanisack had paid the thirtieth tax in Gradisca and thus was liable to pay merely the *Mauth* of 2,5% in Mitrowitz. The amount he paid, however, corresponded to 3,85% of the value of the good.

porting goods into Mitrowitz or transiting goods bound for other destinations were collected at the rate of 2,5% instead of 7,5%.

The ad valorem tax rates enforced in Mitrowitz could vary elsewhere. The customary rates implemented in Pakratz, Brodt, and Ratscha and the averages for the calculated rates are given in table 6.

TABLE 6
The Customary Tax Rates and the Averages for Calculated Ad Valorem Taxes in Mitrowitz, Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha (1714, 1719-27)

Year	Mitrowitz		Pakratz		Brodt		Ratscha	
	Cust- omary Rate	Calcu- lated Rate	Cust- omary Rate	Calcu- lated Rate	Cust- omary Rate	Calcu- lated Rate	Cust- omary Rate	Calcu- lated Rate
1714			9,5	9,45				
1719	7,5	3,38*	7	6,63	9,5	9,49		
1720	7,5	4,16	7	6,56	9,5	7		
1721	7,5	5,12			9,5	3,96		
1722	7,5	4,52						
1723							9,5	2,89
1724							9,5	2,10
1726			7	7,14				2
1727							7,5	4,61
Average		4,30		7,45		6,82		2,9

* Covers the last four months of the year; figures for fair and retail trade are not included.

Among the ad valorem taxes paid by the Austrian merchants, the taxes collected on fair trade (in Futack, Jarrack etc.) occupied a particular place. This tax was levied at the rate of 2% for the years 1719-1721 and at 2,5% in 1723. The total tax amount received from fair trade for the research period corresponded to 9,4% of the total ad valorem taxes. On the other hand, the commercial articles traded at fairs and their prices were not detailed.

Retail trade⁴⁸ is another form of commerce that is comparable to

⁴⁸ The terms used in source material hereof were *kleine Verhandlungen*, *Kleinigkeiten* and *geringe Wahren*.

fair trade and the trade of groceries. The total tax amount for retail trade and grocery trade remained minor, accounting for 4,08 and 3,21% of the total ad valorem tax amount, respectively.

In Mitrowitz, specific duties played a significant role in total tax figures. The share of the goods subject to specific tariffs amounted to 50,73% and slightly exceeded the total ad valorem tax amount. The tax totals for the goods subject to specific tariffs and the figures for the goods taxed in proportion to their estimated or declared value have been presented in table 7.

TABLE 7
Tax Figures for the Austrian Merchants (Mitrowitz, 1719-1723), (fr.)

Years	Ad Valorem Duties	% in Total Tax	Specific Duties	% in Total Tax	Total Tax
1719*	83,49	48,41	88,98	51,59	172,47
1720	381,56	46,07	446,71	53,93	828,27
1721	431,52	43,22	566,90	56,78	998,42
1723	379,19	64,27	210,81	35,73	590
Total	1.275,76	49,27	1.313,40	50,73	2.589,16

* Covers the last four months of the year.

The balanced distribution between the specific and ad valorem taxes seems to have prevailed in other customs stations as well, as can be seen from the figures on Pakratz and Brodt. Ratscha has yet to reveal a new pattern. Here, in contrast to the high figures attained between 1723 and 1725, specific taxes ceased to exist in 1727.

TABLE 8
Distribution of the Specific and Ad valorem Taxes in Mitrowitz, Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha (1720-26)

Mitrowitz 1720-23			Pakratz 1714,1719-20,1726			Brodt 1719-21			Ratscha, 1723-25		
Specific Taxes	Ad val. taxes	Total (%)	Specific Taxes	Ad val. taxes	Total (%)	Specific Taxes	Ad val. taxes	Total (%)	Specific Taxes	Ad val. taxes	Total (%)
50,73	49,27	100	46,21	53,79	100	55,56	44,44	100	82,43	17,57	100

The specific duties collected from the Austrian merchants in Mitrowitz were confined to a limited class of goods and consisted mainly of cattle and farm animals. But the list of the goods also included wax, hide, and fish. The information regarding their prices was usually missing. However, certain incidents lead us to believe that they could be taxed above 7,5 or below 2,5% of their value.⁴⁹

The commercial goods subject to specific and ad valorem taxes were quite different from each other. A ranking of the goods according to these different tax categories reveals the contrasting configuration between them (see Table 9).

3.4 Goods

3.4.1 Goods traded by Austrian Merchants

The goods traded in Mitrowitz in the early 1720s bear parallels with the merchandise traded in Hungary and the Slavic lands to the north of the Sava River during the late 17th and the first half of the 18th century. The merchandise traded in these lands consisted mainly of cattle, beverages, cereals, leather, various industrial and artisanal products, foodstuffs, tobacco, honey, wax, and fish.⁵⁰ In Mitrowitz, in addition to these articles, pigs and tortoiseshell came into prominence.

The commercial goods traded by the Austrian and Ottoman merchants in Mitrowitz are different from each other in nature and deserve to be handled separately. To start with the merchandise traded by the Austrian merchants, its composition is as follows in Table 10.

⁴⁹ The tax rate for *Simon undt Ivan von Vallova*, who had paid the thirtieth tax in *Varosh bey Kupinova* in October 1720 for example, corresponded to 1,66 percent of the value of the good. This rate was also valid for Matthias Püschinger, who was transporting leather from Belgrade to Pettau in January 1721. In the case of Vida and his comrades who were driving pigs from Sabaz and had paid the thirtieth tax there in March 1721, on the other hand, the rate fell to 0.7%. After the inclusion of the thirtieth tax paid in Sabaz, however, the total tax rate turned out to be 9.7%.

⁵⁰ Gavrilovic, *op. cit.*, p. 545.

TABLE 9
Goods Liable to Ad Valorem and Specific Taxes
in Mitrowitz (1719-1723), (Fr.)

Ad Valorem Taxes			Specific Taxes		
Goods	Tax	%	Goods	Tax	%
Beverages (Wine & Spirits)	314,70	24,67	Oxen	607,06	46,22
Foodstuffs	243,21	19,07	Pigs	479,21	36,49
<i>fruits</i>	90,89	7,12	Wax	74	5,63
<i>sea food</i>	66,80	5,23	Sheep & goat	68,92	5,25
<i>victuals</i>	40,21	3,15	Sturgeon & roe	40,20	3,06
<i>nuts</i>	29,78	2,33	Cow, calf & bull	22,80	1,74
<i>fats, oil and flesh</i>	15,53	1,21	Fish (salted & smoked)	12,48	0,95
Livestock & Farm animals	223,28	17,50	Hide (oxen, cow & bull)	7,45	0,57
(Articles of) Fair Trade	119,86	9,40	Oyster	0,9	0,07
Tortoiseshell	83,30	6,53	Silk	0,4	0,03
(Articles of) Retail Trade	52,05	4,08			
Leather, Hide & Fell	48,79	3,82			
Groceries	40,94	3,21			
Wax	36,13	2,83			
Tobacco (Rough & Ordinary)	32,37	2,54			
Woodenware	16,48	1,29			
Salt peter	11,60	0,91			
Textiles & Drapery	9,52	0,75			
Pistols & Muskets	9,32	0,73			
Poultry (Geese, Hens, Egg)	8,90	0,70			
Pots & pans (Earthen-wooden)	6,45	0,51			
Hardware	4,35	0,34			
Various	10,02	0,79			
Other	4,40	0,35			
Total	1.275,75	100,00	Total	1.313,42	100,00

Before delving into an analysis of Table 10, it is best to examine the configuration prevalent in other customs regions in the vicinity at that time and make some comparisons. Above all, it can be argued that the good composition dominated by livestock, farm animals, beverages, and foodstuffs was not a Mitrowitz-specific feature at that time. Despite changes in varying degrees, the ranking of primary goods did not change substantially in Pakratz, Brodt, and Ratscha, as can be seen in Table 11.

TABLE 10
Tax Figures and Good Composition for Austrian Merchants (1719-1723), (d.)

Articles	Tax	%	Articles	Tax	%
Livestock & Farm Animals	140.127	54,12	Leather, Hide & Fell	5.623,80	2,17
<i>ox</i>	66.598	25,72	(Articles of) Retail Trade	5.205	2,01
<i>pig</i>	49.038,50	18,94	Groceries**	4.094,50	1,58
<i>cow</i>	12.165,50	4,70	<i>Turkish merchandise</i>	1.447,50	0,56
<i>sheep & goat</i>	7.042	2,72	<i>German merchandise</i>	787	0,30
<i>young bull</i>	2.487,50	0,96	<i>Venetian merchandise</i>	500	0,19
<i>calf</i>	2.125,50	0,82	<i>other (of all sorts)</i>	1.360	0,53
<i>horse</i>	550	0,21	Tobacco (Rough & ordinary)	3.237,75	1,25
<i>mare</i>	120	0,05	Woodenware	1.648,08	0,64
Beverages (Wine & Spirits)	31.470,25	12,15	<i>barrel stave</i>	480	0,19
Foodstuffs	29.728	11,48	<i>shovel</i>	412,08	0,16
<i>sea food</i>	9.379	3,62	<i>woodenware (of all kinds)</i>	410	0,16
<i>fish (fresh, salted, smoked)</i>	4.403	1,70	<i>tobacco pipes & rods</i>	193	0,07
<i>sturgeon & roe</i>	4.742,50	1,83	<i>saddle tree</i>	112,50	0,04
<i>oysters</i>	233,50	0,09	<i>trough</i>	22,50	0,01
<i>fruits</i>	9.137	3,53	<i>distaff</i>	18	0,01
<i>apple</i>	5.468,75	2,11	Salt peter	1.160	0,45
<i>plum</i>	1.645,75	0,64	Textiles & Drapery	952,20	0,37
<i>fig</i>	816	0,32	<i>braid</i>	203,70	0,08
<i>pear</i>	824	0,32	<i>flax</i>	192,50	0,07
<i>pomegranate</i>	237,50	0,09	<i>Moravian cloth</i>	125	0,05
<i>fruits</i>	132,50	0,05	<i>wool (sheep & land)</i>	274	0,11
<i>lemon</i>	12,50	0,00	<i>goat hair</i>	47,50	0,02
<i>victuals</i>	6.680,25	2,58	<i>hair</i>	45	0,02
<i>onion</i>	950,75	0,37	<i>woolen blankets</i>	37	0,01
<i>bean</i>	930	0,36	<i>bedding</i>	27,50	0,01
<i>flour</i>	1.294,50	0,50	Pistols & Muskets	932,83	0,36
<i>victuals*</i>	1.111,25	0,43	Poultry (Geese, Hens, Egg)	890,75	0,34
<i>wheat</i>	607,50	0,23	Pots & Pans (Earthen, Wooden)	645,66	0,25
<i>garlic</i>	260	0,10	Hardware	435,83	0,17
<i>cereals</i>	570	0,22	<i>iron (plough & hoof)</i>	92,50	0,04
<i>cheese (smearcase etc.)</i>	280,50	0,11	<i>nails</i>	66,50	0,03
<i>cabbage</i>	149,75	0,06	<i>powder</i>	67	0,03
<i>biscuits (biscotin)</i>	53,50	0,02	<i>sabre</i>	63,33	0,02
<i>semolina</i>	300	0,12	<i>metal (tin) plates</i>	41,5	0,02
<i>honey</i>	82,50	0,03	<i>knife</i>	42	0,02
<i>barley</i>	90	0,03	<i>pickax</i>	35	0,01
<i>nuts</i>	2.978	1,15	<i>carabiner</i>	10	0,00
<i>chestnut</i>	1.072	0,41	<i>clamp</i>	18	0,01
<i>nut</i>	1.494,25	0,58	Various	955,09	0,37
<i>hazelnut</i>	411,75	0,16	<i>hops</i>	390	0,15
<i>fats, oil & flesh</i>	1.553,50	0,60	<i>millstone</i>	235	0,09
<i>bacon (fat & flitch)</i>	773,75	0,30	<i>halter</i>	108,75	0,04
<i>tallow</i>	282,25	0,11	<i>heckle</i>	63,34	0,02
<i>lard</i>	128	0,05	<i>spike</i>	42	0,02
<i>olive oil</i>	267,5	0,10	<i>glasses</i>	37,50	0,01
<i>flesh</i>	75	0,03	<i>whetstone</i>	35	0,01
<i>suet</i>	27	0,01	<i>sandals</i>	33	0,01
(Articles of) Retail Trade	11.986	4,63	Other	480,26	0,19
Wax	11.013,50	4,25	TOTAL	258.916,4	100
Tortoiseshell	8.330,20	3,22		5	

* Stands for food supply or provisions. Almost always recorded simply as "kuchel victualen", but occasionally elaborated so as to mention the name of grains, onion, garlic, hens, geese and cattle.

** Stands for the "cramerey wahren", most of the time "of all sorts".

TABLE 11
Goods traded by Austrian Merchants in Mitrowitz, Pakratz, Brodt and Ratscha (1719-25), (d.)

Mitrowitz 1719-23			Pakratz 1719-20			Brodt 1719-21			Ratscha 1723-25		
Articles	Taxes	(%)	Articles	Taxes	(%)	Articles	Taxes	(%)	Articles	Taxes	(%)
Ox & Cow	78.763,50	30,42	Pig	95.879,5	62,41	Wax	40.456	53,15	Pig	21.561,5	81,63
Pig	49.038,50	18,94	Cattle	42.329,5	27,55	Pig	23.268	30,57	Woodenware	1.189	4,5
Wine & Spirits	31.470,25	12,15	Sheep	4.400,5	2,86	Wein	3.376	4,44	Nuts & Fruits	1.089	4,12
Foodstuffs	29.728	11,48	Horse	3.555	2,31	Tobacco	1.462,5	1,92	Cereals	915,5	3,47
Wax	11.013,50	4,25	Hide	1.854	1,21	Groceries	1.140	1,50	Spirits	626	2,37
Tortoiseshell	8.330,20	3,22	Wheat	1.750	1,14	Fruits	914	1,14	Tortoiseshell	291	1,1
Other	50.572,50	19,53		3.855,5	2,52		5.453,5	7,28		742	2,81
Total	258.916,45	100		153.624	100		76.110	100		26.414	100

What is common in these figures is the high percentage of cattle and farm animals, evidently responsible for more than half of the total trade. It should be considered that the customs stations in the table, all located within Slavonia and Syrem, were supposed to be part of former Hungarian dominions and bore similar characteristics with the rest of the Hungarian lands and the territories surrounding Hungary. Therefore, one has to inquire into the general outlook of trade in Hungarian territories and in the borderlands between Austria and the Ottoman Empire.

The trade of livestock was the most important branch of Hungarian foreign trade until the middle of the 18th century.⁵¹ At that time, there were even attempts to send them to England through Adriatic ports.⁵² The same was true for cereals, wine, wax, honey, and woodenware, all of which were destined for export via Trieste.⁵³

In the early 1730's, cattle and sheep accounted for more than two-thirds of Banat's active balance of trade.⁵⁴ This situation was not different in the preceding century. The import of cattle from Hungary and other Turkish provinces was one of the tasks of the First Oriental

⁵¹ Laszlo Makkai, "Der Ungarische Viehhandel 1550-1650", in *Der Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas 1450-1650* (Ingomar Bog, ed.), Böhlau Verlag, Köln-Wien 1971, p. 483.

⁵² Fournier, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

Company in the second half of the 17th century. The cattle procured from Ottoman provinces served to meet the demand of meat in Vienna and to supply leather to shoemakers, saddlers, and belt makers in Vienna and other Upper German provinces (Nurnberg etc.).⁵⁵

This pattern can be further traced back to the 16th century. It was argued that by the 15th century, central and southeastern European territories had entered the orbit of Western Europe's more industrialized economies. In the 16th century, the westernmost Ottoman provinces increasingly tended to import metal works and textiles from southern German provinces in exchange for cattle, wine, leather, and copper due to the influence of Europe's new emerging economic structure.⁵⁶

Due to the wars fought between the Habsburgs and Ottomans in the 16th and 17th centuries, vineyards, and winemaking to the west of the Danube fell into decline. But cattle husbandry and trade, mainly owing to the high demand surviving from preceding centuries in the West, flourished occasionally.⁵⁷ In the second half of the 16th century, Hungarian cattle provided the majority of the meat for the southern German territories between Rhein and Main, Frankfurt, Strasburg, Tyrol, and Venice.⁵⁸ The number of cattle supplied from Hungary, Transylvania, Moldavia, and Walachia and sent into the centers mentioned above varied between 100,000 and 190,000 during the 16th century.⁵⁹ The number of Hungarian cattle sent into the West between 1570 and 1590 was estimated to be between 150,000 and 200,000.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ H. Hassinger, *Die Erste Wiener Orientalische Handelskompagnie 1667-1687*", *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 35, Stuttgart, 1942, pp. 31-34.

⁵⁶ Ferenc Szakály, "Kontinuitätsfrage der Wirtschaftsstruktur in den ungarischen Marktflecken unter der Türkenherrschaft", in *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege*, Othmar Pickl (Hrsg.), *Grazer Forschungen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, Band 1, Graz, 1971, pp. 236-237, 240-241; Othmar Pickl, "Die Verkehrswege nach dem Südosten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis ins 18. Jahrhundert", in *Südostdeutsches Archiv*, 15-16, 1972-1973, p. 108.

⁵⁷ Szakály, *op. cit.*, pp. 241, 251-52, 271-72.

⁵⁸ Pickl, "Verkehrswege", p. 108; "West-Ost Handel", p. 35.

⁵⁹ Pickl, "West-Ost Handel", p. 35.

⁶⁰ Herald Prickler, "Das Volumen des westlichen ungarischen Aussenhandels vom 16. Jahrhundert bis 1700", in *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege*, Othmar

The growth of the cattle trade was also linked to the increase in the imports from Walachia and Moldavia, as opposed to the ruination of agricultural lands and the growth of animal husbandry in early Hungarian dominions.⁶¹ Some even argued that the cattle exports from Hungarian territories to the West after 1570s should have been considered as transit trade rather than export trade.⁶² The evolution of pig trade in Slavonia, on the other hand, is linked to indigenous forests, which covered 70% of the total area of Slavonia at the start of the 18th century.⁶³ According to this theory, the spatial distribution of forests in Slavonia in the 16th and 17th centuries overlapped with the spatial distribution of pig farming settlements, and thus the surroundings of the settlements with the most pigs were heavily forested.⁶⁴

3.4.1.1 IMPORTS INTO MITROWITZ

The import and export articles in Mitrowitz must be separated for a better examination of the composition of the goods. However, this is not an easy task. The information on the routes taken by Austrian merchants is limited. The data on the merchants' origins and destinations is erratic. Likewise, the original terminology used in the source material does not always make a clear distinction between the goods that were brought into, transited through, or sent out from

Pickl (Hrsg.), *Grazer Forschungen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, Band 1, Graz, 1971, p. 140.

⁶¹ E. Fügedi, "An der Wende eines Wirtschaftssystems Einige Fragen des Ungarischen Aussenhandels im 15. Und 16. Jhr.", in *Österreichischer Handel mit Südosteuropa und die Wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, 1982, p. 76; Prickler, "ungarischen Aussenhandels", pp. 140-41.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Stepan Vidaković, *Forestry and wood industry in Slavonia from the 19th Century onwards* [Master of Arts in History and Philosophy]: <http://www.efos.unios.hr/repec/osi/eecytt/PDF/EconomyofeasternCroatianyesterdaytodaytomorrow04/eecytt0421.pdf>.

⁶⁴ Anđelko Vlašić, *The Correlation Between the Spatial Distribution of Forests and Pig Farming in Ottoman Slavonia*. U: *CIEPO* 22: 41-53. Uluslararası Osmanlı Öncesi ve Osmanlı Çalışmaları Komitesi Bildiriler Kitabı II. Ur. Kenan İnan, Miraç Tosun i Deniz Çolak. Trabzon: Trabzon Büyükşehir Belediyesi, 2018, pp. 41-53.

Mitrowitz for other destinations. Sometimes neither the type of commercial activity nor the departures and destinations for the incoming and outgoing merchants were mentioned. The latter was particularly true for oxen and pigs supplied from around or passing through the town.

Nonetheless, the information on the location of the customs houses situated on the route to Mitrowitz and the merchants taxed in these stations partially compensates for the lack of information on the incoming merchants and the imported goods.

The locations of the customs houses situated on the route to Mitrowitz and the regions sending goods there are shown in Map 3. The number of the merchants bringing goods into Mitrowitz is 344. Some of the goods carried by these merchants were subject to transit trade and thus must have been forwarded to further destinations.

MAP 3
Regions Sending Goods to Mitrowitz (1719-1723)



Mitrowitz was almost always a final destination for cattle, farm animals, tortoiseshell, hides, and skins, as well as such articles as victuals, garlic, figs, olive oil, millstone, roan, sheep wool, goat hair, braids, sabres, heckles, saltpeter, metal plates, glass, knives, and spikes.

The merchandise that could be either imported into or transferred from Mitrowitz to further destinations was more assorted. They included apple, plum, pear, pomegranate, lemons, nuts (hazelnut, chestnut, etc.) cabbage, beans, wine and spirits, tobacco and tobacco pipes, fish and roe, oysters, groceries, flax, silk, cloth, bedding, bacon, lard, tallow, cheese, onions, flour, biscuits, earthenware, pans, wax, pistols and muskets, knapsacks, sandals, nails, powder, and other products of retail trade.

The figures at hand suggested that the best part of the merchandise imported into Mitrowitz was transferred to other regions. About one third of the incoming merchants at least moved on to other destinations. Belgrade, which was to receive 74 merchants, ranked first among these destinations. It was followed by Esseg, Brodt, Gradischka, Vulckovar, and Pettau, which were home to 27 merchants. The rest included Szvornik, Svinar, Ihrick, Ofen, Seralien, Sabaz, and Szernabara. With regard to the species of goods destined to arrive at the above centers, Belgrade was to receive mainly fruits consisting of apple, pear, plum, and nuts; wine; and various victuals and groceries. The remainder largely received such articles as fish, hide, sturgeon, and roe.

Map 3 demonstrates that, the regions sending goods or situated on the route to Mitrowitz are limited to a handful of places in the neighborhood of Mitrowitz, and these places are located, except for Matzva, mostly along the river routes of the Danube, the Drava and the Sava. The Sava River seems to be used both in the direction of water flow and in the opposite direction. But on several occasions, as in the case of Matzva, waterways were linked to overland routes. 131 of the merchants, corresponding to 38,08% of the total, were reported to have used waterways. 66 of these merchants apparently used the Sava River. Merchants benefiting from river transportation and making use of ships or *corabs*,⁶⁵ sometimes employed more than

⁶⁵ Small and long wooden canes widely used in Slavonia. They had a loading capacity of 25 cwt or about 1,250 kg. (N.E. Kleemann, *Briefe über die Schifffahrt und Handlung in Ungarn, Slavonien und Kroatien. Geschrieben auf einer Reise in diesen Ländern 1773*. Prag

one vessel in their enterprises. The cases referring to the employment of *corabs*, counting 35 in all, outweighed the cases involving the use of *ships*, which remained at nine. The goods carried in *corabs* were almost always limited to fruits such as apples, nuts, plums, and pear, along with wine and some victuals, though the ships also carried fish, sturgeon, roe, lamb skin, and earthenware.

Among the regions sending goods to Mitrowitz, Matzva, Kobaz, and Belgrade came into prominence. Matzva emerged as the leading source of cattle and farm animals in this trade, with Mitrowitz serving as the final destination for 89 merchants out of a total of 90. Except for the tortoiseshell traded by two merchants, the goods imported by other merchants from Matzva to Mitrowitz consisted entirely of oxen, cows, calves, young bulls, mares, sheep, goats, and pigs. Among the oxen, there were both the *Matzvarer* and oxen of *Sclavonian* origin. The better part of the cattle and other farm animals were transported over the Sava River.

Kobaz differed from Matzva in terms of the nature of the commercial articles. These articles consisted chiefly of apple, nuts (chestnut, hazelnut and so forth), plums, pears, wine, and spirits, which were followed by tobacco, onions, cabbage, beans, earthenware, fat, and flich. Similar to the case of Matzva, the waterways were used intensively in the transportation of the goods from Kobaz, with the *corabs* being used only by 27 merchants. But Mitrowitz did also seem to function as a transit region in this trade, for the bulk of the merchandise was destined to arrive in Belgrade, which was the case for 41 merchants out of a total of 61. This number could be actually higher as the information for the rest of the merchants was missing.

With respect to the case of Belgrade, there were both differences and similarities with Matzva and Kobaz. For certain merchants advancing from Belgrade, Mitrowitz was not a destination. Nearly half of the merchants leaving from Belgrade were bound to arrive in regions beyond Mitrowitz. The destinations for these merchants were

1783, p. 31; Hans Halm, *Österreich und NeuRussland, Donauschiffahrt und -Handel Nach dem Südosten 1718-1780*, Erster Band, Breslau, 1943, p. 119.)

Esseg, Valckovar, Brodt, Pettau, Gradischka, Ihrick, and Svinar. The merchandise sent from Belgrade to Mitrowitz involved most of the commercial articles sent from Matzva and Kobaz, but the majority of them consisted of fish, sturgeon, roe, groceries, tortoiseshell, hide, and skin. The rest included flax, wax, tallow, goat hair, wool, tobacco pipes, saltpeter, lemon, figs, onions, and glassware. In this trade, river routes were used in the opposite direction on occasion, and ships were used sporadically, for example, to send goods to Gradischka.

Other commercial centers of modest importance sending goods to Mitrowitz comprised Osijek, Brodt, Jessenovaz, Gradisca, and Borez. Among the commercial articles sent from Osijek, groceries and flour came into prominence, although the range of the goods was diverse enough to include wine, wheat, tobacco, silk, lard, nuts, knapsacks, sandals, nails, pans, and powder. Some of these articles were obtained from the fairs in the region. At least two-thirds of the merchants trading in these articles used Mitrowitz as a transit region, with 10 of them heading to Belgrade. The articles brought from Brodt, meanwhile, consisted mainly of wine, although apples, pears, plums, hazelnuts, chestnuts, cabbage, garlic, and bacon fat were equally present among the articles of import. Almost all of these articles were to transit through Mitrowitz, Belgrade likewise being their final destination. The merchants' cargo from Jesenovaz was largely made up of wine as well. The rest of their cargo included chestnuts, earthen pots and dishes, braid, and leather. Most of the merchants, apparently, were using the waterways, sometimes employing more than one ship. The destinations generally were not specified, although Mitrowitz seemed to have been a transit region for many of them. Gradisca resembled Brodt in terms of the variety of goods and the transit nature of the trade, with the water routes leading to Belgrade still in use. Gradisca's cargo primarily consisted of various fruits, such as chestnuts, hazelnuts, apples, and pears, followed by wine, beans, onions, tobacco pipes, kidney fat, and flitches of bacon. Except for wax traded by one merchant, the cargo of the merchants coming from Borez consisted entirely of fish, sturgeon, and roe, but some of this merchandise was destined for Brodt and Gradisca.

3.4.1.2 EXPORTS FROM MITROWITZ

The export articles of Mitrowitz are relatively easier to identify. But it should be remembered that these articles also included transit goods. The Austrian merchants leaving from Mitrowitz and the districts they headed to are shown on Map 4. Their number is 259, but 108 of them have used Mitrowitz as a transit region. It should be also noted that there were still other merchants departing from Mitrowitz, but nothing is known about where they headed. Altogether, the number of merchants departing from Mitrowitz comes close to 300.

The high number of the merchants using Mitrowitz as a transit region and comparatively low numbers of merchants leaving the town suggest that it had little to offer for sale and was chiefly a home to incoming goods.

Beverages (spirits and wine), victuals, poultry, and the products of poultry like hens and eggs constituted the main branch of goods exported from Mitrowitz. Out of a total of 297, the cargo of 80 merchants departing from Mitrowitz consisted exclusively of beverages, mostly wine, in addition to another 7 merchants carrying wine among other commercial articles. Victuals were being transported separately by 30 merchants, in addition to 15 merchants carrying them among other cargo. Next came fruits (apple, plums, pear, and pomegranate) and nuts (chestnut, hazelnut, and walnut), traded by 18 merchants either separately or jointly.

Cattle and farm animals were the second type of item exported from Mitrowitz. There were 41 merchants driving cattle herds away from Mitrowitz. Oxen were common among cattle breeds, as evidenced by 20 merchants driving only "Slavonian oxen" of varying sizes. The export of farm animals from Mitrowitz lagged far behind that of cattle, according to the activities of a smaller number of 15 merchants. Meanwhile, pigs driven by 11 merchants took the lead among farm animals, followed by sheep and goats driven by 4 merchants.

Tortoiseshell ranked third in the list of export articles. The number of the merchants transporting tortoiseshell exclusively was 48.

Other commercial articles of considerable importance sent out from Mitrowitz involved tobacco, leather (hide and skins), and wax. The number of the merchants taking tobacco with them, either separately or together with other commercial articles, was 32. This number was 9 and 8, respectively, for the merchants trading in leather and wax. The rest of the goods imported from the town was diverse enough to include sheep's wool, hair, wooden shovel, distaff, clamp, plough iron, halter, tallow, saddle tree, barrel stave, wooden bowls and trough, leather shoes, hops, and the like, but the number of the merchants trading in each of these articles remained quite small.

MAP 4
Destinations for the Austrian Merchants and Goods from Mitrowitz (1719-1723)



The ascendancy of Belgrade over the regions receiving goods either from or through Mitrowitz is particularly remarkable. Although far from being a match to it, the closest contenders to Belgrade are Matzva and Osijek. Around half of the merchants advancing from Mitrowitz, 127 in total, headed towards Belgrade. But less than half of them, numbering 53, seem to have departed from Mitrowitz. They used both the water and overland routes in their trade. Next to Bel-

grade in importance was Matzva. Unlike the merchants destined to arrive at Belgrade, all of the merchants heading towards Matzva departed from Mitrowitz. It also appears that the merchants made frequent use of the Sava River in their commercial trips. The case of Osijek was comparable to Matzva in many ways, although some of them were coming from further regions beyond Mitrowitz. Other destinations worthy of mention involve Szernabara, Brod, Futackh, Gradisca, Sabaz, Vuckovar, and Svoznick.

The map showing the destinations for merchants and goods from Mitrowitz partially overlaps with the previous map showing the regions sending goods to Mitrowitz. In both maps, the main commercial partners of Mitrowitz are Belgrade and Matzva. Both maps demonstrate that the commercial activities go little beyond Belgrade to the east, while they have a broader extent to the west. The latter map, however, seems to have a narrower extent, concentrating on fewer commercial centers. Besides, it has little contact to the south beyond the Sava River. The merchants advancing from Mitrowitz and the merchandise sent from Mitrowitz out, on the other hand, apparently penetrated parts of Bosnian, Hungarian, and even German territories.

3.4.2 Goods traded by Ottoman merchants

The commercial articles traded by Ottoman merchants can be satisfactorily illustrated for the period June 1722 and December 1723. These items differ in character from the merchandise sold by Austrian subjects. The region's indigenous products, such as livestock, farm animals, foodstuffs, and beverages, no longer dominate the table, though some others, such as wax, honey, and copper play an important role. Leather and textiles, which had previously lagged far behind among the articles traded by Austrian merchants, are now on the rise. Leather, textiles, and hardware are the most common manufactured and semi-finished goods.

The composition presented in Table 12 is not peculiar to Mitrowitz. It is a general pattern that can be applied to other towns

TABLE 12
Merchandise Traded by Ottoman Merchants
in Mitrowitz between 1722-1723 (Fr.)

Good	Value (Fr.)	%	Good	Value (Fr.)	%
Wax	18744,5	26,23	Tobacco & Tobacco pipes	561	0,79
Leather & Leather Products	18338,1	25,66	Groceries	537	0,75
Textiles, Drapery & Haberdashery	11523,17	16,13	Kitchenware	502,7	0,7
Honey	6092	8,53	Coffee	402,84	0,56
Copper & Copperware	6072,93	8,5	Foodstuffs	351	0,49
Hardware	3632,9	5,08	Miscellaneous	758,33	1,06
Horse equipment	1720,69	2,41	Unspecified	172	0,24
Cattle & farm animals	1099	1,54	Other	153,84	0,22
Beverages	795	1,11	Total	71457	100

in the area at that time. In this connection, the figures of Pakratz, Szernabara, and Ratscha are of great importance and enable us to make a comparison with the pattern in Mitrowitz.

As shown in Table 13, the pattern in Mitrowitz closely resembles the set up in other locations. The most striking difference is in Ratscha, where textiles and leather were excluded while fruits and nuts, which were traditionally traded by Austrian subjects, gained

Table 13
Goods traded by Ottoman Merchants in Mitrowitz,
Pakratz, Szernabara* and Ratscha (1719-26), (Fr.)

Mitrowitz 1722-23			Pakratz 1719-20,1726			Szernabara, 1724			Ratscha, 1723-24		
Articles	Value	(%)	Articles	Value	(%)	Articles	Value	(%)	Articles	Value	(%)
Wax	18744,5	26,23	Textiles & Drapery	1734,44	51,77	Textiles	21803,6	58,76	Raw iron	1307	33,21
Leather & Leather work	18338,1	25,66	Honey	830,5	24,79	Leather	10092,5	27,20	Fruits & nuts	566	14,38
Textiles & Drapery	11523,17	16,13	Miscellaneous	400	11,94	Foodstuff	1606,5	4,33	Copper	466	11,84
Honey	6092	8,53	Horse	110	3,28	Shoes, straps & bags	1402,1	3,78	Hardware	432,73	11,00
Copper & Copperware	6072,93	8,5	Copper	88	2,63	Hardware	1090,1	2,94	Wax & honey	277,6	7,05
Hardware	3632,9	5,08	Wax	50,25	1,50	Copper & Copperware	374,9	1,01	Strapping & harnesses	164	4,17
Horse equipment	1720,69	2,41	Hide	32,5	0,97	Other	737,8	1,99	Groceries	116	2,95
Other	5332,71	7,46	Other	104,56	3,12				Other	606,17	15,4
Total	71457	100		3350,25	100		37107,5	100		3935,5	100

* Covers the five months from March to July.

prominence. However, this order quickly changes, and by 1727, textiles have risen to first place in Ratscha, followed by metals and hardware.

The commercial articles traded by Ottoman subjects in Mitrowitz are difficult to distinguish between Turks (Muslims) and non-Muslims, although the latter appear to have engaged more in high-value goods. But this difference is more conspicuous in the case of Szernabara, where the value of the goods traded by Greeks amounted to 76,62% of the total value of the goods, whereas that of the Turks remained at 17%. Likewise, the Greeks had superiority over the Turks (Muslims) in Ratscha in 1727, both in terms of value and tax amount, although they were in the minority in terms of numbers.

The composition in Table 13 can be differentiated between import and export goods as well. The total value of the goods imported into Mitrowitz between June 1722 and December 1723, amounting to 39.100 fr., was higher than the total value of the goods sent out from Mitrowitz during the same period, which remained at 32.357 fr. A similar case was applicable to merchant numbers as well, which proved to be 320 for the incoming merchants against 310 for those who left the town. These figures imply that the imports into Mitrowitz by the Ottoman merchants was higher than the imports from the town during this interval, but when the span of time is extended to cover the whole research period, the above implication changes.

The total value of the goods imported by the Ottoman merchants from Mitrowitz between 1719 and 1723 is 72.055 fr. 9 d. This amount corresponds to 51,8% of the total value of the goods traded by Ottoman merchants in Mitrowitz, which means that the value of the merchandise exported to and imported from Mitrowitz was nearly equal. Actually, this equality can also be observed in merchant numbers. The number of merchants importing goods from Mitrowitz was 643. This number, like the value figures, represented 51,8% of the total merchant number trading in Mitrowitz.

3.4.2.1 IMPORT ARTICLES

The composition of commercial items imported by the Ottoman merchants into Mitrowitz between June of 1722 and the December of 1723 is shown in Table 14.

What is noticeable in Table 14 is the absolute predominance of leather and textiles. This predominance is also reflected in the terminology used for some of the goods.

TABLE 14
Goods Imported by Ottoman Merchants into Mitrowitz (1722-1723), (Fr.)

Articles	Value	%	Articles	Value	%
Leather & leather Products	17.749,10	45,39	Hardware	3.632,90	9,29
<i>leather*</i>	8.117,50	20,76	<i>plough iron</i>	1.104,50	2,82
<i>hide & fell</i>	4.527	11,58	<i>horseshoe & nails</i>	598,50	1,53
<i>shoe & boot</i>	3.561,10	9,11	<i>clamp iron</i>	531	1,36
<i>belt work</i>	1.243	3,18	<i>hoes</i>	442,04	1,13
<i>furriery work</i>	283	0,72	<i>iron pan</i>	373,50	0,96
<i>holster</i>	17,50	0,04	<i>trivet</i>	170	0,43
Textiles, Drapery & Haberdashery	10.139,17	25,93	<i>licer</i>	146,50	0,37
<i>blankets (woolen)</i>	5.286	13,52	<i>locks (Turkish)</i>	88,33	0,23
<i>cloth**</i>	1.530,50	3,91	<i>nail</i>	55,50	0,14
<i>linen & flax</i>	911,33	2,33	<i>saw (Turkish, Razisch)</i>	38,50	0,10
<i>spindle & distaff</i>	534,60	1,37	<i>knives (Turkish etc.)</i>	33,03	0,08
<i>thread, cords and yarn (cotton etc.)</i>	493,20	1,26	<i>tube/pipe</i>	16,50	0,04
<i>coats (Turkish, Razish, haircloth)</i>	457,50	1,17	<i>shovel</i>	10	0,03
<i>schaika</i>	440	1,13	<i>hatchet</i>	8	0,02
<i>camisole (black, Turkish, woolen)</i>	122,50	0,31	<i>adze</i>	6	0,02
<i>haircloth (sacks, horse rugs & covers)</i>	107	0,27	<i>fire steel</i>	6	0,02
<i>trousers***</i>	61	0,16	<i>ironware</i>	5	0,01
<i>mantels (Turkish, aba)</i>	49,34	0,13	Copper & copper ware	3.036,43	7,77
<i>weaver's comb</i>	57	0,15	Miscellaneous	2.538,87	6,49
<i>shirts (Razisch etc.)</i>	18,70	0,05	<i>kitchenware</i>	499,70	1,28
<i>cotton</i>	17	0,04	<i>groceries (Turkish etc.)</i>	432	0,10
<i>socks (woolen)</i>	15	0,04	<i>tobacco pipes</i>	410,50	1,05
<i>gold work</i>	14	0,04	<i>coffee</i>	402,84	1,03
<i>hemp (Razisch etc.)</i>	11	0,03	<i>paper</i>	186	0,48
<i>silk knob</i>	7	0,02	<i>corals (glass)</i>	162,50	0,42
<i>silk girdle</i>	3	0,01	<i>tables/plates</i>	112,50	0,29
<i>breast cloth</i>	2,50	0,01	<i>tallow</i>	93,50	0,24
<i>weaver's needle</i>	1	0,00	<i>soap (Turkish, Seralien)</i>	83	0,21
Horse equipment	1.720,69	4,40	<i>rice</i>	77,50	0,20
<i>knapsack and traveling bags</i>	779,03	1,99	<i>incense</i>	45,83	0,12
<i>horse rugs</i>	618,50	1,58	<i>pomegranate</i>	33	0,08
<i>bridle, halter, bits & reins</i>	237,63	0,61	Unspecified	164	0,42
<i>stirrup</i>	54,83	0,14	Other	118,84	0,30
<i>harness</i>	19,70	0,05	TOTAL	39.100	100,00
<i>curry comb</i>	11	0,03			

* Meschin, suffian & sole leather.

** Ordinary & fine; blue & red; Venetian.

*** Turkish & Rázisch; Aba & Mantel.

The terminology referring to the origin of the commercial articles involved Turkish, Razish and Venetian goods. It included Turkish groceries, knives, locks, mantels, camisole, and soap; Razish shirts and hems; Turkish and Razish saws, trousers, and coats/jackets; and Venetian clothing. The seemingly high share of the Turkish goods was best observed in leather and leather products. 39,06% of the leather and leather products, for example, were recorded as *meschin*, a Turkish word for roan. This rate increased to 45,65% when combined with *sattian*, another Turkish word for tanned and dyed sheep and goatskins. As for the shoes and boots, they were always called *szisma* and *pabotschen*, the Turkish equivalents for the same trade articles. With the latter included, Turkish merchandise accounted for 65,71% of the market for leather and leather products.

A similar case can be partially applied to textiles, draperies, and the products of haberdashery. In this category of goods, just like the *harar* sacks, covers, and coats woven from haircloth, the mention of Turkish *aba* mantels, trousers, and coats, all made of coarse woolen cloth, are not infrequent, while certain cloth types like *schaicka*, a kind of homespun woolen cloth, are peculiar to Turkish textile industry.

The trade of *aba* is more richly documented in Szerna Bara and Ratscha. In Ratscha, *aba* accounted for 71,86% of the total woolen exports. Greeks, mostly from Macedonia, who were responsible for the 98,07% of the total *aba* exports, were in full command of this trade.

Aba alone accounted for 61,19% of the textiles and 36,54% of the total trade in Szernabara. For *sajak*, these rates were 7,48 and 4,39%, respectively. But the control of the Macedonian Greeks over the trade of *aba* was extended to all textile products. Cotton was mainly traded as raw material, but there were also bands, linings, canvas, and such fabrics as *pogasie*, *masslan*, etc. among the cotton and linen clothes.

The Greeks' ascendancy could also be seen in the leather trade in Szernabara. Almost all of the leather traded by the Greeks was processed, specifically *cordovan*, *meschina* and *satyan*. However, un-

TABLE 15
Value of the Merchandise Traded by the Ottoman Subjects in Szernabara (1724), (d.)

Greeks			Turks			Ratz		
Goods	Value (d.)	%	Goods	Value (d.)	%	Goods	Value (d.)	%
Textiles			Leather & -work	219700	33,90	Leather	118050	53,76
Woolen	1526900	53,70	Fruits & nuts	93900	14,49	Textiles	58150	26,49
Cotton& Linen	527100	18,54	Copper & Hardware	93400	14,41	Ironware	23400	10,66
Silk	20300	0,71	Zismen & popotzen	82000	12,65	Paper	17300	7,88
Clothes	34500	1,21	Beltwork	51000	7,87	Copper	2600	1,18
Leather	671500	23,62	Other	108100	16,68			
Other	62850	2,21						
Total	2843150	100,00	Total	648100	100,00	Total	219500	100,00
%	76,62	%		17,46	%		5,91	100,00

like in Mitrowitz, both leather and textiles were exported outside of Szernabara, possibly to the North. Some of them were bound for Hungarian cities as Comorn and Raab. It is reasonable to assume that they were being imported in large quantities into other Austrian provinces at that time, because by the 1730s, the Austrian administration had prohibited the import of all leather except *saffian* and certain textile and drapery products, ostensibly to protect domestic industry and prevent money from escaping.⁶⁶

In the second half of the 18th century, Aba clothing was still in high demand among Wallachians and Serbs. They were heavily imported into Banat in the early 1760s, along with raw cotton, wool, silk, cotton yarn, and cotton cloth.⁶⁷ But soon afterwards, in parallel with the development of the textile industry in Hungarian territories, their imports from Turkish provinces were banned.⁶⁸

Turkish leather and textiles have been imported into Austria since the early centuries, either as raw materials or finished goods.

⁶⁶ Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 86-87, 201.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

Textiles, rugs, carpets, silk, spices, and other fine clothing were among the items exported from Ottoman provinces to Temesvar, Belgrade, Brashov, and Sibiu in the 16th century. In exchange, hardware and textiles from Germany, England and the Netherlands were imported.⁶⁹ Rugs and carpets, silk, cotton, leather, sheepskin, dyestuffs, and wine were among the Turkish goods exported to the Polish cities of Lemberg, Krakau, and Posen in the second half of the 16th century.⁷⁰

In the 17th century, the Turkish merchandise exported from Ottoman provinces to Transylvania consisted of wool, cotton, rugs and carpets, blankets, garments, clothes, fruits, spices, and cattle. Some of them were further transferred to Poland and Hungary.⁷¹ Some of the textile products previously imported from Turkish provinces, such as undyed aba, began to be produced locally in Transylvania at that time, and the Transylvanian authorities issued instructions to protect the local weavers from Ottoman Imports.⁷² The Turkish goods imported into Jaroslav in the first half of the 17th century included saffian, silk cloth, clothes woven from camel hair, spices, cotton, and the like. The merchandise imported from the East was so diverse that even the fabrics of Catholic clergy ceremonial costumes were woven from Turkish velvet.⁷³

The import of Turkish leather products into Austrian provinces at the beginning of the 18th century can be associated with the development of husbandry and animal industry in the Balkans. Already in the 16th and 17th centuries, husbandry occupied a central

⁶⁹ Marta Bur Markowska, "Über die Arts des Waarenaustausches zwischen dem Osmanischen Imperium und die Österreichischen Territorien während des 17. Und 18. Jh." *Österreichischer Handel mit Südosteuropa und die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts. (Forschungsgespräch am 9-10 Dezember 1980)*, Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, p. 133.

⁷⁰ Markowska, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁷² Mária Pakucs-Willcocks, "Turkish" Textiles in South-Eastern and East-Central Europe in the Early Modern Period: The Evidence of Transylvanian Customs Accounts", in *Journal of Early Modern History*, 24, 2020, p. 371.

⁷³ Markowska, *op. cit.*, p. 136.

place in the economies of Balkan countries, where the surplus of animal products was used as raw material in certain crafts and contributed to their development indirectly. Highly developed techniques of tanning and dyeing were also in use.⁷⁴ In the second half of the 17th century, the import of leather and textiles was made a monopoly of the First Oriental Company.⁷⁵ According to the customs records of Baja, Sylla, Esztergom, and Michaloviz to the north of the Sava River, ox hides and sheep skins traded intensively in the early 1690s began to be replaced at the beginning of the 18th century by tanned leather known as *satyan*, *korduan*, and *karmasin*.⁷⁶

According to an inventory of the commercial goods kept in stores in Hungary in 1737, Turkish goods accounted for 25% of the total.⁷⁷ The textile products, particularly the coarse and cheap clothes from the Balkans demanded by Hungarian peasantry and lower classes, continued to be sold in Hungary in the second half of the 18th century.⁷⁸ During the 18th century, such Balkan cities as Salonika, Philipolis, Larissa (Yenişehir), and Ambelakia were closely connected to Western markets, and the woolen clothes and cotton yarn woven and spun in these centers were exported to Silesia, Saxony, and Vienna.⁷⁹ Through Salonika, the *abas* woven in Thessaly and Macedonia were also exported to Livorno, Genoa, Venice, Messina, Malta, Ancona, France and Holland in the 18th century.⁸⁰

3.4.2.2 EXPORT ARTICLES

The Commercial articles sent out from Mitrowitz by the Ottoman merchants are mostly confined to wax and honey, to be partially accompanied by copper. Table 16 shows how the goods imported by the Ottoman merchants from Mitrowitz were composed.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁷⁵ Halm, *op. cit.*, p. 64; Hassinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 15.

⁷⁶ Gavrilovic, *op. cit.*, p. 546.

⁷⁷ Markowska, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-38.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Markowska, *op. cit.*, p. 139.

⁸⁰ N.G. Svoronos, *Le Commerce de Salonique au XVIII^e Siècle*, Paris 1956, p. 254.

The intensive trade of wax and honey by the Ottoman merchants recalls the activities of the second Oriental Company in the region and its privileges at that time, for it was proposed that the company's monopoly over the trade of wax and its right to set the prices deterred the local people from engaging in this lucrative and prospering trade.⁸¹ As for the copper, it began to be sent to the inner parts of the Ottoman Empire in increasing amounts after the Treaty of Passarowitz. Following the signing of the treaty, the copper mines in Northern Serbia, together with those of Majdanpek, Oravica, and Baja de Arama in Banat, came under Austrian rule. Soon afterwards, some of these mines were farmed out.⁸² Meanwhile, the successful operation of the Majsanpek and Oravic mines promoted copper exports, the majority of which were destined for the Ottoman Empire.⁸³ A separate agreement was reached with Bosnian and Raitz merchants as early as 1722, but they failed to meet expectations due to overproduction, and the Temeswar Company was asked to fill the gap. Starting in 1727, however, a second appeal was made to the Ottoman merchants.⁸⁴

Wax and copper imported into Ottoman provinces was also exported from Banat. But during the reign of Maria Theresia, the copper exports into the Ottoman Empire decreased considerably.⁸⁵

A glance at the Ottoman merchants' and goods' destinations suggests that the articles imported from Mitrowitz by the Ottoman merchants were almost always transported to the southern regions, which were mostly populated by Muslim Bosnians. Among these locations, Zvornik rose to prominence, followed by Sarajevo, another important destination. Other settlements, ostensibly all within Bosnia's borders, were of secondary importance. Other destinations for Ottoman merchants included Belgrade to the north and Moscopoli and Salonica to the east.

⁸¹ Đorđević and Nedeljković, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

⁸² Pickl, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁸³ Bronza, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

⁸⁴ Pickl, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁸⁵ Jordan, *op. cit.*, p. 205.

TABLE 16
Goods Imported from Mitrowitz by Ottoman Merchants, (1719-1723), (Fr.)

Goods	Value	%
Wax	46.883,50	65,07
Honey	11.418,20	15,85
Copper	6.469	8,98
Textiles & Drapery	2.157	2,99
<i>cloth</i>	1.165	1,62
<i>blankets (woolen)</i>	615	0,85
<i>silk (cloth)</i>	170	0,24
<i>string, lace & cords; spindle, distaff & reed</i>	125	0,17
<i>wool</i>	62	0,09
<i>linen</i>	20	0,03
Foodstuffs	1.972,70	2,74
<i>wine & spirits</i>	1.043,90	1,45
<i>apple</i>	292	0,41
<i>cereals (wheat & barley)</i>	283,50	0,39
<i>pearl onion (bulbs)</i>	222,30	0,31
<i>fish</i>	49	0,07
<i>flour</i>	42	0,06
<i>coffee</i>	40	0,06
Cattle & farm animals	1.099	1,53
<i>oxen, cows, calves</i>	800	1,11
<i>sheep & goat</i>	273	0,38
<i>horse</i>	26	0,04
Leather & leather Products	1.284,50	1,10
<i>hide & fell*</i>	390	0,54
<i>pelt**</i>	195,50	0,27
<i>belt work</i>	135	0,19
<i>leather (meschin)</i>	60	0,08
<i>holster</i>	13	0,02
Groceries	491	0,68
Various	631,50	1,07
<i>tobacco</i>	186,50	0,26
<i>horns (buffalo & oxen)</i>	108	0,15
<i>clamps & clocks</i>	70	0,10
<i>carton</i>	60	0,08
<i>shoes</i>	27	0,04
<i>bridle</i>	26,50	0,04
<i>knapsack and travelling bags</i>	20	0,03
<i>horse shoe & nails</i>	20	0,03
<i>tobacco pipes & pipe stems (weichsel)</i>	16	0,02
<i>kitchen ware (copper)</i>	45	0,06
<i>glass vessels</i>	37	0,05
<i>knives</i>	15,50	0,02
Other	140,50	0,19
TOTAL	72.055,90	100,00

* Oxen, cow, buffalo, sheep, lamb, fitch.

** Marten, fox, cat, otter.

MAP 5
Destinations for the Ottoman Merchants
and Goods from Mitrowitz (1719-1723)



4. Conclusion

At the beginning of the 1720s, Mitrowitz distinguished itself from other customs stations within the Austrian military zone along the Sava River in respect to the consistency of the registers and the magnitude of the commercial activities.

The customs records of Mitrowitz in the early 1720s demonstrate that the commercial activities in the region were not interrupted after

the Treaty of Passarowitz. Both the Austrian and Turkish subjects took part in these activities, but the supremacy of the latter was more evident, which was reflected both in merchant numbers and tax figures. The numerical supremacy of the Ottoman merchants can also be extended to Brodt, where they slightly surpassed the Austrian subjects. Based on these figures, it can even be argued that the Ottoman merchants made good use of the opportunities offered by the Commercial Treaty of Passarowitz. The figures in Ratscha and Pakratz, however, placed them in the minority.

There appear to have been two distinct patterns in Mitrowitz's trading activities. The first is the traditional pattern followed by Austrian subjects, which is limited to the exchange of indigenous products. This trade typically ran east-west, bordering the Drava River in the North and the Sava River in the South. The activities of the agents of this trade remained mostly within the borders of Austria, with little contact with the regions east of Belgrade and south of the Sava River.

The other, which ran along the North-South axis, was led by Ottoman subjects. This pattern had also a long tradition and bore the characteristics of the conventional border trade between the Ottoman provinces and Austria. The current figures suggest that Turkish subjects controlled the border trade between Austria and the Ottoman Empire. But some of them did also participate in the trade of indigenous products in Mitrowitz. For the most part, the range of their commercial activities was confined to the Ottoman provinces to the south of the Sava River, but occasionally it expanded as far as Macedonia and Salonika.

The details of the differentiation between the activities of the Ottoman and Austrian merchants can be better observed in the commercial articles. The merchandise traded by the Ottoman merchants varied depending on whether it was imported into or sent out of Mitrowitz. The articles sent out from Mitrowitz were mainly limited to such natural products and raw materials needed in Ottoman lands as wax, honey, and copper. But those imported into Mitrowitz were composed more of manufactured goods. It seems that the value

of the goods exported to and imported from Mitrowitz by the Ottoman merchants was roughly equal and this parity was also observed in the number of merchants arriving at and departing from the same town.

The diversity between the incoming and outgoing goods was less explicit in the trade of Austrian merchants. This was primarily due to the fact that a significant portion of the commercial items they traded were related to transit trade. The composition of transit goods and the size of transit trade suggested that Mitrowitz played an important intermediary role in the region's trade activities.

The differentiation between the Austrian and Ottoman subjects can also be extended to the ethnic roots or religious denominations of the merchants. Ottoman subjects comprised both Muslims and non-Muslims, but the latter remained in the minority. Besides, they were further divided into sub-groups consisting mainly of Slavic and Greek merchants.

The difference between Muslims and non-Muslims can be partly extended to the merchandise they traded, although this difference was less noticeable in Mitrowitz in comparison to other customs stations to the south of it. These customs regions, namely Szernabara and Ratscha, stood out both in respect of the emergence of Ratz merchants and the dominant role of the Greeks in the trade of certain commercial articles.

The inter-regional and international character of the Ratz and Greek merchants, both as Ottoman and Austrian subjects, is also observed in Mitrowitz. Respecting the Ottoman subjects, they can be roughly differentiated from each other and identified with certain geographical locations.

In the case of Szernabara, the Ratz merchants were still in the minority, but the Greeks outweighed the Muslims both in terms of merchant number and tax amount. The Greeks also differed from the Turks (Muslims) with respect to the trade of high-value goods. Here, the trade was confined almost entirely to textiles and leatherwork, and the Greeks handled the bulk of this trade. In Ratscha, where they remained superior to the Turks in terms of total value of

goods, the Greeks maintained control over the textile trade. These two samples, more than Mitrowitz, represent the 18th century pattern prevalent in trade between Austria and the Ottoman Empire.

This pattern, in fact, further changed in the second half of the 18th century, during which, together with textile raw materials, dyestuffs like saffron, madder, and indigo imported into Austria came into prominence. Furthermore, Muslims became a minority among the Ottoman merchants, while the Greeks strengthened their superiority among non-Muslims.⁸⁶

The commercial articles traded in Mitrowitz during the research period differed from the character of the 18th century European and colonial trade. They lacked the colonial coffee, sugar, indigo, cochineal, logwood, pepper, clove, and other goods that were heavily traded between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, such as watches and clocks, jewelry, glassware, paper, tin, and so on.⁸⁷ As a result, Mitrowitz deserves to be treated as a local rather than an international commercial center.

Bibliography

- BRONZA B. (2016), "Austrian Trade Towards the Ottoman Empire and Asia During the XVIII Century", in *Journal of Historical Researches*, 27, pp. 139-149.
- DORĐEVIĆ M., NEDELJKOVIĆ S. (2018), "Commerce and Customs Service Ottoman-Habsburg Border in the First Half of the 18th Century", in *Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and History*, 17/2, pp. 127-135.
- ELIBOL N. (2004), "XVIII. Yüzyılda Avusturya Topraklarında Faaliyet Gösteren Osmanlı Tüccarları", in *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15, pp. 59-112.

⁸⁶ See V. Popovic, "Les Merchands Ottomans à Vienne en 1767", in *Revue Historique du Sud-est Européen*, XVII/4-6, 1940, pp. 166-187; N. Elibol, "XVIII. Yüzyılda", pp. 59-112.

⁸⁷ Svoronos, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-280.

- (2005), “XVI-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Avusturya’nın Doğu Ticareti”, in *Türk Kültürü İncelemeleri Dergisi*, 12, pp. 23-50.
- FISCHAMEND C.E. (1999), “Der Grenzüberschreitende Wirtschaftsraum in der frühen Neuzeit dargestellt am Weinbau der Stadt Bruck a.d. Leitha”, in *Burgenländische Heimatblätter*, 61/2, pp. 65-127.
- FOURNIER A. v. (1887), *Handel und Verkehr in Ungarn und Polen um die Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts*. Archive für Österreichische Geschichte, 96. Band, Wien.
- FÜGEDI E. (1982), “An der Wende eines Wirtschaftssystems Einige Fragen des Ungarischen Aussenhandels im 15. Und 16. Jhr.”, in *Österreichischer Handel mit Südosteuropa und die Wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, pp. 69-80.
- GAVRILOVIĆ S. (1996), *Materialien zu Balkanhandlern in Ungarn im XVIII Jahrhundert*, Zollhäuser, Band II, Beograd.
- HALM H. (1943), *Österreich und Russland, Erster Band: Donauschiffahrt und –Handel nach dem Südosten 1718-1780*, Verlag Thiel und Hintermeister, Breslau.
- HASSINGER H. (1942), “Die Erste Wiener Orientalische Handelskompagnie 1667-1687”, *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 35, Stuttgart, pp. 1-53.
- HAVADI X. (2009), “Die Österreichische Militärgrenze: Staatliche Kontrolle der Grenze im Absolutischen Zeitalter”, in *Geographia Napocensis*, III/2, pp. 69-82.
- JORDAN S. (1967), *Die Kaiserliche Wirtschaftspolitik im Banat im 18. Jahrhundert*, Buchreihe der Südostdeutschen Historischen Kommission, v. 17, München.
- KLEEMANN N.E. (1783), *Briefe über die Schiffahrt und Handlung in Ungarn, Slavonien und Kroatien. Geschrieben auf einer Reise in diesen Ländern 1773*, Prag.
- HALM H. (1943), *Österreich und Neurussland, Donauschiffahrt und -Handel Nach dem Südosten 1718-1780*, Erster Band, Breslau.
- MAKKAI L. (1971), “Der Ungarische Viehhandel 1550-1650”, in *Der*

- Aussenhandel Ostmitteleuropas 1450-1650*, Ingomar Bog, ed., Böhlau Verlag, Köln-Wien, pp. 483-506.
- MARKOWSKA M.B. (1982), "Über die Arts des Waarenaustausches zwischen dem Osmanischen Imperium und die Österreichischen Territories während des 17. Und 18. Jh.", in *Österreichischs Handel mit Sudosteuropa und die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Forschungsgespräch am 9-10 Dezember 1980, Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, pp. 131-142.
- NAGY B. (2016), "Old Interpretations and New Approaches: The 1457-1458 Thirtieth Customs Register of Bratislava", in R. Zaoral (ed.), *Finance in Central Europe during the Later Middle Ages*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, pp. 192-201.
- PAKUCS-WILLCOCKS M. (2020), "Turkish" Textiles in South-Eastern and East-Central Europe in the Early Modern Period: The Evidence of Transylvanian Customs Accounts", in *Journal of Early Modern History*, 24, pp. 363-382.
- PANOVA S. (1982), "Einige Aspekte in der Entwicklung des Handels in den Bulgarischen Ländern im 17. und 18. Jhr. und die Bedeutung Österreichs", in *Österreichischs Handel mit Sudosteuropa und die wirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Bulgarischen Länder bis Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts (Froschungsgespräch 9-10 Dezember 1980)*, Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, Jahrgang IV, pp. 81-88.
- PEEZ C. v. (1915), "Alte Serbische Handelsbeziehungen zu Wien", in *Mitteilungen des Institutes für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, XXXVI, 3. Heft, Wien, pp. 498-510.
- PEŠALJ J. (2010), "Making a Prosperous Peace: Habsburg Diplomacy and Economic Policy at Passarowitz", in C. Ingrao et. al. (ed.), *The Peace of Passarowitz, 1718*, Purdue Univ. Press., pp. 141-157.
- PETRIĆ H. (2010), "The Navigation and Trade Agreement of 1718 and Ottoman Orthodox Merchants in Croatia and the Military Border", in C. Ingrao et. al. (ed.), *The Peace of Passarowitz, 1718*, Purdue Univ. Press, pp. 179-189.
- PICKL O. (1972/1973), "Die Verkehrswege nach dem Südosten vom

- Ausgang des Mittelalters bis ins 18. Jhr.", in *Südostdeutsches Archiv*, München, 15-16, pp. 101-114.
- (1981), "Österreichs Stellung im West-Ost Handel vom 16. bis zur Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Handels mit dem Südosten", in *Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich*, IV/2, pp. 35-57.
- POPOVIC V. (1940), "Les Merchands Ottomans à Vienne en 1767, in *Revue Historique du Sud-est Européen*, XVII/4-6, pp. 166-187.
- PRICKLER H. (1978), "Die Rudersdorfer Dreissigstregister von 1538 bis 1555. Eine Quelle zur Geschichte des ungarisch-steirischen Grenzhandels im 16. Jahrhundert", in *Mitteilungen des Steiermarkischen Landesarchivs*, 28, pp. 41-135.
- (1971), "Das Volumen des westlichen ungarischen Aussenhandels vom 16. Jahrhundert bis 1700", in *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege*, Othmar Pickl (Hrsg.), Grazer Forschungen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, Band 1, Graz, pp. 131-144.
- SIEGHART R. (1915), *Zolltrennung und Zollenheit: Die Geschichte der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Zwischenzoll-Linie*, Manzschke K.u.K. Hof-Verlags- und Universitäts-Buchhandlung, Wien.
- ŠPIESZ A. (1968), "Die Orthodoxen Handelsleute aus dem Balkan in der Slowakei", in *Balkan Studies*, 9/2, pp. 381-428.
- SRBIK H.R. VON (1907), *Der Staatliche Exporthandel Österreichs*, Wien und Leipzig.
- STOIANOVICH T. (1960), "The Conquering Balkan Merchant", in *Journal of Economic History*, 20/2, pp. 234-313.
- SVORONOS N.G. (1956), *Le Commerce de Saloniqu au XVIII^e Siècle*, Paris.
- SZAKÁLY F. (1971), "Kontinuitätsfrage der Wirtschaftsstruktur in den ungarischen Marktflecken unter der Türkenherrschaft", in *Die wirtschaftlichen Auswirkungen der Türkenkriege*, Othmar Pickl (Hrsg.), Grazer Forschungen zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, Band 1, Graz, pp. 235-272.
- VIDAKOVIĆ S., *Forestry and Wood Industry in Slavonia from the 19th Century Onwards*, Master of Arts in History and Philosophy, <http://www.efos.unios.hr/repec/osi/eecytt/PDF/EconomyofeasternCroatiaYesterdayTodayTomorrow04/eecytt0421.pdf>.

- Vlašić A. (2018), *The Correlation Between the Spatial Distribution of Forests and Pig Farming in Ottoman Slavonia*, U: CIEPO 22: 41-53. Uluslararası Osmanlı Öncesi ve Osmanlı Çalışmaları Komitesi Bildiriler Kitabı II. Ur. Kenan İnan, Miraç Tosun i Deniz Çolak. Trabzon: Trabzon Büyükşehir Belediyesi, pp. 41-53.
- VRBANUS M., SKENDEROVIĆ R. (2016), Trgovački Promet na Tridesetnici Brod od 19. Studenoga 1719. do Kraja Lipnja 1721. *Scrinia Slavonica*, 16, pp. 91-146.