

Georg Christ, Franz-Julius Morche, Roberto Zaugg
Wolfgang Kaiser, Stefan Burkhardt, Alexander D. Beihammer (eds.)

Union in Separation

Diasporic Groups and Identities
in the Eastern Mediterranean (1100-1800)

viella

Catalan quasi-monopoly, the opportunities presented by the Venetian markets but also the hunger for grain of the Barbary Coast, Egypt and Syria created favourable conditions for the Venetian implantation. In fact, the Valier company's business activity seems globally compatible with the Sicilian economy, more so from the point of view of the Sicilian monarchs and barons than from that of the towns who blamed the foreign exporters for starving them.. The letters portray Sicily's growing importance in Venetian trade in the second half of the fifteenth century. Despite this, the Venetian "diaspora", which barely exceeded more than several dozen, was integrated only to a low degree. The example of the Valier brothers clarifies this feature of Venetian expatriate merchant life in light of the strategies adopted by other merchant "nations", such as the Tuscans who were deeply immersed in Palermo and Messina, or the Genoese. Venice remained the focus of their personal life; their emotional ties – their family and permanent residence – were to Venice. Neither Matteo Valier nor his brother, both unmarried, were interested in the advantages that a Sicilian marriage or citizenship could offer. In their exile psychology, Sicilian residence gave the appearance of permanency but it did not extend beyond their youth or years of professional training. The Valier brothers may have made a limited investment in Sicilian society, but their success lay in their ability to effectively target the inner workings of the Sicilian economic apparatus to access the resources they needed for their business.

STEPHAN SANDER-FAES

Merchants of the Adriatic: Zadar's Trading Community around the Mid-Sixteenth Century*

1. Introduction

The present contribution focuses on the merchants, spice traders, and businessmen of Zadar (Zara) between the two wars of the "Holy Leagues" against the Ottoman Empire during the 16th century.¹ The merchants, spice traders, and retailers of central Dalmatia, then part of Venice's maritime state along the Eastern shores of the Adriatic, are at the centre of the argument. How large was the trading community which lived between the frontiers of both Latin Europe and the Ottoman Empire? Where did these individuals originate from geographically as well as in terms of allegiance? What did they do with the revenues they generated, where did they invest them? The chapter also pays special attention to ensuing questions as regards both their legal as well as social status.

For this survey, focused on Zadar and its jurisdiction between 1540 and 1569, the protocol books of fifteen then-present notaries have been analysed.² The

* This article was written and consigned to the editors before the publication of the author's monograph, *Urban Elites of Zadar: Dalmatia and the Venetian Commonwealth, 1540 to 1569* (Rome: Viella, 2013), which is the reason why some references may appear slightly outdated.

1. Given Dalmatia's history after the demise of the Republic of St. Mark, nationalistic ends often – and on both shores – sought to justify the writing of differing histories of the Adriatic and, with notably few exceptions, only a small number of post-nationalistic approaches to its early modern history exist. Cf. Tomislav Raukar, "Komunalna društva u Dalmaciji u XIV. stoljeću [Commune Societies in Dalmatia in the 14th century]", in *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku* [Studies about Dalmatia in the Middle Ages], ed. by Tomislav Raukar (Split: Književni Krug, 2007), pp. 69-139, here p. 78. Further bibliographical references can be found in *Hrvatska povijest srednjeg vijeka* [The History of Croatia in the Middle Ages], ed. by Neven Budak and Tomislav Raukar (Zagreb: Školska Knjiga, 2006), pp. 428-432. All homonyms quoted directly from the primary sources are spelled as they appear, names in the secondary sources are reproduced as they appear; all toponyms are given in their present form to facilitate finding them on a contemporary map.

2. The present survey is based upon the protocols of the following individuals, preserved in the *Državni arhiv u Zadru* (DAZd, Croatian State Archive), *Spisi zadarskih bilježnika* (SZB, Notarial Manuscripts from Zadar): Augustinus Martius (AM, active from 1540-1551), Cornelius Constantius (CC, 1567-1569), Daniel Cavalca (DC, 1551-1566), Franciscus Thomaseus (FT, 1548-1561), Gabriel Cernotta (GC, 1562-1564), Horatius de Marchettis (HM, 1567-1569), Johannes a Morea (JM, 1545-1569), Johannes Michael Mazzarellus (JMM, 1540-1554), Marcus Aurelius Sonzonius (MAS, 1544-1548), Nicolaus Canali (NC, 1558-1567), Nicolaus Dras-

sources, preserved in the local branch of the Croatian State Archives, contain a wide variety of notarial instruments.³ In their form, the surveyed notarial acts – procuratorial appointments, real estate transactions, marriage contracts as well as wills and testaments – are comparable to those found elsewhere in Italy and the wider Mediterranean,⁴ enabling broad comparisons with similar urban societies.⁵ While the following analysis rests primarily on these unpublished sources, the survey also makes use of two already-published bodies of material, the *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae* and the *Statuta Iadertina*. The former are the *relazioni* written by Venice's legates, civilian and military officials serving in her Adriatic dominions.⁶ The latter is Zadar's communal statutory body of law, for-

mileus (ND, 1540-1566), Petrus de Bassano (PB, 1540-1569), Paulus de Sanctis (PS, 1545-1551), Simon Budineus (SB, 1556-1565), and Simon Mazzarellus (SM, 1555-1567). Hence DAZd, SZB, and the respective notary's name(s) are abbreviated.

3. *Pregled arhivskim fondova i zbirki republike Hrvatske* [Overview of the Archival Collections and Manuscripts in the Republic of Croatia], ed. by Josip Kolanović, 2 vols. (Zagreb: Hrvatski državni arhiv, 2006-2007), here vol. 1, pp. 881-884.

4. Cf. Branka Grbavac, "Testamentary Bequests of Urban Noblewomen on the Eastern Adriatic Coast in the Fourteenth Century: The Case of Zadar", in *Across the Religious Divide: Women, Property, and Law in the wider Mediterranean, 1300-1800*, ed. by Jutta G. Sperling and Shona Kelly Wray (London-New York: Routledge, 2010), pp. 67-80, here p. 68-69, who refers to Milan von Šufflay, *Die Dalmatinische Privaturkunde* (Vienna: Gerold, 1904), and Linda Guzzetti, *Venezianische Vermächtnisse: Die soziale und wirtschaftliche Situation von Frauen im Spiegel spätmittelalterlicher Testamente* (Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler, 1998). For the more technical aspects of the notaries of Venice proper during the 14th and 15th centuries see Maria Pedani Fabris, "*Veneta Auctoritate Notarius*": *Storia del Notariato Veneziano, 1514-1797* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1996), especially pp. 1-19.

5. E.g. Diane Owen Hughes, "Domestic Ideals and Social Behavior: Evidence from Medieval Genoa", in *The Family in History: Lectures given in Memory of Stephen A. Kaplan under the Auspices of the Department of History at the University of Pennsylvania*, ed. by Charles E. Rosenberg (Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975), pp. 115-43; Zdenka Janeković-Römer, *Maruša ili suđenje ljubavi: Bračno-ljubavna priča srednjovjekovnog Dubrovnika* [Maruša or Trial of Love: A Marital Love Story from Medieval Dubrovnik] (Zagreb: Algoritam, 2008), Ead., *Rod i grad: Dubrovačko obitelj od XIII do XV stoljeća* [Kinship and the City: Dubrovnik's Families from the 13th to the 15th Centuries] (Dubrovnik: Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti u Zagrebu, 1994); Bariša Krekić, *Unequal Rivals: Essays on Relations between Dubrovnik and Venice in the 13th and 14th centuries* (Zagreb: Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti u Dubrovniku, 2007). On Venice proper start with John Martin and Dennis Romano, "Reconsidering Venice", in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City State, 1297-1797*, ed. by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 1-35; recent studies include Jutta G. Sperling, *Convents and the Body Politic in late Renaissance Venice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), and Mary Laven, *Virgins of Venice: Broken Vows and Cloistered Lives in the Renaissance* (New York: Viking, 2003). However, the most problematic aspects of recent historiography pertaining to Dalmatia's past is that those (admittedly few) theses and dissertations written by younger scholars are usually published in their mother tongues only, thus inaccessible to most Western historians. The references above can thus be only considered indicative, not all-encompassing.

6. First editions were published by Simeon (or Šime) Ljubić, one of the most eminent 19th-century scholars of medieval Croatia, under the auspices of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences. His work was continued by Grga Novak in the 1960s and 1970s. The present survey uses information contained in vols. 1-3 which include reports written by Zadar's counts and captains

formally adopted together with the Amendments introduced by the Republic of St. Mark in 1563 and printed in Venice in the subsequent year.⁷

With the exception of the period from 1358 to 1409,⁸ most coastal communities of medieval and early modern Dalmatia were under Venetian suzerainty.⁹ Over the course of the 15th century the Republic of St. Mark re-acquired the majority of cities, towns, and their respective jurisdictions, followed by their integration into the larger framework of her maritime possessions in the Eastern Mediterranean.¹⁰ In general these urban societies were embedded within the larger administrative, legislative, and structural context of Venice's dominions in both the Italian *Terraferma* as well as her maritime state, also known as *Oltremare* or *Stato da mar*.¹¹ The city of Zadar, dubbed "*metropoli et chiave di quella provintia*",¹² became the nominal capital of the Venetian Adriatic dual province encompassing possessions

as well as more general overviews by Venetian legates responsible for the entirety of her Adriatic possessions. *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, ed. by Simeon Ljubić, 3 vols. (Zagreb: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1876-1880).

7. Written mostly in Latin, some of the amended parts, the so-called *Reformationes*, were drawn up in the 16th-century Venetian vernacular. The statutes were edited and annotated with a critical apparatus in the late 1990s; it also contains references to other editions of communal law compilations in Dalmatia: *Zadarski statut sa svim reformacijama odnosno novim uredbama donesenima do godine 1563* [Zadar's Statute with all the Reforms and new Regulations adopted by the Year 1563], ed. by Josip Kolanović and Mate Križman (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), especially p. 9-26.

8. On the Hungarian suzerainty cf. Pál Engel, Gyula Kristó, and András Kubinyi, *Histoire de la Hongrie médiévale: Des Angevins aux Habsbourgs* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008), pp. 62-64, and Pál Engel, *The Realm of St Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526* (London: Tauris, 2001), pp. 161-167.

9. More recently Gherardo Ortalli, "Beyond the Coast – Venice and the Western Balkans: The Origins of a Long Relationship", in *Balcani occidentali, Adriatico e Venezia fra XIII e XVIII secolo/Der westliche Balkan, der Adria-raum und Venedig (13.-18. Jahrhundert)*, ed. by Gherardo Ortalli and Oliver J. Schmitt (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), pp. 9-25. Only few accounts on Croatian history in Western languages exist and among the most recent is Tomislav Raukar, "Croatia within Europe", in *Croatia and Europe*, vol. 2: *Culture, Arts and Sciences: Croatia in the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. by Ivo Supičić (London: Wilson, 2008), pp. 7-40, but follow also the references given in Grbavac, "Testamentary Bequests", pp. 67-68.

10. On Venice's maritime state after the Peace of Turin (1382) see Benjamin Arbel, "Colonie d'oltremare", in *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 5: *Il Rinascimento: Società ed Economia*, ed. by Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), pp. 947-985, and Bernard Doumerc, "Il dominio del mare", in *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 5: *Il Rinascimento: Società ed Economia*, ed. by Alberto Tenenti and Ugo Tucci (Rome: Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996), pp. 113-180.

11. For the legislative aspects of Venetian rule in both her dominion on the *terraferma* as well as in the *stato da mar* Gaetano Cozzi, *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente veneto: Saggi su politica, società, cultura nella Repubblica di Venezia in età moderna* (Venice: Marsilio, 1997), p. 292; on Istria Egidio Ivetić, *Oltremare: L'Istria nell'ultimo dominio veneto* (Venice: Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, 2000), pp. 21-47; on Dalmatia cf. the introduction in Vjekoslav Maštrović, *Razvoj sudstva u Dalmaciji u XIX. stoljeću* [The Development of the Juridical System in Dalmatia in the 19th century] (Zadar: Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, 1959), pp. 11-17.

12. Described as such in 1553 by Venice's syndic, Antonio Diedo, in his report to the Senate; quoted in *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae: Tomus 3: Annorum 1553-1571*, ed. by Simeon Ljubić (Zagreb: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1880), pp. 1-30, here p. 17.

in both Dalmatia and Albania.¹³ Medieval developments along the neighbouring Apennine peninsula conveyed additional cultural, ecclesiastical, legal, linguistic, and social influences whose repercussions could also be felt across the Adriatic. Hence urban societies along both shores bore not only considerable resemblance to each other, but those situated on the oriental littoral mirrored more strongly Venice proper, its social hierarchy, and over-all societal organisation. Leaving aside the *Serenissima's* bureaucrats, over the course of the Middle Ages the Dalmatian nobility, too, separated itself from the rest of the general populace by means of legally regulating its privileged descent.¹⁴ Alongside the (coastal)¹⁵ aristocracy a variety of administrative, ecclesiastical, intellectual, and mercantile elites existed, often occupying various public offices necessary for the functioning of society's everyday life.¹⁶

2. Zadar and Its Jurisdiction

After the Venetian re-acquisition of Zadar and its hinterlands in the wake of the Hungarian succession crisis in 1409, its jurisdiction encompassed the city proper, its suburban settlement, the minor fortified places of Nin (Nona), Novigrad (Novegradi), and Vrana (Aurana) as well as a number of islands off the coast.¹⁷ According to contemporary accounts Zadar's jurisdiction still comprised 37 islands and 85 minor villages after the territorial losses sustained as a consequence of the

13. On the late medieval and early modern Adriatic in general follow Bernard Doumerc, "L'Adriatique du XIII^e-XVII^e siècle", in *Histoire de l'Adriatique*, ed. by Pierre Cabanes (Paris: Seuil, 2001), pp. 203-311; on Venetian Albania see Oliver J. Schmitt, *Das venezianische Albanien, 1392-1479* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001); on Dalmatia Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u srednjem vijeku* [History of the Croats in the Middle Ages] (Zagreb: Biblioteka Posebna izdanja, 1990), and Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje: Prostor, ljudi, ideje* [The Croatian Middle Ages: Spaces, People, Ideas] (Zagreb: Školska Knjiga, 1997).

14. On the Venetian *Serrata* Gerhard Rösch, "The *Serrata* of the Great Council and Venetian Society, 1286-1323", in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, ed. by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 67-88; for guidance to the historiographical discussions and recent bibliographical references Stanley Chojnacki, "Identity and Ideology in Renaissance Venice: The Third *Serrata*", in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, ed. by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 263-294, and Monique O'Connell, *Men of Empire: Power and Communication in Venice's Maritime State* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), pp. 57-74.

15. The hinterland's nobles styled and lived much more like the Croatian-Hungarian magnates; see Engel, *Realm of St. Stephen*, pp. 83-88, 119-122, 174-181.

16. Cf. Neven Budak, "Urban élites in Dalmatia in the 14th and 15th Centuries", in *Città e sistema adriatico alla fine del medioevo: Bilanci degli Studi e prospettive di ricerca*, ed. by Michele P. Ghezzi (Venice: Società Dalmata di Storia Patria, 1998), pp. 181-199, and note 93.

17. On Zadar's past in general *Prošlost Zadra* [The Past of Zadar], ed. by Dinko Foretić, 3 vols. (Zadar: Narodni list, 1976-1987), of which vols. 1-2 deal with its history prior to 1409, and vol. 3 is of importance in the context of the present survey; Tomislav Raukar, Ivo Petricioli, Franjo Švelec, and Šime Peričić, *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom, 1409-1797* [Zadar under the Venetian Administration] (Zadar: Narodni List, 1987).

Ottoman-Venetian war of 1537-1540.¹⁸ Additional territorial losses were sustained as a consequence of the Cyprus War (1570-1573), however, the basic administrative organisation, dating back to the Middle Ages, was preserved.¹⁹ One of the consequences thereof was the declining importance (and possibilities) for continued agriculture due to increased insecurity outside fortified places, a problematic situation further compounded by the redrawing of the borders in the 1570s.²⁰

After 1409 the Venetians kept the medieval organisation of the mainland in place and focused chiefly on amending those parts of the legal framework of importance to their authority.²¹ To facilitate the defence of her dominions Venice re-organised the bureaucracy: apart from higher-ranking regional commanders²² these were Zadar's count (*comes/conte*) as the highest-ranking civilian authority and his military commander; the captain (*capitaneus*), himself assisted by a castellan (*castellanus*).²³ The Venetian officials were assisted by members of both

18. The numbers above are from the report of Venetian legate Giovanni Battista Giustiniano from spring of 1553; he wrote of 6,536 souls in the city proper, 5,293 on the islands, and 12,000 on the mainland. See his report in *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae: Tomus 2: Annorum 1525-1553*, ed. by Simeon Ljubić (Zagreb: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1877), pp. 190-272, here p. 198. Prior to the war Zadar's jurisdiction had been significantly larger and more populous, especially on the mainland, comprising 280 minor villages and a total population "alla somme de anime 24,000" (6,903 in the city proper, 1,148 in the suburbs, 9,109 on the mainland, and 6,859 on the islands) according to the report by Zacharia Vallarezzo, dated 10 September 1527, quoted after *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae: Tomus 1: Annorum 1433-1527*, ed. by Simeon Ljubić (Zagreb: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1876), pp. 194-223, here p. 197.

19. Most recently on these border changes Tea Mayhew, *Dalmatia between Ottoman and Venetian Rule: Contado di Zara, 1645-1718* (Rome: Viella, 2008), especially pp. 91-140; Walter Panciera, "Tagliare i confini": La linea di frontiera Soranzo-Ferhat in Dalmazia (1576)", in *Studi storici dedicati a Orazio Cancila*, ed. by Antonio Giuffreda, Fabrizio D'Avenia, and Daniele Palermo, vol. 1 (Palermo: Associazione Mediterranea, 2011), pp. 237-272.

20. Cf. Marina Mocellin, "La città fortificata di Zara dal XV al XVI sec.", *Atti e Memorie della Società Dalmata di Storia Patria* 15/4 (1992): pp. 9-68, here p. 63, *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Tomislav Raukar, pp. 379-380, and Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, pp. 105-110; on Venetian fortresses in present-day Croatia Andrej Žmegač, *Bastioni jadranske Hrvatske* [Fortifications of the Croatian Adriatic] (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2009), especially pp. 29-71.

21. Cf. Cozzi, *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente veneto*, p. 292; Ivan Pederin, *Mletačka uprava, privreda i politika u Dalmaciji (1409-1797)* [The Venetian Administration, Economy, and Politics in Dalmatia] (Dubrovnik: Časopis, 1990), p. 14, and Maja Novak-Sambrailo, "O autonomiji dalmatinskih komuna pod Venecijom [On the Autonomy of Dalmatian Communes under Venice]", *Rad. JAZU-Zd.* 11-12 (1965): pp. 11-131.

22. For these offices see O'Connell, *Men of Empire*, pp. 27-33; Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, pp. 150-156; Pederin, *Mletačka uprava*, pp. 14-17, 105; and Gaetano Cozzi, "La politica del diritto nella Repubblica di Venezia", in *Repubblica di Venezia e stati italiani: Politica e giustizia dal secolo XVI al secolo XVIII*, ed. by Gaetano Cozzi (Turin: Einaudi, 1982), pp. 227-261, here pp. 251-254.

23. Both were usually Venetian patricians of lower birth and wealth, usually serving ca. 2 years, thus separating the civilian-judicial and military branches of the Venetian government. Yet, despite the geographical distance between the *Signoria* in Venice and the provincial administration; the latter, however, disposed of only rather limited autonomy from the former. Cf. Cozzi, *Ambiente veneziano, ambiente veneto*, pp. 307-308; Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, pp. 156-164;

the local nobility and commoners who filled the various available offices in the respective chancelleries²⁴ as well as the count's councillors drawn from the noble council²⁵ as well as notaries, scribes, customs officials, etc., eventually constituting a social group of civil servants of both noble and non-noble descent.²⁶

Apart from these administrative changes Venice also sought to centralise economic developments along the Eastern shore of the Adriatic after 1409, the cumulative effect of which rendered Dalmatia "economically insignificant"²⁷ by the turn of the 16th century. Dalmatia's thriving salt production, the economic backbone of the coastal cities during the half-century under Hungarian suzerainty, was integrated into the *Serenissima's* state monopoly.²⁸ And while life along the border

Novak-Sambrailo, "O autonomiji dalmatinskih komuna", pp. 11-131, here pp. 59-128; Pederin, *Mletačka uprava*, p. 42; *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, p. 45, and the relevant section in Giovanni Battista Giustiniano's report in Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 2, pp. 190-272, here p. 197. Consequently, also the higher ecclesiastical offices throughout Venice's overseas possessions were reserved for Venetian patricians only. Arbel, "Colonie d'oltremare", p. 947-985, here p. 975.

24. On the count's chancellery Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, p. 159; for the right of the count to employ a gastald (*gastaldus*) and four heralds (*praecones*), see *Reformationes*, capitolo 32: "De gastaldione et praeconibus domini comitis et eorum salario". Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, p. 541. Hence *Reformationes* is abbreviated as 'Ref.', capitolo as 'cap.'

25. Around the mid-16th century the nobles' council comprised 70 male adult members from among whom the 4 councillors were elected every 3 months and who assisted the count when he read the law. The number is given by Giovanni Battista Giustiniano in Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 2, pp. 190-272, here p. 197, but cf. also Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, p. 163; *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 369, 402, as well as the relevant clauses in the statutes, Ref., cap. 10: "De Consilio Iadrensi", and Ref., cap. 11: "De iuramento consiliariorum". Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, pp. 526-528, p. 576. On the Venetian justice system O'Connell, *Men of Empire*, Cozzi, *Ambiente veneziano*, pp. 307-308; Gaetano Cozzi, "Il Dominio da Mar", in *La Repubblica di Venezia nell'età moderna: Dalla Guerra di Chioggia al 1517*, ed. by Gaetano Cozzi and Michael Knapton (Turin: UTET, 1986), pp. 195-204, here p. 199; Pederin, *Mletačka uprava*, p. 15; *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. Raukar, p. 369, as well as the relevant clauses in the statutes, Liber II, titulus I, capitulum 8: "De caesarum seu litigiorum forensium personarum expeditione", Lib. II, tit. I, cap. 9: "De universali domini comitis et eius Curiae iurisdictione", and Lib. II, tit. I, cap. 10: "De speciali Curiae domini comitis seu Maioris Curiae recognitione", Ref., cap. 81, "A sententia criminali non potest appellari lata per dominum comitem, a civili potest infra decem dies, ab interlocutoria non", Ref., cap. 97: "De appellacionibus". Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, pp. 132, 576, 586.

26. Arbel, "Colonie d'oltremare", pp. 971-974; and Cozzi, "Politica del diritto", p. 255-256.

27. Budak, "Urban élites", p. 186; a trend long-established by Tomislav Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću: Ekonomski razvoj i društveni odnosi* [Zadar in the 15th century: Economic Development and Social Relations] (Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu – Institut za hrvatsku povijest, 1977).

28. Zadar's thriving salt production resulted in increased economic activity from 1358-1409. After the Venetians took over again, they soon imposed new rules effectively strangling development – but depriving the local populace the means to wage (successful) rebellion against (too) direct rule. And while artisans and craftsmen were less affected by the changes imposed by Venice, their trades declined, too. In addition, due to continued Ottoman expansion into the Western Balkans migration and trade first declined and subsided in the early decades of the 16th century, cumulatively strangling the coastal economies from both inside as well as outside. Only Dubrovnik (Ragusa) managed to retain its "independence" more or less throughout the early modern period. Cf. Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, especially pp. 281-297, Id., "Venezia,

zone between Venice's possessions and the Ottoman Empire was not easy,²⁹ the common enemy held the social strata together, thus providing the *Serenissima's* representatives with a certain amount of clout among the local populace thanks to the (relative) stability their presence brought.

3. Merchants of Zadar

By the mid-16th century the population of Zadar's jurisdiction had dropped to about 18,000 people of which about a third lived within the fortified perimeter of the city proper.³⁰ Thereof about 8-10% belonged to the urban nobility.³¹ The number of commercially active individuals was much smaller: analysis of the notarial instruments revealed a list of 43 merchants, retailers, and spice traders who, augmented by their family members, may have amounted to between 200-250 individuals.³²

Table 9: Zadar's merchants by trade description³³

mercator ^a	aromatarius ^b	bazariotus ^c	other ^d	total
34	4	2	3	43

il sale e la struttura economica e sociale della Dalmazia nel XV e XVI secolo", in *Sale e saline nell'Adriatico, secoli XV-XX*, ed. by Antonio di Vittorio (Naples: Giannini, 1981), pp. 145-156, Id., "Zadarska trgovina solju u XIV i XV stoljeću [Zadar's Salt Trade in the 14th and 15th Centuries]", *Radovi filozofskog fakulteta: Odsijek za povijest Zagreb 7-8* (1969-1970): pp. 19-79; on legal aspects cf. *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 75-88; on migration and transhumance Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, p. 232-249.

29. Mainly consisting of (organised cross-border) robberies, livestock theft, and slavery; cf. Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, pp. 256-262; *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, pp. 356-359, ed. by Raukar, as well as Lib. II, tit. II, cap. 15: "Qualiter conceditur publicorum malefactorum detentio". Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, p. 136.

30. 6,536 in the city proper, 5,293 on the islands, and 12,000 in the villages of fortified places on the mainland. Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 2, pp. 190-272, here p. 198.

31. According to *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 261-262, ca. 600 nobles lived in Zadar around the mid-16th century; actual numbers are quite hard to come by as no population data prior to Zacharia Vallaresso's report (1527, cf. note 18) exist. Cf. also Arié Malz, "Frühneuzeitliche Modernisierung als Sackgasse: Die dalmatinische Städtewelt vom 15. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert", in *Städte im östlichen Europa: Zur Problematik von Modernisierung und Raum vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Carsten Goehrke (Zurich: Chronos, 2006), pp. 103-133, here pp. 103-113, as well as the population tables in Mocellin, "Città fortificata", pp. 29-31.

32. Based upon the assumption that these 43 individuals and their spouses had 2-3 children each.

33. Cf. note 2 for the sources; in all, 3,019 individual instruments have been surveyed: a) lists all instances in which the term merchant (*mercator*) has been written next to one of the contracting parties; b) lists all instances in which the term spice trader (*aromatarius*) has been used; c) lists all instances in which the term (small) retailer (*bazariotus*) has been used; d) lists all instances in which the following terms have been used: fruit seller (*fructuum venditor*), meat merchant (*mercator saluminum*).

Table 1 shows that four out of five members of Zadar's mercantile community were perceived as merchants, another tenth of them as spice traders, and about half of that percentage as retailers. Usually, these trade descriptions were written next to the honorific, surname, and personal name as in, for instance, *ser Benedictus Blancus mercator Iadra*,³⁴ *dominus Jacobus de Nobilibus parmensis Aromatarius*,³⁵ or *ser Philipo Tuertchouich bazarioto*.³⁶ Indications such as these render identification possible and enable a tentative assessment of the numbers involved relative to the overall population of Zadar around the middle of the 16th century.

As regards the geographical provenances of the members of Zadar's mercantile community, two main points must be considered. While some individuals (or their ancestors) originated in places relatively distant from their then-present city of residence, the majority of them either came from neighbouring coastal cities along the shores of the Adriatic or established themselves in Zadar prior to the war of 1537-1540.³⁷ Combined analysis of the data contained in the real estate transactions and procuratorial appointments³⁸ suggests that the overwhelming majority of the mercantile community operating out of Zadar between the two Ottoman-Venetian wars resided there permanently, either enjoying legal rights as citizens, residents, or both.³⁹ In fact, even those individuals found to have originated from further afar, also enjoyed such a legal status in their city of residence; such examples include *Bartholomeo de Nigris de Ravenna*,⁴⁰ *ser Andreas Postner de Gliubgliana*,⁴¹ or *ser Joanni de Venetiis*.⁴² In spite of their differing geographical provenances, though, Bartholomaeus was referred to as *habitor[i] Jadre*⁴³ and both Andreas as well as Johannes as *civis ac habitator*.⁴⁴

Analysis of the data contained in the sources with respect to trade description, surname, and location of provenance yielded the following results:

34. SB I, 1, 4, c.198v, 31 August 1559.

35. DC I, 2, 3, s.p., 13 March 1562.

36. NC I, 1, B, s.p., 9 May 1540.

37. Cf. Raukar, "Croatia within Europe", pp. 15-19, who provides an overview about the increasingly problematic life of Dalmatian cities in times of Ottoman raids.

38. The former refers to 1,067 instances in which property was bought or sold, 476 concessions, and 226 rental contracts; all three categories refer to instruments transferring real estate property within Zadar's jurisdiction between 1540-1569; the latter refers to 932 individual procuratorial appointments from the same period.

39. Based upon the above-mentioned sources (cf. note 2, 33): 23 out of the 43 individuals identified are referred to as both citizens and residents (53.5%), 13 were referred to as citizens only (30.2%), 5 as resident only (11.6%), and the rest as n/a (2 or 4.6%).

40. DC I, 2, 4, s.p., 21 June 1562.

41. SB I, 1, 1, c.7r/c.7v, 10 November 1556.

42. SB I, 1, 3, c.164v, 12 January 1559.

43. ND I, 2, 3, f.43r/f.43v, 3 March 1565.

44. For Andreas SB I, 1, 1, c.7r/c.7v, 10 November 1556, for Johannes DC I, 2, 1, c.43v, 15 July 1559.

Table 10: Geographical provenance of Zadar's merchants (c.1540-1569)⁴⁵

Provenance ^a	no. ^b	% ^c	Toponyms in the sources ^d
Zadar (incl. jurisdiction)	25	58.1	Zadar, Iž (Eso)
Venice (incl. <i>Terraferma</i>)	6	14	Venice, Bergamo
Dalmatia-Albania (excl. Zadar)	4	9.3	Rab (Arbe), Lošinj (Lussino), Skradin (Scardona), Split (Spalato)
Italy (excl. Venice)	6	14	Bologna, Parma, Pontremoli, Ravenna
Austria	1	2.3	Ljubljana
rest, n/a	1	2.3	
	43	99.9	

Most merchants, retailers, and spice traders residing in mid-16th century Zadar originated from within what may be termed the "Adriatic basin", i.e. communities along both shores of the eponymous sea and/or their respective hinterlands. And while some individuals or their ancestors originated from places as distant as Bergamo⁴⁶ or Pontremoli,⁴⁷ the absence of geographical indications usually associated with individuals from outside Venice's possessions in general and Zadar's jurisdiction in particular suggests that these men and their families had established themselves in central Dalmatia well before the Ottoman-Venetian war from 1537-1541.⁴⁸ Citizenship, residency, or both rights are usually found next

45. Sources as in note 33: a) lists the regional provenances, the first three lines (Zadar, Venice, Dalmatia-Albania) refer to Venetian possessions only; b) lists the number of individuals originating from these regions; c) lists the respective percentages; d) lists the toponyms identified within the regions. NB: The toponyms above are the modernised transliterations of the place names found in the sources and do not indicate anything else; and while the regions above are not entirely arbitrary, these indications must be viewed with caution, too.

46. For instance, the Caranina family, consisting of at least *ser Alberto Caranina* and his relative *ser Petro*, are mentioned to have come from Bergamo and, by the mid-16th century, the latter had an *apotheca* (warehouse) *in contrata publica*. For Alberto PB I, 2, 12, s.p., 24 July 1546, for Petro DC I, 2, 1, c.23r/c.23v, 7 June 1559, for the reference to their place of origin, *bergomensis*, DC I, 2, 5, s.p., 31 January 1564, for the latter's warehouse JM I, 1, 1, f.20r, 15 June 1546.

47. One of Zadar's most prominent non-noble (merchant) families originally came from Pontremoli in Tuscany, as indicated by references thereto, e.g. *domino Lazaro de Gnochis de Pontremulo* and his relative, *domino Joanne Antonio de Rossettis de Pontremulo*, were among the wealthiest individuals in Zadar. The former (and his inventory) appears also prominently in the detailed history of Zadar; the latter also possessed a warehouse *ad portas macelli* (near the butcher's gate). For Lazarus JM I, 1, 3, f.59v, 8 April 1555, for Johannes DC I, 2, 4, f.9r, 23 July 1562. On Lazarus's inventory *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 259-261, 265, 300, for Johannes's warehouse JM I, 1, 4, f.90v, 3 February 1556.

48. For instance, "Philippo da Scardona" appeared in Zacharia Vallaresso's report from 1527, suggesting that he might be the same individual as the above-mentioned *Philipo*

to the names of members of Zadar's mercantile community irrespective of their differing geographical provenances,⁴⁹ testifying to a certain extent to what has been called the "sharp contrast" of Venetian self-perception as a stable society and the "underlying reality of economic, social, and geographical fluidity",⁵⁰ more recently characterised as "Kommunikationsraum",⁵¹ and as an area in which the *Serenissima's* "Men of Empire" negotiated power.⁵²

4. Economic Integration

The new economic rules established by Venice over the course of the 15th century culminated in Dalmatia's insignificance in economic terms⁵³ around 1500 and the ensuing decades, especially in comparison to the decades preceding 1409. As a consequence of reduced business opportunities in both salt production and long-distance trade⁵⁴ as well as the increased Ottoman pressure,⁵⁵ Zadar's financially potent merchants preferred investment opportunities assumed to be safer than maritime commerce – real estate.⁵⁶ Tomislav Raukar established and detailed

Tuertchouich (cf. note 36). Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 1, pp. 194-223, here p. 209.

49. In detail: 13 out of 43 individuals were referred to as citizen (*civis*), 5 as resident (*habitor*), 23 as both citizen and resident, and only 2 remain without any reference: in slightly more than 95 % of the cases surveyed the individual was, in fact, a member of Zadar's society.

50. Martin and Romano, "Reconsidering Venice", p. 21.

51. This term roughly translates into "sphere of communication" and has been used by Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Oliver Schmitt who define it as a geographical entity characterised by the exchange of individuals, goods, and ideas taking place on a distinctively larger scale than adjacent areas. Cf. Guillaume Saint-Guillain and Oliver J. Schmitt, "Die Ägäis als Kommunikationsraum im Späten Mittelalter", *Saeculum* 56/2 (2005): pp. 215-225, here p. 217, and Oliver J. Schmitt, "Das venezianische Südosteuropa als Kommunikationsraum (ca. 1400-ca. 1600)", in *Balcami occidentali, Adriatico e venezia fra XIII e XVIII secolo/Der westliche Balkan, der Adria-raum und Venedig (13.-18. Jahrhundert)*, ed. Gherardo Ortalli and Oliver J. Schmitt (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), pp. 77-101, here p. 86.

52. O'Connell, *Men of Empire*.

53. Budak, "Urban élites", p. 186.

54. Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, and *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, especially pp. 27-226, cf. note 28.

55. After the first Ottoman-Venetian war over Salonica in the 1420s, expansion of the former into the Western Balkans directly threatened Venice's possessions along the coasts, making future conflicts all but inevitable, especially considering Venice's precarious lines of both communication and supplies. For instance, Ottoman raiding parties first reached the periphery of Zadar's jurisdiction, the minor fortified places of Nin as early as 1432. Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, pp. 23-39, especially pp. 24-25. On the Ottoman advance into the Bosnian-Dalmatian hinterlands see Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 199-206.

56. Investments into real estate were perceived to be safer, cf. Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 151-196, developments mirrored across the Adriatic in 16th-century Italy, noted Fernand Braudel, *Sozialgeschichte des 15.-18. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1: *Der Alltag* (Munich: Kindler, 1985), p. 51.

this trend for Zadar in the period between 1409 and the Ottoman-Venetian war of 1537-1541.⁵⁷ Analysis of the property markets during the decades after that war leading up to the Cyprus War corroborates these developments:

Table 11: Zadar's property markets (1540-1569).⁵⁸

	no. of acts ^a	turnover ^b	receiving merchants ^c	property value ^d	% of total ^e
sales market	1,067	20,529	120	3,493.5 ducats	17
rental market	226	20,997	36	3,067.5 ducats	14.6
	1,293	41,526	156	6,561 ducats	15.8

After Venice re-acquired Zadar and its hinterlands in 1409, the city's jurisdiction extended over a combined area of roughly 1,150 square kilometres; these included the walled city, its suburban settlement (*burgus/borgo*), a number of islands off the mainland, and the three minor districts of Nin, Vrana, and Novigrad.⁵⁹ Table 3, above, gives indications as to the developments of the vending and rental markets within Zadar's jurisdiction from 1540-1569. Let us first start with the former, which exhibits slightly more than four times the size of the latter, however, in spite of these numbers the total turnover generated by both is practically identical.

Data for the vending market is derived from a total of 1,067 individual contracts by which parcels of real estate property within the entirety of Zadar's jurisdiction were transferred. Interestingly, the number of contracts remains remarkably constant between – in spite of – the two Ottoman-Venetian wars confining the period under investigation.⁶⁰ Apart from geographical and social

57. Cf. Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 71-196, especially the section on property developments in pp. 151-196, and Id., "Komunalna društva u Dalmaciji u XV. i u prvoj polovici XVI. stoljeća [Commune Societies in Dalmatia in the 15th Century and the First Half of the 16th Century]", *Historijski zbornik* 25 (1982): pp. 43-118.

58. Cf. note 2 for the sources; in all, 3,019 individual instruments have been surveyed: a) lists the total number of individual notarial acts for the period from 1540-1569 for both property sold (*emptio*) and rented (*locatio*) within Zadar's jurisdiction; b) indicates the total turnover in both categories in ducats (1 ducat = £6 4 Soldi, Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, pp. 759-760); c) lists the instances in which a member of Zadar's mercantile community bought/rented property (120 buying "merchants" = 12.8%, 36 renting "merchants" = 8.1%); d) lists the value of the property transferred to the "merchants" in ducats; e) lists the "merchants" share of the total turnover.

59. O'Connell, *Men of Empire*, pp. 29-30.

60. Over the three surveyed decades the number of contracts remains basically stable: 352 sales instruments in the 1540s, 356/1550s, and 359/1560s; of these all but 5 were not written in Latin; 173 women were found among the vending parties, only 88 among the acquiring parties. In terms of changes between the 1540s and the 1560s, this is even more interesting as the total number of *morgen* transferred all but doubled in between, from ca. 1,542 *morgen* in the 1540s to ca. 2,955 *morgen* in the 1560s. Contrary to these developments, the average prices did not

indications⁶¹ the differences between vending and buying parties are of interest here: while the nobility's share among both contracting parties remains at ca. 8%,⁶² on average commoners sold "only" 12.5 % of the land but their corresponding share among the acquiring parties was slightly higher than 30%.⁶³ In general, the share of the non-nobles more than doubled, the corresponding differences as regards the mercantile community's investments in real estate are a class of its own, constituting all but a tenfold increase.⁶⁴ In only 16 out of 1,067 instances merchants appear as constituent parties but bought property on 120 occasions, an increase by the factor of 7.5 But the contracts also reveal another interesting issue: over the entire three-decade period under survey, members of Zadar's mercantile community bought property worth ca. 3,493.5 ducats – slightly more than a sixth of the total the total turnover of 20,529 ducats generated by all these transactions.

The second item in Table 3, the rental market, mirrored these developments: out of the 226 notarial instruments leasing property within Zadar's jurisdiction, only one member of the mercantile community was among the landowning parties as opposed to the 36 times a "merchant" was listed as tenant.⁶⁵ In spite of all these partially substantial changes⁶⁶ in terms of landownership, the points of interest here are the tenants in general and the members of the mercantile community in particular. While, on average, still a fifth of the recipient parties were of aristocratic descent,⁶⁷ the non-noble parties were, by far and not surprisingly,

drop uniformly. While the average price of a *morgen* of land within the medieval *ager publicus* doubled (up from 5 ducats in the 1540s to 10 ducats/1560s), average prices for land farther inland decreased from ca. 3 ducats (1540s) to slightly less than 2 ducats (1560s), and remained constant on the islands (ca. 5.5 ducats in both decades).

61. About 9 out of 10 contracting parties originated from within Zadar's jurisdiction, only 2% of them came from elsewhere, and the rest remained unidentified; of the former about 2/3 originated from the city proper.

62. Which corresponds roughly with its size as estimated by Raukar in *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 261-262.

63. It must be noted, however, that on average individuals of non-noble descent made up ca. 72.7% of the vendors and 42.7% of the buyers over the entire three decades.

64. Three-decade averages for the vending parties are 9.6 % (artisans), 1.5 % (merchants), and 1.4 % (intelligence, cf. notes 24, 25, and 26) – as opposed to 13.7 % (artisans), 11.2 % (merchants), and 5.7 % (intelligence) among the acquiring parties.

65. Contrary to the data of the vending market, the number of contracts was not as stable: in all, 34 individual acts were stipulated in the 1540s, 75/1550s, and 117/1560s, an increase of ca. 350% from the first to the last decade under survey; of these 23 were not written in Latin, 30 women were found among the landlords, only 8 among the tenants. As regards property ownership it must be stressed that this was firmly in the hand of both clergy and nobility. In 104 instances (or ca. 46 %) an aristocrat was the landlord, in 61 cases (or ca. 27 %) the property belonged to a member of the cloth or, much more likely, an ecclesiastical institution such as the archbishopric, a congregation or a hospital. This relation changed over time, though: in the 1540s the relation was 12 nobles versus 13 members of the clergy leasing property, by the 1560s the relation had become 61 nobles versus 27 of the latter.

66. Exemplified by Budak's statement about the "political importance of the abbot of St Chrysogonus convent" in 14th-century Zadar. Budak, "Urban élites", p. 188.

67. The three-decade average for the nobility is 46 individuals (20.4 %); 19 individuals belonged to the clergy (or 8.4 %).

the biggest "group": Of these 36 instances or roughly 16% in which a merchant was named, the tenant stands out.⁶⁸ And, as far as the geographical origins are concerned, a significant but predictable shift occurred. Still and comparable to the vending market, nine out of ten landowners originated from within Zadar's jurisdiction, but the city proper and its suburban dwellings made up "only" roughly two thirds thereof.⁶⁹ The total sum of money generated by these 226 contracts amounted to roughly 20,997 ducats, a huge total when placed in the context of the much larger vending market (especially in terms of turnover per contract). Both categories produced about the same amount of money, but this equality in terms of revenue was only possible because the volume of the vending market was that much larger. And, if viewed in terms of ownership, landed property was a significant factor in the generation of wealth for Zadar's nobles and ecclesiastical elites. In general, developments in both vending and rental markets exhibit very similar trends,⁷⁰ and not only in terms of turnover.⁷¹

In both cases, investments by members of the mercantile community more than just exceeded their proportional share of the general populace, their investments were way out of proportion relative to their small overall numbers. To put the numbers discussed above into perspective: Venice's legate Giovanni Battista Giustiniano refers to a total number of seventeen noble families⁷² who, while de-

68. And while the share of other non-noble groups also increased, the most dramatic changes between constituent, landowning versus recipient/renting parties occurred with regard to the mercantile community: artisans (11 landowners/14 tenants), soldiers (8/12), intelligence (12/16); all numbers are the three-decade totals.

69. The numbers are 150 landlords (of which 3 lived in the suburbs), the remaining 25 % came from elsewhere within Zadar's jurisdiction, namely: 6 lived within the medieval *ager publicus*, 5 on the islands, 8 came from within the district of Nin and Novigrad each, 1 from Tino (Tinj), and 29 from the rest of the *Contado*; all numbers are the three-decade totals.

70. This statement does not suggest uniformity and must be treated with caution. As regards price developments, these varied considerably: the number of contracts by which geographically more remote areas of Zadar's jurisdiction were leased did increase roughly tenfold from the 1540s to the 1560s while the turnover remained more or less stable (dropping from ca. 56 ducats per contract in the 1540s to about one ducat less in the 1560s). Similarities with regard to the two other subdivisions do not end here. Price movements (or the lack thereof) characterise the rents with regard to property on the islands, too, as virtually no change was found; again, the area of the medieval *ager publicus* was the most dynamic area. Total turnover in the more remote areas was 3,512.5 ducats/70 contracts (on average ca. 50 ducats per contract), 3,060 ducats/39 contracts (on average ca. 78.5 ducats) on the islands, and 1,770 ducats/33 contracts (average ca. 53.5 ducats) in the *ager publicus*. As regards the latter, the increase was considerable while turnover in the 1540s amounted to only ca. 14 ducats per contract, it shot up to ca. 68 ducats per contract in the 1560s. If not indicated otherwise, all numbers are the three-decade averages.

71. Tomislav Raukar established that the average size of rented property within Zadar's jurisdiction was ca. 7-7.5 hectares during the 15th century; by the mid-16th century only about 1/3 of the contracts listed property size, in addition to the ca. 13 % of contracts in which the property rented is listed in *morgen* (acres), a considerably smaller unit of measurement. Cf. Raukar, *Zadar u XV. stoljeću*, pp. 151-196.

72. As opposed to *Zadar pod mletačkom upravom*, ed. by Raukar, pp. 261-262, who mention 20 families.

scribed as “*devotissimo verso la signoria*”,⁷³ were not very wealthy: “La ricchezza di questi nobili non è molta, perchè la maggior intrada, che sia fra loro, è di ducati quattrocento, cinquecento et fino settecento, come li Tetrici, Rosa, Civallelli, et altri, ch’hanno ducati cento d’entrata, ducento e fino trecento”.⁷⁴ Zadar’s nobles were relatively poor, especially when compared to wealthy merchants like Lazarus de Pontremulo⁷⁵ or other elite commoners⁷⁶ like “Francesco de Ventura”.⁷⁷

5. Social Integration

After the sketch of the origins and activities of Zadar’s merchants, their interactions with the host society take the centre stage. The urban nobility of Dalmatia’s coastal towns, long separated from the rest of the general populace by regulating its aristocratic descent over the course of the Middle Ages,⁷⁸ exhibited largely endogamous marriage practices.⁷⁹ While in and of itself this did not automatically preclude upward social mobility, status boundaries and privileges derived from noble descent were hard but not impossible to overcome.⁸⁰ And while indicative assessments point to between 10–20% of Zadar’s nobles who married fellow nobles from other Dalmatian cities (entailing a considerable amount of geographical mobility),⁸¹ the places of origin tentatively assessed for the members of the mercantile community suggest

73. Quoted after Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 2, pp. 190–272, here p. 197.

74. *Ibid.*

75. In addition to his important role within Zadar’s society, Lazarus had commercial ties to Venice and Bari (cf. note 90). The principal actors of his testament were his wife *Helena* and his two daughters, *Catherina* and *Dionora*, who, in 1558, appointed *dominum Joannem antonium de Pontremulo mercatorem Jadra*, probably a relative, to deal with all outstanding business opportunities left to them after the death of Lazarus, including the restitution of *Helena*’s dowry of 700 ducats. SB I, 1, 3, c.148v, 15 September 1558, DC I, 1, 6, c.6v, 17 April 1558, SM I, 1, 5, f.16r/f.16v, 15 October 1558. Cf. note 47.

76. Argued for by James S. Grubb, “Elite Citizens”, in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City State, 1297–1797*, ed. by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore-London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), pp. 339–364.

77. Who was among the few non-nobles of Zadar referred to specifically by Pauli Justiniani, the city’s former captain, upon his return to Venice in 1553. Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae: Tomus*, vol. 3, pp. 48–55, here p. 52. Francesco promised his daughter, *honesta damicella domina Gasparina*, to *Simon de Marco quondam strenui domini Marci*, accompanied, too, by a dowry worth 700 ducats. For the marriage contract DC I, 2, 2A, c.10v-c.11v, 15 October 1559, for the dowry quitclaim DC I, 2, 6, s.p., 29 May 1565.

78. Cf. note 14.

79. Budak, “Urban élites”, p. 197.

80. Bearing the “nexus of state power and personal influence” (O’Connell, *Men of Empire*, p. 12) so characteristic of Venice’s maritime state in mind, there existed a “certain degree of social mobility up and down the status hierarchies (...) characterized by remarkable geographical mobility”. Martin and Romano, “Reconsidering Venice”, p. 21.

81. As suggested by the total of 88 instances in which nobles from Zadar appear in 656 marriage contracts and dowry quitclaims (cf. note 2 for the sources; the relation is 128 of the former and 528 of the latter); the numbers present the following origins of the contracting

comparable and, in some cases, even greater distances. One of the solutions to this situation was to reside in Zadar, become a citizen, resident, or both, and adopt the city as the centre for other mercantile endeavours. As a consequence of both the nobility’s endogamous marriage behaviour and the presence of other merchants in Zadar, the latter often intermarried, suggesting (at least partially) a quasi-endogamous marriage pattern. Examples thereof include the marriage contract by which “*dominus Paulus Caranina mercator civis et habitator Jadrae*” promised:

Ser Pasinus de Ceronis Similiter mercatoris civis et habitatoris Jadrae ex altera the hand of his niece, *honesta damicaella domina Agnesina* (...) filia quondam ser Joannis Collona de loco Cornaldi dictionis Bergomi,

accompanied by a dowry worth 300 ducats.⁸² Testifying to not only the internal cohesion of the merchants but also the importance of marital ties is a procuratorial appointment from the mid-1560s: “*Paulina filia, et heres pro sua parte quondam domini Berti de Martinis Caranina olim Civis, et mercatoris Jadrae*”, then “*uxor domini Julij Tonini Similiter Civis, et mercatoris Jadrae*”, and her sister “*Helisabeth (...) uxor domini Bernardi Tirabuschi Civis, et mercatoris Jadrae*”, appointed “*dominum Julium Trivisanum Causidicum venetum, et dominum Vivianum Barlendi mercatorem Venetum*” to deal with their late father’s trade in Venice; he was appointed specifically to conduct any transactions deemed necessary with “*Dominicum de Gamberarijs, et filios mercatores venetos*”.⁸³

Another merchant from further afar, the above-mentioned Andreas Postner, married *Corona*, the daughter of “*domina Hieronyma uxor quondam domini Marci Aurelij Sonzonij Notarij et causidici Jadrae*” in 1554; the late Marcus Aurelius had been a prominent notary and attorney, belonging to the upper echelons of Zadar’s non-noble elite.⁸⁴ A third example of such ties and behaviour is the case of “*Julius Toninus mercator civis et habitator Jadrae*” who promised his daughter Cecilia to “*Bartholomeus Lucatellus filius domini Martini*”, another merchant of Zadar, including a dowry worth 400 ducats.⁸⁵

Important as they were, the marital bonds between members of the mercantile community with each other as well as with members of other elite groups were not the only integrating factor. In addition thereto the following factors, too, facilitated matters: despite the differing backgrounds of these “elite commoners” (James Grubb) Venice’s maritime state provided a common ecclesiastical, institutional, financial, and legal framework.⁸⁶ Apart from the codified communal bodies

parties: Zadar (60 constituents/56 recipients), Dalmatia-Albania (28/28), n/a (0/4), covering places from the Kvarner Gulf in Northern Dalmatia to the Bay of Kotor in the south.

82. DC I, 1, 3, c.31r, 5 January 1556. The dowry itself was paid out in full 7 years later, as confirmed by the quitclaim issued by Pasinus. DC I, 2, 4, f.39r/f.39v, 22 February 1563.

83. ND I, 2, 3, f.31v, 5 February 1565.

84. For the marriage contract DC I, 1, 1, c.37r/c.37v, 13 January 1554.

85. DC I, 2, 5, s.p., 1 January 1564. On Martin’s mercantile occupation SB I, 1, 4, c.216r, 18 January 1560.

86. These included the integration of the Church into the Venetian system of governance (cf. note 23), common monetary denominations (cf. note 58) but also the possibility to petition the Court of Appeals (*Quarantia*) in Venice proper if a party was unhappy with the judgement.

of law, partially amended to serve the new suzerain's needs,⁸⁷ the new order also included possibilities of appeal as well as varying degrees of local autonomy.⁸⁸ Given the relatively small area of Zadar proper, the city-dwelling merchants virtually lived next door to the inhabitants of aristocratic descent. Furthermore, some of them were not only conducting business out of central Dalmatia but their services were also indispensable to the functioning of the Venetian administration.⁸⁹ Another aspect of importance was that both nobles and commoners alike⁹⁰ created a very diversified environment, "il che forse avviene per la frequenza de forestieri, nobili veneziani, generali, proveditori, capitani, sopracomiti et altre (...)".⁹¹ This entailed at least three languages: Latin, the language of both administration and bureaucracy, the so-called "lingua franca" as the language of commerce and trade, and "Slavic" as the spoken language at home.⁹² While Dubrovnik constituted the

87. On Zadar cf. note 7. Comparable Dalmatian bodies of law are, e.g., *Zlatna knjiga grada Splita: Textus cum regestis et apparatu critico* [The Golden Book of the City of Split], ed. by Vedran Gligo, 2 vols. (Split: Književni Krug, 1996-2006), or *Knjiga statuta zakona i reformacija grada Šibenika* [Book of Statutes, Laws, and Reformations of the town of Šibenik], ed. by Slavo Grubišić (Šibenik: Muzej grada Šibenika, 1982).

88. On Dalmatia most recently Mayhew, *Contado di Zara*, especially pp. 141-185; O'Connell, *Men of Empire*; Reinhold C. Mueller, "Aspects of Venetian Sovereignty in Medieval and Renaissance Dalmatia", in *Quattrocento Adriatico: Fifteenth-Century Art of the Adriatic Rim*, ed. by Charles Dempsey (Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 1996), pp. 29-56; and, though a bit older, Novak-Sambrailo, "O autonomiji dalmatinskih komuna".

89. Mentioned above Lazarus de Pontremulo appeared in a number of documents from the mid-1550s, acting as an intermediary in the sale of 536 *star* of grain (1 *star* = ca. 82.25 litres; 536 *star* = ca. 44,086 litres, Kolanović and Križman, *Zadarski statut*, pp. 759-760) which were confiscated by Venetian authorities from "domini Hieronymi Dilza, et domini Joannis Antonij Paiari", both merchants and citizens of Ferrara. The grain was confiscated aboard the ship of "ser Jacobus della Zotta, nauta", who had been tasked by the former two merchants to sell the corn in Apulia thus bypassing Venice's staple rights, "sit committere contrabannum". The case was brought before Zara's count and captain who not only fined Jacobus but also sold off the grain via Lazarus and Zoylo de Ferra, a Zaratian nobleman for the total sum of ca. 458 ducats. While these proceedings were still on-going, the corn was stored in three storehouses belonging to Lazarus (for the use of which by the commune he also received rent payments). The revenue generated by these sales was conferred to the original owners, represented in Zadar in the person of their procurator, "ser Gaudentius de Chiaena habitator Ferrariae". DC I, 1, 2, c.16r-c.17r, 15 January 1555.

90. Giovanni Battista Giustiniano puts it this way: "Li popolari veramente, se ben hanno quasi tutti la lingua franca, vivono all'usanza schiava tutti", contrary to the nobles who, notwithstanding their poverty, clung to "costumi (...) quasi italiani, perchè la maggior parte de nobili vive, favella et veste all'usanza d'italia". Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. 2, pp. 190-272, here p. 197.

91. *Ibid.*

92. For information on the languages of these multi-lingual, poly-cultural urban societies in Dalmatia see, *inter alia*, Michael Metzeltin, "Le varietà italiane sulle coste dell'Adriatico orientale", in *Balcani occidentali, Adriatico e Venezia fra XIII e XVIII secolo/Der westliche Balkan, der Adriaraum und Venedig (13.-18. Jahrhundert)*, ed. by Gherardo Ortalli and Oliver J. Schmitt (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009), pp. 199-237, and Ljerka Šimunković, "La politica linguistica della Serenissima verso i possedimenti 'di là da mar': il caso della Dalmazia", in *Mito e antimito di Venezia nel bacino adriatico (secoli XV-XIX)*, ed. by Sante Graciotti (Rome: Calamo, 2001), pp. 95-104.

most prominent example of this diversity,⁹³ testifying to a time "[w]hen Ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans".⁹⁴ This was evident in Zadar, too, where a majority of individuals appearing throughout the sources bear Latin personal names, Italian and/or Slavicised surnames, or a combination thereof. Examples from among the members of Zadar's mercantile community include "ser Franciscus de Martinis alias Iuancich",⁹⁵ "ser Georgius Brunouich",⁹⁶ and "ser Martinus de Marco alias Mestrouich".⁹⁷

6. Conclusion

In general, the situation of Zadar's merchants around the mid-sixteenth century can be summed up as a combination of both external as well as internal factors. The Venetian re-acquisition of Dalmatia over the course of the 15th century changed the overall economic situation fundamentally. In the same period increased export duties and the incorporation of the lucrative salt trade into the *Serenissima's* state monopoly marked a decisive break with the preceding period. Venice's attempted enforcement of her staple rights and the overall economic changes during the 16th century additionally constrained maritime long-distance trade, further contributing to the decline of Dalmatia's urban centres.⁹⁸ Besides these developments the *Serenissima's* inconsistent economic policies took their toll on Dalmatia's attractiveness, too: from the 1520s onwards Šibenik was favoured over Zadar but commodity flows were re-routed again in the early 1590s after the establishment of a *Scala*, a free port in Split, which further reduced central Dalmatia's importance.⁹⁹ In addition to these issues, increasing Ottoman pres-

93. *Inter alia* see Sante Graciotti, "Plurilinguismo letterario e pluriculturalismo nella Ragusa antica (un modello per la futura Europa?)", *Atti e Memorie della Società Dalmata di Storia Patria* 20/9 (1997): pp. 1-16; and Bariša Krekić, "On the Latino-Slavic Cultural Symbiosis in Late Medieval and Renaissance Dalmatia and Dubrovnik", in *Dubrovnik: A Mediterranean Urban Society, 1300-1600*, ed. by Bariša Krekić (Aldershot: Variorum, 1997), pp. 312-332.

94. Taken from John V. Fine, *When Ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans: A Study of Identity in pre-nationalist Croatia, Dalmatia, and Slavonia in the Medieval and Early Modern Periods* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006), setting aside the problematics of the term "ethnicity" in pre-modern society.

95. DC I, 2, 2A, c.44r-c.45r, 4 January 1560.

96. PB I, 1, 9, f.11v, 24 April 1543.

97. SB I, 1, 2, c.89v/c.90r, 21 January 1558. It must be stressed that this holds true for both Dalmatia's nobility (though, unexpectedly – see also note 91 above – to a somewhat smaller degree) as well as commoners. E.g., "Antonius de Begna alias Grascich quondam Damyani nobilis Jadre or Coliza uxor quondam spectabili domini Georgij Dragocueich Nobilis Sibenicensis (of Šibenik)". DC I, 2, 2A, c.27r/c.27v, 17 November 1559, JM I, 1, 3, f.8r, 29 March 1553.

98. Only a handful of notarial instruments establishing overseas companies (*societas*) could be found among the more than 6,000 individual contracts protocolled by the 15 notaries of Zadar, underlining the decline of maritime commerce originating from central Dalmatia.

99. The former, located ca. 80 km South-East of Zadar, was granted the right to collect the salt tax (*gabella de sal*) in 1525. For the establishment of the free port in Split start with Renzo Paci, *La 'scala' di Spalato e il commercio veneziano nei Balcani fra Cinque e Seicento* (Venice:

sure – not only in terms of territorial expansion but also in the form of migratory movements – further exacerbated an already rather precarious situation from the 1430s onwards. The consequences were increased insecurity, in both agricultural and human terms, that caused the migratory movements from the Western Balkans towards the coastal cities to eventually cease, rendering re-population of the towns impossible.

Zadar's small mercantile community adapted to these changing circumstances accordingly and started to prefer safer investment opportunities – real estate – over the increasingly precarious long-distance trade from the 15th century onwards. This trend held true also for the following century immediately preceding the Cyprus War (1570-1573) but continued to reduce the overall attractiveness of central Dalmatia. Notwithstanding these issues, Zadar's merchants, spice traders, and retailers were well integrated into the social fabric, most of them also enjoying citizenship or residency rights. Before the outbreak of the war, Zadar's importance as mercantile turnover hub had already been eroded significantly, bringing both the numbers and activities of its merchants down to corresponding levels of near-insignificance.

ANDREA CARACAUSI

Foreign Merchants and Local Institutions: Thinking about the Genoese “Nation” in Venice and Mediterranean Trade in the Late Renaissance Period*

1. *Trading Diasporas and Legal Institutions*

On 21st February 1585, Genoese merchants Giovanni Francesco Franceschi and Francesco Cavana appeared before Venetian notary Luca Gabrieli. On behalf of nobleman Oliviero Marini they testified that:

Magnifico Genoese nobleman Oliviero de Marini son of Agostino, resident in this city of Venice ... is living and human [*in humanis*] and talks, sees, walks and does everything that every man does and sees.¹

Oliviero Marini was one of the most important Genoese merchants in late Renaissance Venice. By 1585, he was already doing business, acting as an independent merchant, as resident agent for the Marini companies in Genoa and broker for the Genoese and non-Genoese merchants working in many European and Mediterranean cities. Moreover, he was the consul of the Genoese nation in Venice, judging conflicts and registering acts as a notary for Genoese merchants. Nevertheless, ten years later, on 22nd March 1596, Oliviero asked Pietro Francesco Marri and Paolo Battista Sivori to testify that he was resident (*comorans*) in Venice and “well known”. Some months later, on 27th August 1596, Pietro Francesco Marri and Florentine merchant Donato Baglioni confirmed this on oath.² Such declarations were a very frequent occurrence among Genoese merchants in Venice.³ Why did Oliviero require these? Why did the Genoese merchants need to certify their presence and status in the host country?

Over recent decades, the topic of trading diasporas has elicited growing interest from medieval and early modern history scholars. Books on trade and finance, social groups and religious minorities have analyzed mechanisms of cultural, social and economic interaction between merchants and migrants in the centuries before the first Industrial Revolution in depth. Since Fernand Braudel's seminal work on the early modern economy, merchant communities, nations, groups and, last but not least, networks have become useful tool-box terms to explain success

1. ASVe, *Notarile atti*, b. 6532, c. 65r, 21 February 1585.

2. ASVe, *Notarile atti*, b. 6542, c. 65r, 22 March 1596, c. 218r, 27 August 1596.

3. ASVe, *Notarile atti*, b. 6523, c. 163v, 16 May 1580; b. 6545, c. 297r, 23 September 1598; b. 6549, c. 281v, 12 September 1602.

Deputazione di Storia Patria per la Venezia, 1971), and see the more recent references in Benjamin Arbel, *Trading Nations: Jews and Venetians in the Early Modern Eastern Mediterranean* (Leiden-New York: Brill, 1995), p. 7.