Between Families and Institutions. Zadar's Notaries as Intermediaries between Church and Society in the mid-Sixteenth Century Adriatic

STEPHAN SANDER-FAES (Zürich)

Introduction

In the forty years since Paolo Prodi published his essay on the Church in Renaissance Venice, many of the most pressing issues he raised pertaining to "religious institutions and [...] ecclesiastical organizations" have been addressed.¹ Today there are studies discussing a wide range of relevant topics from the role of the Doge to that of the Patriarchate and from the city's religious institutions to its religious minorities.² Most studies, however, focus on Venice proper and the smaller communities scattered throughout its lagoon. A second branch of research details the Venetian *Terraferma* on the Italian mainland.³ While Prodi acknowledged the transformative importance of Venice's conquest of large swaths of northern and north-eastern Italy, he gave little mention to the other half of the Venetian state, the *Stato da mar* or maritime state. The *Stato da mar* extended from Istria to Cyprus and included possessions in the western Balkans, the Aegean Sea, and the large island of Crete. Of these, the cities, islands, and towns in the Adriatic, organised as the Venetian dual province of Dalmatia and Albania, not only served as a buffer zone in face of the Ottoman Empire but also provided the Most Serene Republic with a number of secure ports of call for its commercial and military maritime endeavours.⁴

¹ Paolo PRODI, The Structure and Organization of the Church in Renaissance Venice. Suggestions for Research, in: John R. HALE (ed.), *Renaissance Venice*. London 1973, 409-430, here 409.

² Start with Cecilia CRISTELLON / Silvana MEIDEL MENCHI, Religious Life, in: Eric R. DUSTELER (ed.), *A Companion to Venetian History (1400-1797)*. Leiden 2013, 379-420; David D'ANDREA, Charity and Confraternities, in: ibidem, 420-447; Benjamin RAVID, Venice and its Minorities, in: ibidem, 449-485; both with bibliography.

³ Start with Michael KNAPTON, The *Terraferma* State, in: ibidem, 85-124; Edoardo DEMO, Industry and Production in the Venetian *Terraferma* (15th-18th Century), in: ibidem, 291-317; Giuseppe DEL TORRE / Alfredo VIGGIANO (eds.), 1509-2009, *L'ombra di Agnadello. Venezia e la Terraferma*. Venezia 2010.

⁴ The fundamental studies are Benjamin ARBEL, *Venice's Maritime Empire in the Early Modern Period*, in: Eric R. DUSTELER (ed.), *A Companion to Venetian History (1400-1797)*. Leiden 2013, 125-253;

This essay examines Zadar's notaries in their role as intermediaries, their relationship with the city's cathedral chapter in the middle of the sixteenth century, and their interactions with the rest of urban society.⁵ The city, then known as Zara, was the capital of Venice's Adriatic possessions and, in the words of Venetian syndic Antonio Diedo, Dalmatia's "metropolis and key city"⁶. Reacquired together with the previously Angevin territories on the Adriatic's eastern coast at the beginning of the preceding century, Venice reorganised its new possessions over the following decades. These changes, while not without benefits, considerably changed the economic, ecclesiastical, legal, and political norms, which governed the Dalmatian cities and their inhabitants.⁷ In general the urban elites' commercial activities were curtailed by Venetian claims to staple rights and their attempts to monopolise the hitherto lucrative salt trade in particular. Political power was concentrated in the hands of a few Venetian patricians and commoners appointed by the Senate to administer the far-flung territories of Venice's maritime state. Dalmatia's local elites received offers of participation in non-essential administrative, economic, judicial, and political roles. These roles were not confined solely to temporal matters, but also extended to the ecclesiastical sphere.⁸ Despite the recent increase in studies of the *Stato da mar* and its Adriatic components, the clergy and its interactions with the cities' societies have, in Neven Budak's words, "only exceptionally been a matter of interest to scholars"⁹. This article aims to further our

and Benjamin ARBEL, *Colonie d'oltremare*, in: Alberto TENENTI / Ugo TUCCI (eds.), *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 5: Il rinascimento. Società ed economia. Roma 1996, 947-985; see also Monique O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire. Power and Negotiation in Venice's Maritime State*. Baltimore/PA 2009, 17-38.

⁵ On Zadar: Dinko FORETIĆ (ed.), *Prošlost Zadra. Zadar 1976-1987*; Tomislav RAUKAR, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću. Ekonomski razvoj i društveni odnosi. Zadar 1977*; Tomislav RAUKAR (ed.), *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku*. Split 2007; most recently: Tea MAYHEW, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule. Contado di Zara (1648-1718)*. Rome 2008; Stephan SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites of Zadar. Dalmatia and the Venetian Commonwealth (1540-1569)*. Rome 2013.

⁶ Quoted in Simeon LJUBIĆ (ed.), *Commissiones et relationes Venetae*, vol. 3: *Annorum 1554-1581*. Zagreb 1880, 17. This and all other translations are by the author.

⁷ For the following cf. ARBEL, "Colonie d'oltremare", 974-976; ARBEL, "Venice's Maritime Empire", 144-164, 182-193; Gaetano COZZI, *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente Veneto. Governanti e governati nel dominio di qua dal Mincio nei secoli XV-XVIII*, in: Gaetano COZZI (ed.), *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente veneto*. Venezia 1997, 291-352, 302; O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire*, 27-33; on incorporation in the Venetian Republic Gherardo ORTALLI, *Entrar nel Dominio. Le dedizioni delle città alla Repubblica Serenissima*, in: Giorgio ZORDAN / Gino BENZONI (eds.), *Società, economia, istituzioni. Elementi per la conoscenza della Repubblica di Venezia*, vol. 1. Verona 2002, 49-62, here 52-54; for an extensively documented example Ermanno ORLANDO, *Gli accordi con Curzola (1352-1421)*. Roma 2002, esp. 52-74.

⁸ ARBEL, *Colonie d'oltremare*, 948-949; O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire*, 39-56, 75-96; Ivan PEDERIN, *Die venezianische Verwaltung Dalmatiens und ihre Organe (XV. und XVI. Jh.)*, *Studi veneziani* 12 (1987), 99-164, here 143.

⁹ Neven BUDAK, *Urban élites in Dalmatia in the 14th and 15th Centuries*, in: Michele P. GHEZZO (ed.), *Città e sistema adriatico alla fine del medioevo. Bilanci degli studi e prospettive di ricerca*.

understanding of the intricacies of everyday life in the mid-sixteenth century by using the city's notarial records, preserved in great numbers by the Croatian State Archive in Zadar but routinely overlooked by historians. By focusing on the day-to-day routines of the city's notaries and their dealings with the urban clergy it thus aims to contribute to the study of Venetian Dalmatia in the context of the region's multi-cultural and poly-confessional urban *entrepôts*.¹⁰ In doing so, this study contributes an innovative approach to the history of the Adriatic, particularly the still poorly understood middle decades of the sixteenth century.¹¹

Venice and the Mediterranean

The origins of Venetian expansion date back to the turn of the first millennium and include such memorable episodes as the conquest of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade or the Angevin period after the Peace of Zadar (1358).¹² The following overview, however, neglects events before the advent of the second Venetian dominion over much of Dalmatia in 1409/20.¹³ The Republic's renewed expansion was made possible by victory over Genoa, its main rival for most of the Middle Ages, and began in the aftermath of the War of Chioggia (1378 to 1381), a conflict that brought both

Venezia 1997, 181-199, 188, 194-196; see also Franjo ŠANJEK, The Church and Christianity, in: Ivan SUPIČIĆ / Eduard HERCIGONJA (eds.), Croatia and Europe. Culture, Arts, and Sciences, vol. 2: Croatia in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. A Cultural Survey. London 2008, 227-258 (though the author treats Venetian Dalmatia only cursorily).

¹⁰ On Dalmatian chapters now Ante GULIN, Hrvatski srednjovjekovni kaptoli. Loca credibilia Dalmacije. Zagreb 2008, esp. 239-294 (even though the author focuses mainly on the Middle Ages), incl. further references.

¹¹ Good new studies, though focusing mostly on the (late) Middle Ages, include Irena BENYOVSKY LATIN, Srednjovjekovni Trogir. Prostor i društvo. Zadar 2009; Serdo DOKOZA, Dinamika otočnog prostora. Split 2009; Dušan MLACIĆ, Građani plemići. Pad i uspon rapskog plemstva. Zagreb 2008; Oliver Jens SCHMITT, Korčula sous la domination de Venise au XV^e siècle. Pouvoir, économie et vie quotidienne dans une île dalmate au Moyen Âge tardif. Paris 2011, <<http://conferences-cdf.revues.org/270>>, 26 November 2011; and the collected essays in Uwe ISRAEL / Oliver J. SCHMITT (eds.), Venezia e Dalmazia. Roma 2013.

¹² On Venice Gaetano COZZI / Michael KNAPTON / Giorgio SCARABELLO, La Repubblica di Venezia nell'età moderna. Torino 1986-1992; Élisabeth CROUZET-PAVAN, Venice Triumphant. The Horizons of a Myth. Baltimore/PA 2002; Bernard DOUMERC, Venise et son empire en Méditerranée (IX^e-XV^e siècle). Paris 2012; Frederic C. LANE, Venice. A Maritime Republic. Baltimore/PA 1973; and the 12-vol. Storia di Venezia. Dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima. Roma 1991-2002.

¹³ On medieval Venetian expansionism Gherardo ORTALLI, Beyond the Coast. The Origins of a Long Relationship, in: Gherardo ORTALLI / Oliver J. SCHMITT (eds.), Balcani occidentali. Adriatico e Venezia fra XIII e XVIII secolo. Vienna 2009, 9-25; on the Adriatic Bernard DOUMERC, L'Adriatique de XIII^e au XVII^e siècle, in: Pierre CABANES (ed.), Histoire de l'Adriatique, Paris 2001, 201-316; on the 4th Crusade most recently Gherardo ORTALLI / Giorgio RAVEGNANI / Peter SCHREINER (eds.), Quarta crociata. Venezia, Bisanzio, impero Latino. Venezia 2006.

warring parties to their economic, financial, political, and social breaking points.¹⁴ Unlike Genoa the Venetians were able to quickly recover, and renewed their expansion throughout the eastern Mediterranean from the 1380s onwards. The last decade of the fourteenth century witnessed the acquisition of Venice's first possessions in Albania, and in 1409 the Republic took advantage of the Hungarian succession crisis to bring claims to the better parts of Dalmatia against its titular ruler, Ladislaus of Naples.¹⁵

Soon after the turn of the fifteenth century, Venice faced a new opponent in the Levant – the Ottoman Empire.¹⁶ Both powers quickly expanded their authority throughout the region, yet once most territories located between them had been taken over by one or the other, conflict between the Most Sublime Porte and the Republic of St Mark became all but inevitable. Conflicts erupted roughly once every generation, and led Venetian statesman and historian Giovan Battista Nani to comment that “one cannot live next to the Turk without becoming an enemy of them.”¹⁷ The decades around 1500 proved decisive in many ways. Venice lost against the Ottomans at sea and a coalition of nearly all major Christian powers almost destroyed the Republic following the ignominious defeat at Agnadello (1509). In addition, news of the Spanish and Portuguese exploits in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans eventually resulted in a paradigm shift in attitudes in Venice over the course of the sixteenth century.¹⁸ Despite the success of a united Christian fleet against the Ottoman Empire off Lepanto

¹⁴ Michel BALARD, La lotta contro Genova, in: Girolamo ARNALDI / Giorgio CRACCO (eds.), Storia di Venezia, vol. 3: La formazione dello stato patrizio. Roma 1996, 87-126.

¹⁵ Bariša KREKIĆ, Venezia e l'Adriatico, in: ARNALDI / CRACCO (eds.), Storia di Venezia, vol. 3, 51-85, here 73-82; the most recent overview from Croatia is Tomislav RAUKAR, Croatia within Europe, in: Ivan SUPIČIĆ / Eduard HERCIGONJA (eds.), Croatia and Europe. Culture, Arts, and Sciences, vol. 2: Croatia in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. A Cultural Survey. London 2008, 7-40, esp. 11-33; on Venice's Albanian possessions Oliver Jens SCHMITT, Das venezianische Albanien (1392-1479). München 2001 (Südosteuropäische Arbeiten, 110).

¹⁶ Start with Daniel GOFFMAN, The Ottoman Empire and Early Modern Europe. Cambridge 2009; Caroline FINKEL, Osman's Dream. The Story of the Ottoman Empire (1300-1923). London 2005, 3-151; Colin IMBER, The Ottoman Empire (1300-1650). The Structure of Power. Basingstoke 2002, 25-53; Nicolas VATIN, L'Ottomans et l'Occident (XV^e-XVI^e siècles). Istanbul 2001; in much detail Kenneth M. SETTON, The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571), vol. 2: The 15th Century. Philadelphia 1978, 138-270; on Southeast Europe in particular John V. A. FINE, The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late 12th Century to the Ottoman Conquest. Ann Arbor 1987, esp. 499-611; for bibliographic guidance Klaus KREISER, Der osmanische Staat (1300-1922). München 2008, 161-214.

¹⁷ Giovan Battista NANI, Historia della Republica Veneta dal 1613 al 1671. Venice 1686, vol. 2, 24; MAYHEW, Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule, 24.

¹⁸ Alberto TENENTI, The Sense of Space and Time in the Venetian World in the 15th and 16th Centuries, in: John R. HALE (ed.), Renaissance Venice. London 1973, 17-46, esp. 24-29; Ugo TUCCI, The Psychology of the Venetian Merchant in the 16th Century, in: ibidem, 346-378.

(1571), the Venetians were forced to cede the large island of Cyprus to the Sultan less than two years later. The sun had set on Venice's "imperial age"¹⁹.

On an administrative level, once Venice expanded its authority formal contracts between seemingly equal partners were drawn up. These affirmed the existing political and social order, guaranteed certain reciprocal rights, and ensured Venetian pre-eminence regarding essential issues in matters temporal and ecclesiastical.²⁰ By the 1440s, nominal boundaries had been drawn up between possessions on the Italian mainland and the maritime state.²¹ In Venice proper new offices were created and older ones were enlarged, which served the dual purpose of employing some of the city's poorer patricians as well as further cementing the *Signoria's* rule.²² In religious matters this resulted in Catholic control over all other Christian – mostly Orthodox – denominations and a policy of relative freedom of worship.²³

Venice and the Adriatic in the 16th Century

By taking advantage of the Hungarian succession crisis, Venice was able to recover most Dalmatian and Albanian coastal communities at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Upon their sometimes involuntary incorporation into the *Stato da mar*, these cities and their jurisdictions were reorganised in accordance with Venetian interests, the most salient of these being the safety of vital shipping lanes along the eastern coast of

the Adriatic and the availability of secure harbours.²⁴ Civilian and military appointees who belonged to the Venetian patriciate were placed at the head of local administrations. Step by step Dalmatia's cities were integrated into a more centralised system of governance, which, in turn, had a negative effect on economic development. While commerce and trade continued, albeit on a lower level and with decreasing intensity, local elites lost the majority of their political prerogatives. On the other hand, however, Venetian rule provided not only a modicum of organization but also worked as a sort of safeguard of public order in those Dalmatian cities that had seen bitter power struggles between the urban upper nobility and the commoners.²⁵

On a regional level, and contrary to their pattern of cultural, economic, and social decline, the cities' military role was enhanced. After the 1460s, the growing Ottoman menace made it necessary to build, modernize, or enlarge massive fortifications, which remain clearly visible today.²⁶ A number of armed conflicts during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries gradually reduced the agriculturally important hinterlands of the Dalmatian cities to little more than small strips of land. After the end of the latest round of fighting in the 1570s, Venetian syndic Andrea Giustiniano reported that he inspected "the borders which, at the present time, are three miles away from the city [of Zadar]" and found that "all surrounding dwellings were destroyed, causing the impoverished peasants – including all of their livestock – to seek shelter in the city at nightfall, only to return to their fields at dawn, always accompanied by two units of mercenaries."²⁷ Fortifications, supply systems, and garrisons were the main investments. While the agricultural output of the hinterlands was continuously reduced, maritime traffic and cross-border trade in livestock increased modestly. In any event, integration into the larger framework of the *Stato da mar* also meant the enlargement and reorganization of administrative offices. At the same time, it also led to a cumulative concentration of power in the hands of a few Venetian officials.²⁸

¹⁹ David S. CHAMBERS, *The Imperial Age of Venice (1380-1580)*. New York 1970; for an older but very detailed synthesis Freddy THIRIET, *La Romanie vénétienne au Moyen Âge. La développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénétien*. Paris 1959, esp. 181-349.

²⁰ Gherardo ORTALLI, *Entrar nel Dominio. Le dedizioni delle città alla Repubblica Serenissima*, in: Giorgio ZORDAN / Gino BENZONI (eds.), *Società, economia, istituzioni. Elementi per la conoscenza della Repubblica di Venezia*, vol. 1. Verona 2002, 49-62, esp. 52-54; O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire*, 27-33; for an extensively documented example see Ermanno ORLANDO, *Gli accordi con Curzola (1352-1421)*. Roma 2002, esp. 52-74.

²¹ Gaetano COZZI, *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente Veneto. Governanti e governati nel dominio di qua dal Mincio nei secoli XV-XVIII*, in: Gaetano COZZI (ed.), *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente veneto. Saggi su politica, società, cultura della Repubblica di Venezia in età moderna*. Venezia 1997, 291-352, here 292, 302.

²² Stanley CHOJNACKI, *Identity and Ideology in Renaissance Venice. The Third Serrata*, in: John MARTIN / Dennis ROMANO (eds.), *Venice Reconsidered. The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State (1297-1797)*. Baltimore/PA 2000, 263-294, esp. 268f.; Gaetano COZZI, *Authority and the Law in Renaissance Venice*, in: John R. HALE (ed.), *Renaissance Venice*. London 1973, 293-345, 325-327; Bernard DOUMERC, *Il dominio del mare*, in: Alberto TENENTI / Ugo TUCCI (eds.), *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 5: *Il rinascimento. Società ed economia*. Roma 1996, 113-180, esp. 164-178; O'CONNELL, *Men of Empire*, 57-74.

²³ ARBEL, *Colonie d'oltremare*, 974-976; PRODI, *Organization of the Church*, 417-422; SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 76-82, 88-93, 116-26; THIRIET, *Romanie vénétienne*, 287-291, 403-410, 429-435; see also fn. 4, 7, 8, 9.

²⁴ Tomislav RAUKAR, *Društvene strukture u mletačkoj Dalmaciji*, in: Mirjana GROSS (ed.), *Društveni razvoj u Hrvatskoj od 16. do početka 20. stoljeća*. Zagreb 1981, 103-125, 103.

²⁵ Arié MALZ, *Frühneuzeitliche Modernisierung als Sackgasse. Die dalmatinische Städtewelt vom 15. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert*, in: Carsten GOEHRKE (ed.), *Städte im östlichen Europa. Zur Problematik von Modernisierung und Raum vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Zürich 2006, 103-133, esp. 107-111; Tomislav RAUKAR, *Komunalna društva u Dalmaciji u XV. i u prvoj polovici XVI. stoljeća*, *Historijski zbornik* 35 (1982), 43-118; on Zadar more specifically RAUKAR, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, 75-88; Tomislav RAUKAR et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom (1409-1797)*. Zadar 1987, 75-93; SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 143-163.

²⁶ See Andrej ŽMEGAČ, *Bastioni jadranske Hrvatske*. Zagreb 2009, 29-71, on Zadar in particular 189f.; see also fn. 55.

²⁷ Quoted in Grga NOVAK (ed.), *Commissiones et relationes Venetae*, vol. 4: *Anorum 1572-1590*. Zagreb 1964, 161-185, 176.

²⁸ RAUKAR et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, 277-301; Grga NOVAK, *Prošlost Dalmacije*. Zagreb 2001, 129-131, 137-144; see also fn. 4, 7, 8, 9, 23.

After Venice regained control over the cities along the eastern coast of the Adriatic, ecclesiastical affairs were organised along the same pattern. The highest positions – archbishoprics, bishoprics, and the like – were reserved for Venetian patricians only, a policy that was in effect in the entire maritime state. Lower positions in the ecclesiastical administration, the monastic communities, and the secular clergy were open to both local nobles and to commoners, a situation again mirroring temporal administrative developments.²⁹ Despite the riches of Dalmatia's archives the ecclesiastical sphere in the Venetian Adriatic during the Early Modern period continues to represent what Neven Budak has referred to as an “almost unexplored field”,³⁰ a situation that has not much changed in the past fifteen years.

Zadar's Notaries, the Clergy, and Society

Around the mid-sixteenth century, Zadar, Dalmatia's capital city, was home to both secular Venetian officials and a relatively large ecclesiastical population. To reflect the heterogeneity of that population, I use the term “clergy” to denote both individuals identified by ecclesiastical affiliation, social status, and professional titles, as well as the city's religious institutions, such as the archbishopric, the various congregations, parish churches, and administrative chapters. Zadar's clergy were distributed across the city's archbishopric, eight monastic congregations, various parish churches, and Franciscan Third Order Regulars of both sexes. In addition there were two hospitals in the city, together with two more lazarettos outside the city walls. The city also served as a residence for the bishop of neighbouring Nin. Both sees were reserved exclusively for Venetian patricians but were administered by their respective chapters, whose membership was open to local nobles and commoners alike. While during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries most of the city's building efforts went into fortification and support structures to counter the Ottoman threat, the construction of a Slavic-language seminary augmented the ecclesiastical sphere as well.³¹

In 1555, Muzio Calino, a Brescia-born theologian and secretary to the Venetian patrician and humanist Alvise Cornaro, became Zadar's archbishop. It was in this

²⁹ ARBEL, *Colonie d'oltremare*, 975; BUDAK, *Urban élites*, 186, 194–196; Bariša KREKIĆ, *Developed Autonomy. The Patricians in Dubrovnik and Dalmatian Cities*, in: Bariša KREKIĆ (ed.), *Urban Society of Eastern Europe in Premodern Times*. Berkeley 1987, 185–215, 188–192; PEDERIN, *Die venezianische Verwaltung Dalmatiens*, 143; RAUKAR, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, 301–306.

³⁰ BUDAK, *Urban élites*, 195; on the Croatian State Archives Josip KOLANOVIĆ (ed.), *Pregled arhivskim fondova i zbirki republike Hrvatske*. Zagreb 2006–2007; on the archival holdings in Zadar used here vol. 1, 881–884; see also the comment by Oliver Jens SCHMITT, *L'apport des archives de Zadar à l'histoire de la Méditerranée orientale au XV^e siècle*, in: Sandro G. FRANCHINI/Gherardo ORTALLI/Gennaro TOSCANO (eds.), *Venise et la Méditerranée*. Venise 2011, 45–54, esp. 47–49.

³¹ ARBEL, *Colonie d'oltremare*, 975; BUDAK, *Urban élites*, 194–196; PEDERIN, *Die venezianische Verwaltung Dalmatiens*, 143; RAUKAR et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, 277–301, 537–542; RAUKAR, *Croatia within Europe*, 26–30; SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 76–82, 88–93.

capacity that he contributed to the reforms of the Roman Catechism, the missal, and the breviary endorsed by the Council of Trent before returning to Zadar in 1565. Only a year later, after failed attempts to secure the see of his hometown, Calino assumed the bishopric of Terni, where he died in 1570.³² In Zadar's notarial acts, he was known as “Mutius Calino” and was assisted by the metropolitan chapter.³³

A document from the second half of the 1550s contains a list of the chapter's members. Assembled in the city cathedral's chapel of St. Barbara were “Franciscus de Grisogonis, archpriest, Petrus Britanicus, *primicerius* [the first among the city's canons], Johannes Donatus Begna, canon and vicar, Johannes Sichirich, Matthaeus de Marchettis, Johannes Thomaseus, Antonius Mirchouich, Sanctus de Sanctis, and Vincentius de Ventura”.³⁴ Of these nine men, both the archpriest and vicar belonged to the local nobility, which included the Grisogonus and Begna families as numerous and prominent members.³⁵ Despite their non-noble descent, the other members of the metropolitan chapter likewise belonged to families conferring a certain amount of prestige and social status: Johannes Thomaseus, Sanctus de Sanctis, and Matthaeus de Marchettis were kinsmen of, respectively, Zadar's notaries Franciscus Thomaseus, Paulus de Sanctis, and Horatius de Marchettis. Both the Britanicus and de Ventura families were large and important in Zadar. For instance, a relative of Petrus Britanicus, the “distinguished Simon Britanicus”, was a public interpreter whose daughter had married a member of the patrician Venier family,³⁶ and the de Ventura family enjoyed an

³² Vittor Ivo COMPARATO, Calini, Muzio, in: Alberto M. GHISALBERTI (ed.), *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 16. Roma 1973, 725–727.

³³ Hrvatski Državni arhiv u Zadru (henceforth HR DAZD) 31, Bilježnici Zadra (henceforth BZ), notary Simon Budineus, box I, fascicle 1, book 1, carta 32v, 18 February, 1557 m.v. [1558]. Henceforth notary, box, fascicle, and book are omitted. NB: “carta” (henceforth c.) signifies the original pagination of manuscripts; “folio” (henceforth fol.) signifies the pagination applied to manuscripts by archivists. The Venetian year began in March and is referenced with the abbreviation m.v. (more veneto). Calendric norms are reproduced as they appear on the cited manuscripts with modernised dates in squared parentheses.

³⁴ “Congregatis et Capituliter adunatis In capella Sanctae Barbarae que est sacristia Ecclesiae metropolitana Sancta Anastasia ubi actus capitulares fieri consueuerunt infrascriptis Reverendis dominis de capitulo Jadrensis, videlicet, Reverendo domino Francisco de Chrysogonis Archipresbytero, Reuerendo domino Petro Britanico Primicerio, Reverendo domino Joanne Donato Begnio canonico et Vicario, domino Joanne Sichirich, domino Matheo de Marchettis, domino Joanne Thomaseo, domino Antonio Mirchouich, domino Sancto de Sanctis ac domino Vincentio de Ventura canonicis dictae Ecclesiae Jadrensis.” In exchange for the annual of 10 ducats they consigned one of the chapter's houses situated in Zadar's St Vitus' parish to “Martinus Lucathello”, a merchant and citizen of Zadar. HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 3, c. 112v, 18 April 1558.

³⁵ RAUKAR et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, passim; SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, esp. 88–93, 116–126.

³⁶ Simon's daughter, “Cecilia”, had survived her husband, “Johannes Venier”, a Venetian patrician and citizen of Zadar. HR DAZD 31 BZ, Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 3, c. 27v–c. 28r, 30 November 1555; Nicolaus Canali, I, 1, 4, fol. 18r, 20 August 1567.

elevated reputation reflected in its appearance in the report filed by Paolo Giustiniano upon his return to Venice from captainship of Zadar.³⁷ Whatever their geographical provenance, the metropolitan chapter's members were well integrated into the economic, political, and social fabric of Zadar's society.³⁸

On the basis of the notarial records – which, despite their relative abundance and heterogeneity, enable the historian to reconstruct 'only' certain aspects of everyday life – the activities of the city's ecclesiastical community were similar to those of the rest of the population. It is completely clear and perfectly obvious that both the city's notaries as well as the clergy lived lives that differed substantially from the overwhelming majority of the Zadar's inhabitants. Both groups were literate and typically enjoyed relatively high levels of education.³⁹ In addition, a good deal of the day-to-day activities of men (and women) of the cloth was determined by their various liturgical and spiritual obligations. While not the focus of this study, these matters certainly had an effect on them and their behaviour. Whereas statements about the precise form of these obligations are problematic due to the source base, it is nevertheless possible to reconstruct some of the protagonists' business dealings and interactions with the rest of Zadar's society. And in this – admittedly somewhat restricted – sense the activities of the clergy did not deviate significantly from their temporal contemporaries. Neither Zadar's archbishop nor Nin's bishop made more than rare personal appearances before a notary to conduct business for himself or his see. Usually these high dignitaries were represented by one or more members of their chapters or one or more representatives – *procuratores*⁴⁰ – who

³⁷ LJUBIĆ (ed.), *Commissiones et relationes Venetae*, vol. 3, 48–55, 52; Paolo Giustiniano was captain of Zadar in the first half of the 1550s (see 49f. for a discussion of the duration of his captainship).

³⁸ The de Marchettis family had its origins in Ancona, where Matthaëus also disposed of a prebendary. HR DAZD 31 BZ, Petrus de Bassano, I, 1, 9, fol. 3v, 21 February 1542 m.v. [1543].

³⁹ On the notarial levels of education Maria Pia PEDANI FABRIS, *Veneta Auctoritate Notarius. Storia del notariato veneziano, 1514–1797*. Milano 1996, 1–19; cf. Linda GUZZETTI, *Venezianische Vermächtnisse. Die soziale und wirtschaftliche Situation von Frauen im Spiegel spätmittelalterlicher Testamente*. Stuttgart 1998, 18–28; Branka GRBAVAC, *Patrizierinnen in Zadar und Split. Ihr rechtlicher Status und ihr wirtschaftliches und religiöses Leben*, in Martha KEIL (ed.), *Besitz, Geschäfte und Frauenrechte. Jüdische und christliche Frauen in Dalmatien und Prag, 1300–1600*. Kiel 2011 esp. 50–65; and Valerija TURK-PRESEČKI, *Christliche und jüdische Frauen in Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft des mittelalterlichen Dubrovnik*, in ibidem, 98–156, esp. 115–36.

⁴⁰ The term "procura" signifies unilateral conferment of legal powers with or without explicit mandate(s) regarding the tasks of the appointed agent, attorney, or advocate, the so-called "procurator". These powers, if not assigned for a specified period of time or specific task, typically lasted until the death of one or both contracting parties or a new notarial act's stipulation stating otherwise. See Julia JUNGWIRTH, *Procurator*, in: Thomas OLECHOWSKI / Richard GAMAUF (eds.), *Studienwörterbuch Rechtsgeschichte und Römisches Recht*. Wien 2010, 375; *Procurator*, n., in OED Online, <<http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/151903>>, 18 July 2013; for the legal base according to Zadar's statutes, see Book II, Title IV, which contains 5 chapters, and Book II, Title V, which contains 11 chapters,

acted in their name.⁴¹ If either the Zadar archbishop or Nin bishop appeared in person, this indicated non-routine business, such as the alienation of a part of the archdiocese's immovable property or assessment of the size and income of the prebendary of a newly-appointed dignitary.⁴² In the mid-1550s, for instance, Johannes Thomaseus acted "as procurator and in the name of [...] the Rev. Lord Cornelio Pisauo", Zadar's archbishop. Johannes signed over a quarter of a stone house located in Zadar's parish of St. Catherine to the heirs of the "late Franciscus de Magistris of Pesaro [...], Dionora and Priuigna". In exchange, the two women consigned the archbishopric their half of a house in Zadar's parish of St Vitus, constructed of both stone and wood.⁴³

Zadar's Notaries and Urban Society

During the middle decades of the sixteenth century, roughly circumscribed by two Holy League-Ottoman Empire wars (1537 to 1540 and 1570 to 1573), Zadar was home to fifteen public notaries. The present survey is based on 6 422 individual notarial acts written between January 1540 and December 1569. Within this timeframe, all but two of the notaries were laymen, yet in 1 027 instances (or c. 16 percent) the acts were drawn up at the clergy's behest. As the numbers of acts are distributed quite unevenly, the five notaries whose client share exceeded this threshold of c. 16 percent are of particular interest. These were: Simon Budineus, a canon, who left a total of 827 individual acts, of which 346 (c. 42 percent) were written at the request of clergy members; Marcus Aurelius Sonzonius, a lawyer, 16 acts, 5 (c. 31 percent) written at clergy's request; Petrus de Bassano, another lawyer, 820 acts, 146 (c. 18 percent); Paulus de Sanctis, a cleric, 43 acts, 10 (c. 23 percent); and Simon Mazzarellus, a nobleman of Trogir and Zadar's communal chancellor, 438 acts, 130 (c. 29.5 percent). These five notaries combined were responsible for 637 out of the 1 027 individual acts (c. 62 percent) requested by members of the clergy. By comparison all other notaries had a much smaller ecclesiastical customer base. On average Zadar's other ten notaries managed to attract clergy members in only 390 instances (c. 38 percent).⁴⁴

in: Josip KOLANOVIĆ / Mate KRIŽMAN (eds.), *Zadarski statut sa svim reformacijama odnosno novim uredbama donesenima godine 1563*. Zagreb 1997, 146–160.

⁴¹ For a detailed case study, see SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 64–128.

⁴² This was the case, for example, after the appointment of the Venetian patrician "Marcus Loredan" to the bishopric of Nin in the early 1560s. Upon his designation he assigned "Dominicus Armanus, the "primicerius" of "Nin" the task of compiling a cadastre and producing an inventory of all immovable property, tithes, and other income of St Michael's convent of Pula, Istria. HR DAZD 31, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 488v, 12 February 1565 m.v. [1566] (my emphasis).

⁴³ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 1, c. 40v–c. 41r, 28 March 1554.

⁴⁴ See Stephan SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites in the Venetian Commonwealth. Social and Economic Mobility in Early Modern Dalmatia (Zadar / Zara, 1540 to 1570)*. Ph.Diss. University of Graz, 2011, 34–35, 269–293; SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 243f.

Table 1: Zadar's notaries and their clients (1540-1569).

<i>Notary</i>	<i>Years active</i>	<i>Total no. /acts</i>	<i>Requested by clergy</i>
Augustinus Martius	1540-52	90	7
Cornelius Constantius	1567-69	219	7
Daniel Cavalca	1551-66	1,367	136
Franciscus Thomaseus	1548-61	254	22
Gabriel Cernotta	1562-64	52	5
Horatius de Marchettis	1567-69	257	24
Johannes a Morea	1545-69	812	82
Johannes Mazzarellus	1540-54	284	28
Marcus Aurelius Sonzonius	1544-48	16	5
Nicolaus Canali	1558-69	118	5
Nicolaus Drasmileus	1540-66	825	74
Paulus de Sanctis	1545-51	43	10
Petrus de Bassano	1540-69	820	146
Simon Budineus	1556-65	827	346
Simon Mazzarellus	1555-67	438	130

Sources: HR DAZD 31 BZ; based on analysis of 6 422 individual acts; for additional information on the data see fn. 44.

The notary most favoured by clergy members was Simon or Simeon Budineus, also known under his Slavic name Šime Budinić. Born in Zadar in the early 1530s, he was one of the city's most prominent scions. Despite a ban on men of the cloth working as notaries since the papacy of Eugene IV (b. 1383, r. 1431-47),⁴⁵ Budineus spent at least a decade and a half working as a notary in Zadar before he went to Rome in the early 1580s. In Rome, he translated Counter-Reformation tracts and literature into his Slavic mother tongue and pioneered the use of certain diacritical signs (such as č and ž). While still in Zadar, he counted the city's archbishop and the bishop of Nin among his clients,⁴⁶ together with five of Zadar's eight monastic communities,⁴⁷ the representatives of a considerable number of parish churches, chapels, and hospitals, and a large

⁴⁵ Giorgio CRACCO, *Relinquere laicis e que laicorum sunt. Un'intervento di Eugenio IV contro i preti-notai di Venezia*, *Bollettino della Istituto di Storia e Società e dello Stato Veneziano* 3 (1961), 179-189.

⁴⁶ For example in autumn 1562, the archbishopric's leaseholder, "Pompeius de Soppe", one of the city's noblemen, re-leased part of the property located near the village of Divni to thirteen villagers. HR DAZD 31, BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 392v-c. 393r, 1 November 1562; HR DAZD 31 BZ, Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 5, c. 15r-c. 15v, 1 June 1557; Daniel Cavalca, I, 2, 2A, c. 46v-c. 48r, 9 January 1560 m.v. [1561].

⁴⁷ These were the convents of St Mary (Benedictines), St Catherine (Dominicans), St Demetrius (Dominicans), St Nicholas (Franciscans / Poor Clares), and St Marcella (Poor Clares). HR DAZD 31, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 390r-c. 390v, 26 October 1562 (four individual deeds); Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 391r, 27 October 1562.

number of individual clergy members not only from within the city's jurisdiction but also from elsewhere in the Venetian Adriatic region.⁴⁸

The Metropolitan Chapter and Zadar's Society

In general the activities of metropolitan chapter members were comparable to those of its secular counterparts: they administered the archbishopric's real estate, appointed representatives to deal with issues such as petitioning officials in Rome or Venice, and engaged in other commercial activities. In the mid-1540s, for instance, "Johannes Mazzarellus", a nobleman of Trogir and the communal chancellor of Zadar, and Johannes Thomaseus, the aforementioned canon and member of the metropolitan chapter, together approached notary Paulus de Sanctis, a kinsman of Sanctus de Sanctis, also a member of Zadar's chapter. Together, Mazzarellus and Thomaseus leased the right to collect "all fruits, revenues, and income" from the archbishopric within the city's jurisdiction. In addition, they leased the right to collect the Church's tithes – a tenth of its subjects' income – within the jurisdictions of Zadar and neighbouring Pag for a three-year period, in exchange for an annual payment of 620 Venetian ducats.⁴⁹ A month later, the two men concluded another business agreement in front of the same notary. They made "the Rev. Johannes Barbiricich, a priest of Zadar, their partner" and allowed him to join their tax-farming enterprise. Both the contracts had identical clauses, with one exception: instead of the annual payment of 620 ducats stipulated in the first contract, the new third business partner agreed to pay a surcharge of 15 ducats, raising the annual rent to 635 ducats.⁵⁰

A similar transaction took place a few years later when, in the spring of 1551, "archdeacon Hieronymus de Cortesijs, Johannes Thomaseus, and Paulus de Sanctis junior, all canons of the metropolitan cathedral of St Anastasia", leased the archdiocese's property in and near the hamlet of Miljačka to "Petrus Sterpacnich" and his absent brother, "Marcus." The three canons invoked a "special mandate to act on behalf of the other members of the chapter" and transferred the rights to use and cultivation of the land for four years. As part of the property was undeveloped, the tenants were not required to consign special gifts, so-called *honorantiae*, usually due on feast days

⁴⁸ Simon Budineus first appears in the notarial records in the first half of 1557; the last preserved act he wrote dates from late June 1565 (although he is mentioned as a contracting party as late as 1569). HR DAZD 31 BZ, Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 5, c. 15r-c. 15v, 1 June 1557; Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, s.p., 29 June 1565; Horatius de Marchettis, I, 2, fol. 4v, 3 January 1568 m.v. [1569]. Biographical information in Milan MOGUŠ, *A History of the Croatian Language. Towards a Common Standard*. Zagreb 1995, 77f.; Josip VIDAKOVIĆ, *Cultural-Political History of Zadar with Emphasis on History of Printing Books and Script*, in: Zdenka BOLANČA (ed.), *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference of Printing, Design and Graphic Communications* Blaž Borović, Zadar 26-29 Sept. 2007. Zagreb 2007, 15-18, 16f.; RAUKAR et al., *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, 413-416.

⁴⁹ HR DADZ 31 BZ, Paulus de Sanctis, I, 1, fol. 1r-fol. 1v, 10 May 1545.

⁵⁰ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Paulus de Sanctis, I, 1, fol. 2r-fol. 2v, 14 June 1545.

such as Christmas, Fat Tuesday, and Easter.⁵¹ And as in the other instance, the chapter members conducted this business with a familiar notary, Franciscus Thomaseus, the brother of Johannes.⁵²

Another transaction, this time from the late 1550s, was very similar. This involved a rental contract in which "Marcus Loredan, bishop of Nin and general representative" of Zadar's archbishop Muzio Calino, leased "all and every income of the archbishopric of Zadar ... for three years" to Johannes Thomaseus and his brother Franciscus. This included the right to collect tithes in both Zadar's and neighbouring Pag's jurisdiction. While the conditions and the duration of this contract were basically identical to the previous one, the price had gone up: instead of 620 or 635 ducats, the two brothers agreed to the annual sum of 800 ducats, payable in cash in two instalments, one due on 1 April, the other at the end of July. In addition, the two tenants were to be given "nine barrels of wine belonging to the archbishopric", to be returned at the end of the rental contract (the reason for this additional clause was not specified).⁵³

The Institutional and Legislative Context

To understand the significance of these transactions, it is important to address the laws and customs governing urban communities in the Venetian Adriatic region in general and Zadar in particular. Once incorporated into the *Stato da mar*, the various cities tried to conserve as much of their different legislative heritages as possible. For the most part Venice left the pre-existing normative, political, and social order as it was, but it did amend individual statutes to serve its own interests. As suggested, these included use of its overseas dominions as a buffer zone against the republic's enemies, which, beginning in the 1420s mainly but not exclusively meant the Ottoman Empire. The coastal communities also served as ports of call for the Venetian state-run commercial convoy system called *mude*, where Venice's galleys spent more time than in 'foreign' ports.⁵⁴ The Republic of St Mark consequently treated challenges involving the safety

and security of these shipping routes as a top priority (we can observe a reflection of this in the remnants of large, at times over-sized fortifications in the former *Stato da mar*).⁵⁵ Typically these challenges resulted in changes to the cities' own laws, thus resulting in the integration of some of the issues discussed here into the larger context of the Venetian state as whole. Among these issues were, for instance, citizenship and the right of appeal to higher courts in Venice proper.⁵⁶

Zadar's statutes provided the legal framework within which its urban society operated. Articles detailing rules and regulations were of particular importance as they set the conditions in which the clergy – again understood in the sense of both people and institutions – operated. The foundation of the Church's power was a clause explicitly forbidding the alienation of ecclesiastical property (which was not subject to Venetian changes after 1409).⁵⁷ While these clauses may seem anachronistic at first glance, there is much more to them than meets the eye. During the 1550s and early 1560s Zadar's statutes were reviewed and amended, a process that eventually resulted in the formal promulgation of an 'official' edition in 1563, printed in Venice in 1564. It included both the city's medieval body of law (organised in five books containing a total number of 430 chapters) as well as a total number of 160 amendments, so-called *Reformationes*. Nowhere in the latter is there any reference invalidating the afore-mentioned clauses about the alienation of ecclesiastical property, which the Venetian governors surely could have included. And while there is the possibility that these rules were mostly dead letters no longer in use by the sixteenth century, the notarial records provide ample evidence that, at least during the three decades between 1540 and 1569, these stipulations were mostly observed. Out of a total number of 1 067 individual sales contracts (*emptio*), only 39 (or c. 3.5 percent of the total) were sold by members of the clergy.⁵⁸ As this small number included both *legal* as well as *natural* persons, a qualification is needed.

⁵⁵ See ŽMEGAČ, Bastioni jadranske Hrvatske; on Zadar's fortifications, incl. figures about projects that were never built, MOCELLIN, La città fortificata di Zara dal XV al XVI sec., *Atti e Memorie della Società Dalmata di Storia Patria* 15 (1992), no. 4, 9-68.

⁵⁶ COZZI, Ambiente veneziano, 307f.; COZZI, Il dominio da mar, in: Gaetano COZZI / Michael KNAPTON, La Repubblica di Venezia nell'età moderna, vol. 1: Dalla guerra di Chioggia al 1517. Torino 1986, 195-204, 199; KREKIĆ, Developed Autonomy, 196f.; MALZ, Die dalmatinische Städtewelt, 114f.; Maja NOVAK-SAMBRILLO, O autonomiji dalmatinskih komuna pod Venecijom, *Radovi JAZU-Zd* 11-12 (1965), 11-131, 125; Ivan PEDERIN, Mletakča uprava, privreda i politika u Dalmaciji (1409-1797). Dubrovnik 1990, 15; RAUKAR et al., Zadar pod mletakom učpravom, 369; SCHMITT, Südosteuropa, 90-100; see also the legal base according to Zadar's statutes, Ref. 81, 82, and 97, in: KOLANOVIĆ / KRIŽMAN (eds.), Zadarski statut, 576, 586.

⁵⁷ This particular clause contains a single article stating "what once God has given, let no man transfer to anyone else". Book III, Title VII, "De rebus Ecclesiae non alienandis", in KOLANOVIĆ / KRIŽMAN (eds.), Zadarski statut, 268; cf. the amendments on 521-676.

⁵⁸ Analysis based on 1 067 individual sales contracts ("emptio") concerning the transfer of real estate in Zadar's jurisdictions outside the city walls ("contado"); cf. SANDER-FAES, Urban Elites, 143-150; additional data available in SANDER-FAES, Urban Elites, 269, 275-280.

⁵¹ These gifts typically included small livestock such as piglets, roosters, and young lambs, which had to be handed over according to the relevant clauses of the property transaction. MAYHEW, Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule, 231; Šime PERIČIĆ, Prilog poznavanju agrarnih odnosa u mletačkoj Dalmaciji, *Radovi HAZU u Zadru* 34 (1992), 135-159, 153.

⁵² HR DAZD 31 BZ, Franciscus Thomaseus, I, 2, fol. 8v, 15 May 1551.

⁵³ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 1, c. 24r-c. 24v, 8 January 1557 m.v. [1558].

⁵⁴ ARBEL, Colonie d'oltremare, 976-979; DOUMERC, Dominio del mare, passim; Bernard DOUMERC, La crise structurelle de la marine vénétienne au XV^e siècle. Le problème du retard des *mude*, *Annales E.S.C.* 40 (1985), no. 3, 605-623; Bernard DOUMERC / C. Judde de LARIVIÈRE, Le rôle du patriciat dans la gestion des galères marchandes à Venise au début du seizième siècle, *Studi veneziani* N. S. 36 (1998), 57-84; Elena FASANO GUARINI, Au seizième siècle. Comment naviguaient les galères, *Annales E.S.C.* 16 (1961), 279-296; Doris STÖCKLY, Le système de l'Incanto des galées du marché à Venise. Fin XIII^e et XV^e siècle. Leiden 1995; THIRIET, Romanie vénétienne, 303-349; Ugo TUCCI, Sur la pratique vénétienne de la navigation au XVI^e siècle, *Annales E.S.C.* 13 (1958), 349-448.

Of these 39 instances, the overwhelming majority were individuals (30 instances or *c.* 3 percent of the total) and thus cannot be assumed to have sold Church property. In turn this means that ecclesiastical institutions sold property in only nine cases (or slightly more than *c.* 0.5 percent of the total).⁵⁹ Inside the city walls the picture is roughly comparable. Of a total number of 255 property sales (*emptio*) 27 (or *c.* 10.5 percent) were sold by members of the clergy, and of these 27 instances, only nine (or *c.* 3 percent of the total) were actually sold by ecclesiastical institutions.⁶⁰

These reservations aside, however, this did not render it impossible to *lease*, *grant*, or otherwise temporarily *transfer* real estate to individuals and institutions alike. As the statutes did not limit this possibility to temporal matters, Zadar's ecclesiastical institutions could publicly auction their property for tax collecting purposes, conditioned only on the financial possibilities enjoyed by the various tenants and, for temporal actors only, buyers.⁶¹ The remaining relevant clauses in the city's statutes deal with 'technical' issues such as the landlord's share of the harvest (usually between a quarter and half of the crop), dates of remittance, and reimbursement in cases of natural disasters or hostile incursions.⁶² This is supported by two more sets of data. First, planting concessions or land grants (*concessio* or *pastinatio*), of which a total of 478 individual contracts were written by Zadar's notaries between 1540 and 1569. Both the urban nobility and the clergy dominated this segment of the property market, with the former conceding or granting their property in 198 instances (or *c.* 41.5 percent of the total) compared to the

⁵⁹ Of these only St Mary's in Zadar's suburbs appears twice as the seller; all other institutions – the convents of the Benedictines, Dominicans, and Franciscans – appear only once. HR DAZD 31 BZ, Johannes a Morea, I, 1, 4, fol. 18r–fol. 18v, 26 February 1551 m.v. [1552]; Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 2, c. 11r–c. 11v, 10 January 1556 m.v. [1557]; Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 5, c. 2r, 23 April 1557; Daniel Cavalca, I, 1, 5, c. 15r–c. 15v, 11 June 1557; Johannes a Morea, I, 1, 4, f. 149rv, 18 June 1557; Nicolaus Canalis, I, 1, 1, c. 3r–c. 3v, 13 February 1558 m.v. [1559]; Simon Budineus, I, 1, 3, c. 170r, 28 March 1558; Nicolaus Drasmileus, I, 2, 2, f. 15r–f. 15v, 12 March 1564; and Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 476v, 18 December 1564.

⁶⁰ Analysis based on 255 individual sales contracts ("emptio") concerning the transfer of real estate within Zadar's city walls; cf. SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 198–203; additional data available in SANDER[-FAES], *Urban Elites*, 289–293. Of these the Dominicans sold property in six instances; the St Lazarus' Hospital, the Benedictines, and St John's in the suburbs one plot each. HR DAZD 31 BZ, Johannes Mazzarellus, I, 2, 1, f. 18v–f. 19r, 22 August 1540; Petrus de Bassano, I, 1, 8, f. 40v, 12 August 1542; Nicolaus Drasmileus, I, 1, E, s.p., 21 October 1542; Petrus de Bassano, I, 1, 10, f. 26r–f. 26v, 12 February 1544 m.v. [1545]; Simon Budineus, I, 1, 5, c. 256r, 17 June 1560; Simon Budineus, I, 1, 1, c. 31r–c. 31v, 25 February 1557 m.v. [1558]; Simon/Johannes? Mazzarellus, I, 1, 9, s.p., 6 September 1561; Johannes a Morea, I, 1, 5, f. 39r–f. 39v, 13 May 1562; Gabriel Cernotta, I, 1, 5, f. 15r–f. 16r, 28 June 1562; and Daniel Cavalca, I, 2, 6, s.p., 2 June 1565.

⁶¹ See Book III, Title IX, chapters 32 and 33, which provide the legislative framework for such public auctions. KOLANOVIĆ/KRIŽMAN (eds.), *Zadarski statut*, 278–284.

⁶² See Book III, Title XVI, "De locatione et omnium rerum stabiliū, mobiliū et se moventium et operarum omnium personarum"; and title XVII, "De iure emphiteotico seu de iure quod acquiritur danti et recipienti possessiones aliquas ad pastinandum", in: *ibidem*, 310–332.

latter's 134 instances (or *c.* 28 percent). Of these 134 contracts, however, three quarters came from ecclesiastical institutions.⁶³ Second, rental contracts (*locatio*), of which a total of 226 individual contracts were stipulated in the same time period. In terms of land ownership the picture here is quite similar with the nobility renting their property in 104 instances (or *c.* 46 percent of the total) and the clergy doing so in 61 instances (or *c.* 27 percent) of the cases. Only 8 of these 61 contracts were written at the request of individuals – which means that the proportion of property-owning ecclesiastical institutions is even larger than in the first data set (57 institutions or *c.* 87 percent).⁶⁴

Ecclesiastical institutions were *legal* persons and they thus had to rely on appointed representatives in order to conduct their business. In the section on *procuratores*, the statutes provided a highly detailed framework. Two of the more important stipulations were that appointees had to be at least twenty years old and that sons could represent anyone, even without the consent of their fathers. It is interesting that the statutes are silent with respect to the problem of what we presently label 'conflict of interest'⁶⁵ – and this despite members of Zadar's ecclesiastical institutions frequently conducted their business in front of notaries to whom they were related. For example, in the protocol books of Franciscus Thomaseus, the metropolitan chapter twice appears as the constituent party. On both occasions the chapter was represented by one of its members, once by Antonius Mirchouich, and in the other instance by the notary's brother, Johannes Thomaseus.⁶⁶ At one point the chapter approached notary Horatius de Marchettis, the kinsman of canon Matthaeus de Marchettis.⁶⁷ Likewise, notary Paulus de Sanctis, related to canon and member of the metropolitan chapter Sanctus de Sanctis, wrote four contracts involving members of the metropolitan chapter, once having been approached by the archbishop himself.⁶⁸

Such tensions are even more clearly visible in the protocol books of the notary most favoured by his fellow clergyman, Simon Budineus. Members of the metropolitan

⁶³ Analysis based on 478 individual land grants (*concessio* or *pastinatio*) concerning the temporary transfer of real estate to farmers and labourers within Zadar's jurisdiction ("contado"); cf. SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 150–156; additional data available in SANDER[-FAES], *Urban Elites*, 281–285.

⁶⁴ Analysis based on 226 individual rental agreements ("locatio") concerning the temporary transfer of real estate to farmers and labourers in exchange for cash payment within Zadar's jurisdiction ("contado"); cf. SANDER-FAES, *Urban Elites*, 156–163; additional data available in SANDER[-FAES], *Urban Elites*, 285–289.

⁶⁵ See Book II, Title V, "De procuratoribus seu per quas personas maiores annis viginti possunt in placitis interesse", which contains eleven chapters, and ref. 97, "De appellationibus", in: KOLANOVIĆ/KRIŽMAN (eds.), *Zadarski statut*, 150–160, 586.

⁶⁶ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Franciscus Thomaseus, I, 1, 2, fol. 39v, fol. 39v, 10 January 1550 m.v. [1551]; Franciscus Thomaseus, I, 1, 2, fol. 8v, 15 March 1551.

⁶⁷ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Horatius de Marchettis, I, 1, 3, c. 2r–c. 2v, 7 November 1568.

⁶⁸ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Paulus de Sanctis, I, 1, fol. 1r–fol. 1v, 9 December 1556; I, 1, 1, fol. 12r–fol. 12v, 18 September 1548 (Archbishop Cornelio Pisaurio); I, 1, fol. 24r, 21 February 1551 m.v. [1552]; and I, 1, fol. 28r, 16 October 1551.

Table 2: Institutional clients of Zadar's notaries (1540-1569).

No.	Multiple constituents	Nonrecurring constituents
17	Convent of St Chrysogonus OSB, Zadar	Abbey of St Michael, Preko
8	Convent of St Mary OSB, Zadar	Bishopric of Nin
7	Abbey of Sts Cosmas & Damian, Rogovo Convent of St Dominic OP, Zadar	Cathedral of St Anastasia, Zadar St Marcus Chapel, Zadar's suburbs
6	Archbishopric of Zadar Convent of St Demetrius OP, Zadar	St Peter's Chapel, Petrčane Church of St Euphemia, Preko
5	College of St Simeon/ Mary of the Priests	Church of St Stephen, Zadar
4	Abbey of St Ambrosius, Nin	Convent of St Catherine OSB, Zadar
3	Convent of St John TOR, Zadar Metropolitan chapter, Zadar Convent of St Nicholas OSC, Zadar	Convent of St Macedonius, Nicosia Fraternity St Mary's Fraterniy, Zadar
2	Convent of St Marcella OSC, Zadar Church of St Elija, Zadar Convent of St Francis OSF, Zadar	

Sources: HR DAZD 31 BZ; based on analysis of 1027 individual acts; see fn. 44. OSB = Order of St Benedict; OP = Order of Preachers; TOR = Third Order Regulars; OSC = Order of St Catherine; OSF = Order of St Francis.

chapter approached him on 10 separate occasions.⁶⁹ Zadar's archbishopric appears six times and even the office-holder himself, archbishop Muzio Calino, thrice.⁷⁰ In addition, the bishop of Nin, Marcus Loredan, was a client of Simon Budineus on one occasion, the bishopric itself being a client on three occasions.⁷¹ Along with these high-ranking

⁶⁹ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 1, c. 14v-c. 15r, 9 December 1556 (Franciscus, Johannes Thomaseus); I, 1, 1, c. 39r, 16 March 1557 (Sanctus de Sanctis); I, 1, 1, c. 46r-c. 46v, 30 April 1557 (Franciscus, Johannes Thomaseus); I, 1, 2, c. 63v-c. 64r, 20 July 1557 (Sanctus de Sanctis); I, 1, 2, c. 67v, August 7, 1557 (Sanctus de Sanctis); I, 1, 2, c. 71v-c. 72r, 20 August 1557 (Franciscus, Johannes Thomaseus); I, 1, 2, c. 93r, 29 January 1558 m.v. [1559] (Sanctus de Sanctis); I, 1, 3, c. 112v, 18 April 1558 (metropolitan chapter), I, 1, 3, c. 128r, 5 June 1558 (Vincentius de Ventura); I, 1, 6, c. 375r-c. 375v, 25 June 1562 (metropolitan chapter represented by Zadar's archdeacon "Johannes Baptista de Benedictis"); I, 1, 6, c. 397r-c. 397v, 30 December 1563 (metropolitan chapter represented by "Johannes Barbirich").

⁷⁰ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 2, c. 75v, 3 October 1557; I, 1, 2, c. 88v-c. 88r, 12 January 1558 m.v. [1559]; I, 1, 4, c. 236v-c. 238r, 17 April 1560; I, 1, 6, c. 355r-c. 355v, 5 April 1562; I, 1, 6, c. 392v-c. 393r, 1 November 1562; I, 1, 6, c. 366v, 25 May 1562 (all deeds noting the archbishopric as constituent party); I, 1, 1, c. 24r-c. 24v, 15 January 1557 m.v. [1558]; I, 1, 1, c. 24v-c. 25r, 15 January 1557 m.v. [1558]; I, 1, 1, c. 32v, 18 February 1557 m.v. [1558] (Muzio Calino in person).

⁷¹ HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 2, c. 84v-c. 85r, 22 December 1557 ("Johannes Barbirich" as the bishop's representative); I, 1, 2, c. 85r-c. 85v, 29 December 1558 (Marcus Loredan in person); I, 1, 6, c. 365r-c. 365v, 19 May 1562 (the bishopric of Nin).

Church members, Simon Budineus was also the preferred notary for Zadar's monastic congregations (see Table 2), attracting both institutions and a relatively large number of men and women of the cloth, irrespective of their geographical provenance, monastic affiliation, or social descent.⁷²

Conclusion

The clergy of Zadar played a prominent role in the city's economic, political, and social fabric around the middle decades of the sixteenth century both on an individual and institutional level. Under the Venetian administration, Zadar was home to eight monastic congregations and to the Franciscan lay communities (Third Order Regulars). It was also the seat of a catholic archdiocese and housed the bishop of neighbouring Nin. In this context, the relationship between Zadar's clergy and the various actors of its urban society is in particular need of detailed study – research facilitated by the fact that many of the more important members of the clergy belonged to the upper social strata and can thus be identified with relative ease. As far as notarial sources are concerned, members of the clergy can be identified through terminological markers such as "Reverend" or "venerable"; typically individuals are referred to according to their education, function, or ecclesiastical role, e.g., as canons, clerics, deacons, archbishops, fathers, sisters, brothers, and vicars. In addition, the most prominent individuals are also referred to via their family relations. Taken together, the contents of the notarial instruments allow a reconstruction of the relationships between ecclesiastical individuals and institutions on the one hand and the rest of Zadar's society on the other.

Thus far, analysis of primary sources from the city's notarial records has yielded the following results. Apart from differences stemming from ecclesiastical duties, the activities and interactions of the ecclesiastical institutions, the individuals that represented them, and the individual men and women of the cloth did not differ fundamentally from those within the rest of society. As was the case with high-ranking secular counterparts, both the archbishop of Zadar and the bishop of Nin only rarely appeared in person. Depending on one or another transaction's importance, these high-ranking dignitaries did occasionally attend their business in person. For the most part, however,

⁷² Other than Zadar's monastic communities and many of its parish churches, Simon Budineus' customers included, among others, St Ambrose monastery, Nin (4 times), HR DAZD 31 BZ, Simon Budineus, I, 1, 6, c. 308r-c. 308v, 26 April 1561; c. 312r-c. 312v, 10 May 1561; c. 334v, 26 October 1561; c. 484r-c. 484v, 22 January 1565 m.v. [1566]; Sts Cosmas and Damian monastery, Rogovo (6 instances): I, 1, 3, c. 153r, 15 October 1558; I, 1, 6, c. 463v, 13 September 1564; c. 469v-c. 470r, 17 October 1564; c. 470v-c. 471r, 20 October 1564; c. 471v, 31 October 1564; c. 501v-c. 502r, 31 May 1565; the chapel of St Marcus in the suburbs, St Peter, Petrčane, St Euphemia, Preko, and St Michael monastery, Preko (once each), in the order of their listing: I, 1, 3, c. 175v, 5 March 1559; I, 1, 6, c. 389v, 26 October 1562; I, 1, 6, c. 461r-c. 461v, 21 August 1564; I, 1, 6, c. 451v-c. 452r, 25 April 1564; yet there were also individuals such as "Angelus Bassano", brother of Zadar-based notary Petrus and abbot of Šibenik's St Michael monastery; I, 1, 6, c. 441r, 7 January 1564 m.v. [1565].

either their chapters or one or more representatives acting in their name represented them. Nevertheless, many notarial acts offer clues regarding the positions and dealings of the metropolitan chapter's members, and in their activities these individuals often crossed the boundaries separating kinship or personal relations from their roles within the ecclesiastical and secular institutions with which they were affiliated.

ABSTRACT

Zadars Notaries as Intermediarys

This essay examines the roles of notaries as intermediaries between the ecclesiastical and temporal spheres in Zadar, then the capital of Venice's Adriatic possessions. My focus is on the economic and social relationships between notaries and urban society during the middle of the century. The essay's main emphasis is not on the city's archbishops, exclusively Venetian patricians as they were, but instead on notaries and their ecclesiastical customers. By utilising the rich archival holdings of the Croatian State Archives in Zadar, I investigate the interactions of members of the cathedral chapter and examine their membership status, economic activities, and their formal and informal processes of exchange, as well as various linkages between these functionaries and the city's inhabitants.