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Saint cults and the politics of power in the Dalmatian commune of Zadar (1000-1468)

The city of Zadar lies upon the Dalmatian coast of modern Croatia. Zadar’s position during the medieval period was that of an affluent port, poised between the markets of East and West, the Balkan hinterland and maritime Adriatic. Such a location made it a strategic colonial target for both Venice and the Kingdom of Hungary. This thesis examines the influence of these political, economic and cultural forces upon the commune’s powerful markers of local identity: its saints’ cults. Zadar’s past wealth created a significant cache of associated metalwork and ecclesiastical architecture that has received little attention beyond the Balkans. Beginning with a grand historical narrative - drawn together from the scholarship of Zaratine, Venetian and Hungarian histories - the complex rivalries and ambitions of the various regional protagonists are highlighted. Zadar’s role within these relations, be it peripheral or central, had an impact upon the commune’s social structures and networks. A study of archival sources indicates a blurring of boundaries between identities, both local and foreign, rather than the stark contrasts that often define the city’s histories. Patronage is also an important aspect of this study, showing how sacral works of art and monumental ecclesiastical structures were important tools in strengthening position and power. The results of such largesse were developments in the cults of Saints Chrysogonus, Simeon the Prophet and Mark the Evangelist. These reveal the flow of cultic practices and artistic trends through Europe, with Zaratine audiences aware of and demanding the most current in their local commissions. Each case study considers ritual, iconography and architectural space, thus contributing additional facets to the understanding of Medieval Zaratine identity.
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Notes

Dalmatian Place and People’s Names

I will be using modern Croatian names for the cities of the Dalmatian coast such as Korčula, Šibenik, Split, Trogir and Zadar instead of the Italian Curzola, Sebenico, Spalato, Traù and Zara. This will help readers identify places on maps today. The Italian versions are more common in Venetian scholarship yet city names during the period 1000-1468 were fluid. Zadar for instance is recorded in a range of contemporary documents and sources as Iadra, Iadera, Giadera, Çara and Zara. Which one is correct? The use of the modern name brings the most clarity.

Names of individuals also raise challenges and have in the past been used as a means of defining modern national identities instead of medieval ones. Where possible, rather than using the Latin or Slavicized versions of names found in the secondary literature, I have recorded the spelling from autographed archival

---

documents. If these were the names that people were known by during their lifetimes, it seems logical to continue their usage.²

**Currency**

Medieval coins and their accounting systems are complex topics: the currency of Zadar no less so. Although the currency was based upon a system of pounds, shillings and pence (*libra, soldi* and *denarii*) it is important for the modern reader to realise that there was a distinction between physical coinage and money of account, i.e. written amounts. The various moneys of account reflected the metal worth of coins at any one time and would fluctuate according to commodity prices as well as the general wear and tear of the coins themselves. Depending on what sort of transaction was under discussion, say a large government contract or international merchant deal versus a small bequest to a servant in a will, different moneys of account were used. I would refer any reader to consult Lane and Mueller’s study on Venetian coins and moneys of account, Spufford’s *Handbook of Medieval Exchange* as well as Antonio Teja and Radomir Jurić’s work on Zaratine currency.³ The main system of account used in Zaratine wills and contracts was that of the *libra* or *soldi parvorum* i.e. that system most commonly used in small scale and domestic transactions. As a result I have written all *libre parvorum* amounts in this thesis with a £, e.g. 3 *libre parvorum* becomes £3, unless another, larger system of account has specifically been used. This will be highlighted in the text.

² Email from Dr. Nikola Vuletić, lecturer, Department of French and Ibero-Roman Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia, to Zoë Willis, 26th February 2010.
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Introduction

Zadar is a small port city on the Dalmatian coast of modern Croatia. Today most tourists bypass the city in favour of better-preserved Split or the beautifully restored Dubrovnik. Visitors to Zadar may spend an afternoon walking its marble lined streets before departing on a ferry to one of the many islands of the Dalmatian littoral. Hints of its medieval past remain in the urban fabric, much ravaged by wars over the centuries of which the most recent were World War II and the break up of Yugoslavia in the early 1990s. The city is a patchwork of architectural styles, from Early Christian churches to Communist apartment blocks all laid out upon a street plan little changed since Roman times.¹ In addition to its architectural heritage the city is host to an exceptional wealth of ecclesiastical metalwork and painting, much of it unknown outside Croatia. The challenge of this thesis is to extract from this evidence the material and historical remains of a particular period: that of the medieval. One of the most dramatic manifestations of any medieval society was the cult of the saints. Bridging the temporal and spiritual worlds, these cults incorporated elements from the civic, liturgical and cultural facets of contemporary life. The commune of Zadar was no exception to this phenomenon. Topography, reliquaries and civic rituals all provide indications of devotional practice and its contemporary significance. This study will examine how and why its communion of patron saints - St Chrysogonus the Martyr, St

Simeon the Prophet and St Mark the Evangelist - were the subject of particular veneration and political importance.

Zadar may be imbued with a long history, but its peripheral status today could suggest that a thesis focussing on a small communion of medieval saints in a minor coastal town threatens to be small-scale in its objectives. Indeed, Dalmatia and its place on the Adriatic coastline often needs pinpointing to medieval scholars, never mind the layman. How could an apparently trivial Dalmatian port and its saintly patrons compete with the splendours of the saints and their veneration found in Constantinople, Rome, Venice or the medieval courts of Central Europe? In fact Zadar was an important trading centre and strategic port in the Adriatic and Eastern Mediterranean. Situated between the Balkan hinterland and Latin maritime routes, Zadar was a point of intercultural confluence and a pivotal link in a mercantile network that stretched from the Levant to northern Europe. Because of these factors the city attracted the attentions of external forces: the Venetian Republic and the Kingdom of Hungary. Zadar's place within this pan-European network and the impact upon the local material culture and ritual veneration of its saint cults make it a revealing case study. It will present methodological frameworks for the future study of ‘peripheral’ sites and shall offer alternative views of the traditionally accepted centres of the medieval world.

Within this larger European context a study of Zadar's saint cults could not simply incorporate the tangible remains of church spaces and silver gilt reliquaries. The function of these objects and the different modes of interaction all contribute to their significance and changing meanings over time. Historical events and the resultant material culture were not the products of an isolated community and so should not be studied as such. The impact of medieval imperialism as a conduit of cultic images and ritual practices has particular resonance for Zadar. The date range of
this thesis, from 1000 to 1468, examines a community that is a fascinating challenge of cultural hybridity, but one that also demands methodological interdisciplinarity. Clearly, the scope of this thesis is decidedly large-scale in its ambition.

0.1 Historiography

Having presented such strident defence of Medieval Zadar as worthy of scholarship, the question should be posed: why is so little known about Zadar and Dalmatia beyond the borders of modern Croatia? With such a rich heritage that began in Antiquity, how could scholars, particularly Anglo-Saxons, miss this corner of south eastern Europe? A brief précis of the historiography associated with the medieval history and history of art in the region will provide this answer; distance, language barriers and nationalist rhetoric all had their part to play.

Arguably, the diminution of Zadar’s position in the region, and thus knowledge of its scholastic significance, began after 1409 and the return of the city to Venetian rule. The commune remained a territory in the Republic’s maritime state or Stato da Mar until 1797 and the abdication of the last Doge. During the Early Modern period Zadar increasingly became a backwater, starved of trade and wealth because of disastrous economic policies dictated by Venice, the constant barrage of Ottoman attacks and the demise of trade routes between Europe and the Levant.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries writers like Giovanni Lucio of Trogir and Daniel Farlati composed histories of the region. These incorporated narratives from a range of sources, be they oral, documentary, architectural and, to a lesser degree, artistic. Their books were popular throughout Europe and were complemented with texts written by foreign travellers such as the Frenchman Jacob Spon and the Englishman George Wheeler. Spon and Wheeler’s seventeenth-century
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2 Giovanni Lucio, De Regno Dalmatiae et Croatioe (Amsterdam: Johannes Blaeu, 1666); Daniel Farlati and Jacopo Coleti, Illyricum Sacrum (Venice: 1753), 2.
account focused on the classical architecture and the Old Master paintings found in the Dalmatian communes. \(^3\) Local historians, such as the Zaratine Valerio Ponte and Lorenzo Fondra, were also compiling histories of their communes. But in the case of both Fondra and Ponte, their work was not published until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries respectively. \(^4\)

However, all of these books and manuscripts - be they by foreigners, regional or local historians - were at odds with eighteenth-century Venetian imperial rhetoric, one imbued with Enlightenment ideals of contrast between the savage and civilised. The communes of the Dalmatian coast, grouped together under the geographic determinant of ‘Dalmatia’ that in no way conveyed the individual sense of communal identity that defined each city, were the closest territories of the *Stato da Mar* to fit into the model. \(^5\) Part Latin and part Slavic, Zadar and its neighbouring Dalmatian communes were at once familiar yet ‘Other’ to the ruling Venetians. This disconnect seemed to justify the discouragement of further promotion and study of the region.

After the fall of the Venetian Republic, Zadar was subject to Napoleon and then Austro-Hungarian rule. Zaratini such as Carlo Federico Bianchi, and in the early
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\(^4\) Ponte’s original manuscript can still be found in the State Archives in Zadar, the Državni arhiv u Zadru. Although consulted by later local historians it was not until Vitaliano Brunelli transcribed and published about half of Ponte’s manuscript that the work became more accessible, albeit only in Croatia and parts of Italy. Zadar, Državni arhiv (hereafter cited as DAZD), Bibliothek, Rkp 19; Vitaliano Brunelli, ‘Historia Ecclesiae Iadrensis auctore Valerio Ponte achidiacono - La storia della chiesa di Zara dell’archid. V. Ponte’, *Rivista Dalmatica*, IV / I (1907), pp. 102-33; Vitaliano Brunelli, ‘Historia Ecclesiae Iadrensis auctore Valerio Ponte achidiacono - La storia della chiesa di Zara dell’archid. V. Ponte’, *Rivista Dalmatica*, IV / II (1908), pp. 192-232; Vitaliano Brunelli, ‘Historia Ecclesiae Iadrensis auctore Valerio Ponte achidiacono - La storia della chiesa di Zara dell’archid. V. Ponte’, *Rivista Dalmatica*, V / I (1909), pp. 65-109. For Fondra see Lorenzo Fondra, *Istoria delle insigne reliquia di San Simeone Profeta che si venera in Zara*, ed. Carlo Federico Bianchi (Zadar: Tipi dei Fratelli Battara, 1855).
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twentieth century, Vitaliano Brunelli continued to write histories of the commune.⁶ The rigorous archival research of both these men was of an exceptionally high and thorough standard, and indeed this calibre of primary scholarship is what continues to distinguish modern Croatian historians and art historians of Zadar. Yet both Bianchi and Brunelli share a similar problem with today’s Croatian scholars: their publications had a relatively small print run, primarily intended for local consumption. Aside from the architectural studies of the Austrian Eitelberger in 1884 and the Englishman Thomas G. Jackson in 1887, there was little foreign interest in Dalmatia and its communes.⁷

The nineteenth century was also a period of increasing national, rather than regional, characterisations. Whilst under Austro-Hungarian rule, the intellectuals and politicians of the Dalmatian coast and Croatian hinterland began to connect themselves with burgeoning senses of either Slavic or, in response to the unification of Italy in 1860, Italian identity.⁸ One of the great projects of the ‘Illyrian’ movement, a group bent on forging linguistic and cultural unity upon the ancient territories of Roman Illyria - Dalmatia, Pannonia, Croatia, Serbia and Slovenia⁹ - was the transcription and compilation of thousands of notarial and diplomatic documents found throughout the archives of the region. Begun in 1874 with the most recent volume only published in 1990, the seventeen-volume Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Slavoniae et Dalmatiae - or Diplomički Zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije - increased the accessibility of the region’s medieval sources to

⁷ R. Eitelberger von Edelberg, Die mittelalterlichen Kunstdenkmale Dalmatiens (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1884); Thomas G. Jackson, Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria with Cettigne in Montenegro and the Island of Grado, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887), 1.
⁸ Reed (2009), pp. 13 & 29.
⁹ Ibid., p. 13.
international scholars. But another aspect of the Illyrian or Yugoslav (Southern Slav) movement was the promotion of Serbo-Croat as the language of choice. Local scholarship was written for a local audience, increasingly promoting an irredentist view of a united, Slavic people that was anachronistically projected upon interpretations of the medieval period. Scholars throughout Europe, although versed in Latin, German, French, Italian and English - depending on their region and specialism - were rarely equipped with a Slavic language. The Latin sources were available but contemporary developments in the study of the medieval Dalmatian communes were unknown beyond south eastern Europe.

During the twentieth century concepts of Slavic identity and perception of medieval history and culture fluctuated in response to the demands of contemporary political ideology. Chapter 2 of this thesis will emphasise that between the years 1000 and 1468 Zadar was home to a vibrant mélange of cultures and language, the inevitable result of a port city situated between a dynamic maritime trade route and the mineral and agricultural wealth of the Balkan hinterlands. Yet the medieval society of the Dalmatian communes was defined as ‘Croatian’ during the fascist rule of Ante Pavelić in the 1940s, then became a homogeneous ‘Yugoslav’ when Tito came to power, before reverting back to ‘Croatian’ after the bloody dissolution of Yugoslavia in the 1990s.

A recent doctoral thesis by Laurel Reed has gone into great depth analyzing the waves of nationalist rhetoric that shaped the region’s historiography. Her work highlights these currents for foreign scholars unaware of the modern nuances of ethnicity and religion that have so horribly disfigured the Balkans. It is at first surprising to find modern definitions of ethnic and political identity imposed upon the medieval, particularly in regional scholarship so deeply imbued with an excellent
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10 Ivan Kukuljević-Sakinski, *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Slavonieae et Dalmatiae* (Zagreb: 1874), 1.  
12 Ibid.
tradition in empirical archival research. Fortunately, during the second half of the twentieth century this high standard of research did continue. Important works of local history and art history were written by historians, art historians and archaeologists such as Nada Klaić, Ivo Petricioli, Tomislav Raukar, Nikola Jakšić, Emil Hilje and most recently, Marijana Kovačević, whose impressive doctoral thesis on metalwork in fourteenth-century Zadar will prove a great resource.\(^1\)

The difficulty of local scholars to gain access to developments in academia beyond Yugoslavia’s borders also raised problems. In 1978 Bariša Krekić, a Yugoslav historian of Medieval Dubrovnik based in America, wrote a review of Tomislav Raukar’s *Zadar u XV stoljeću; ekonomski razvoj i društveni odnosi (Zadar in the 15th Century; Economic Development and Societal Relations).*\(^2\) Today Raukar’s book is still a masterly testament to careful archival study but, as noted by Krekić, the study ‘...might have profited from the modern works of some Western historians’.\(^3\) A new generation of Croatian scholars has begun to engage with methodologies and scholarship from all over Europe and America, creating novel and exciting responses to medieval culture and history in the Dalmatian communes.\(^4\) Many of these have been published in
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English, in contrast to earlier works written in Croatian that might have summaries in English, Italian or German.

For those Western scholars who could not read the Serbo-Croat scholarship a substantial body of work on medieval Dalmatia written in Italian exists. These books were often composed by authors heavily influenced by the Risorgimento concept of *italianità*. This was a heady, irredentist notion of Italian unity, a concept that incorporated parts of the Italian peninsula, Istria and nominally Dalmatia, areas that had historically been autonomous. The political result was that between 1918 and 1944 Zadar did indeed become a part of Italy. During the twentieth century, works by Alessandro Dudan and Giuseppe Praga, an academic and archivist born in Split and Zadar respectively, presented an image of the Dalmatian communes as beacons of civilized Italianate or Latin light in a sea of Slavic and barbaric darkness. Granted, this stance was taken in the context of the increasingly fascist state of Italy during the 1920s, 30s and 40s. The Italian position was prone to as much bias as that held by their Slavic peers, and one that still remains current in some pockets of modern Italy. This tendency was most disconcertingly apparent in Giuseppe Pilo’s *The Fruitful Impact: The Venetian heritage in the art of Dalmatia: “For three hundred and seventy-seven years”*, originally published in 2001, without reference to any contemporary Croatian scholarship, and translated into English in 2005. That is changing. Like Reed and her analysis of Slavic scholarship, the Italian response to Dalmatian history has also been the subject of recent study, for example in a 2002 article by Egidio Ivetić.

---

17 Reed (2009), pp. 29 & 30.
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Scholars from beyond the Adriatic have not been discouraged by these tensions. Suzanne Mariko Miller’s thesis on the development of Venetian colonial administration in medieval Dalmatia cut through much of the recent subjective accretions, dismissing stark contrasts of ethnic definitions (‘Slavic’ versus ‘Latin’) and instead presenting a case for cultural hybridity and ambiguity.\textsuperscript{23} Taking a similar stance, Monique O’Connell’s 2009 volume \textit{Men of Empire: Power and Negotiation in Venice’s Maritime State}, analysed the networks of trade, familial and political alliances of the \textit{Stato da Mar} in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Very much aware of the modern political tensions that resonate through the concept of Dalmatian history, she wrote:

Scholars engaged with this literature are coming to agree that the medieval and early modern Mediterranean cannot be understood as a context between two or even three political and cultural monoliths, but instead as a constant and competitive negotiation among multiple and shifting political authorities.\textsuperscript{24}

These acute approaches are a helpful way to engage with this fascinating region and the complexities of its social frameworks during the medieval period. The one criticism of both Miller and O’Connell is that as Venetianists their work is more dependent on Italian scholarship and at times lacks the Yugoslav and Croatian perspective that would bring additional insights.

This is an issue that continues to beset the study of countries and communes outside of the sphere of ‘Western Europe’. In order to produce as rounded a piece of work as possible, scholars must engage fully with the tremendous efforts of

\textsuperscript{23} Suzanne Mariko Miller, \textit{Venice in the East Adriatic: Experiences and experiments in colonial rule in Dalmatia and Istria} (c. 1150–1358), Ph.D thesis (Stanford University, 2007), p. 3.

local researchers and the richness of their finds, often from the depths of regional
notarial archives. This engagement demands a knowledge of the local language, be it
Serbo-Croat, Greek, Macedonian, Albanian, Czech, Polish or Hungarian. A daunting
prospect but the only means by which as rounded or objective a response to history or
the history of art can be produced. No scholar is infallible though. Even equipped with
the language necessary for the study in question, problems can arise. Edward Said
wrote that

No one [has] ever devised a method for detaching the scholar from the
circumstance of life, from the fact of his involvement (conscious or
unconscious) with a class, a set of beliefs, a social position, or from the mere
activity of being a member of a society.\textsuperscript{23}

Yet by acknowledging and critiquing one’s own stand point and training, a scholar can
try to bring balance and objectivity into their work, especially to areas marred by war
and conflicting identities.

This may be a suitable moment to acknowledge my own flaws in the
preparation of this thesis. Zadar’s history, including a study of its medieval saint cults,
incorporates histories and influences from Zadar proper, Venice and Hungary.
Equipped with Italian, Latin and Croatian I have dealt with literature and sources
written in Croatia and Italy. Without Hungarian, I have leant heavily upon the English
work of John Fine, Pál Engel and Gábor Klaniczay with additional medieval Hungarian
sources from the \textit{Codex Diplomaticus}.\textsuperscript{24} However, Engel noted that any study of
Hungarian medieval history is a challenge: there are not many contemporary narrative

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{24} John V.A. Fine Jr., \textit{The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the
Ottoman Conquest} (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1987); Pál Engel, \textit{The Realm of St. Stephen: A
History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526} trans. by Tamás Pálósfalvi, ed. Andrew Ayton, International Library
of Historical Studies (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2001); Gábor Klaniczay, \textit{Holy rulers and blessed princesses:
dynastic cults in medieval central Europe,} Past and Present publications. (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 2002).
\end{flushright}
sources written within the Kingdom of Hungary, such as chronicles, family histories. Often only contemporary foreign texts can illuminate the medieval Kingdom’s political and social life. In addition, much Hungarian archival documentation from this period was lost in the sixteenth century when the Ottomans destroyed the Royal chancellery in Buda.\textsuperscript{25} Those few royal charters and privileges that survived have in the main been published.

\textbf{0.2 Medieval Imperialism}

The concepts of medieval colonialism and imperialism are also important methodological hurdles to consider. Zadar was an advantageous target of both Venetian and Hungarian territorial expansion. Edward Said’s seminal \textit{Orientalism} paved the way for research that dealt with imposed notions of identity, subjugation and ‘civilisation’, the contrast between the known and ‘Other’ and its impact upon both material and intellectual culture.\textsuperscript{26} But this postcolonial methodology was shaped with the nation state in mind and dealt with nineteenth-century paradigms of contrast. How best to engage with the concept of imperialism and identity in an age well before the formation of the nation state?

Recent scholarship has begun to negotiate the concept of a medieval Post-Colonialism.\textsuperscript{27} The challenge is not to place anachronistic concepts of statehood and identity upon the medieval, thus avoiding the issue that has dogged the historiography

\textsuperscript{25} Engel (2001), pp. xv-xvi.
\textsuperscript{26} Said (2003), pp. 1-2.
of Dalmatia. One convincing framework that has recently been suggested by Barbara Fuchs is the notion of ‘imperium studies’. The thesis is that medieval governments used the model of the Roman Empire for their own programmes of territorial expansion, but with tailored responses to contemporary needs. Instead of modern scholars looking back through Early Modern history and the development of the nation state it would be better to consider history from the other way around, from the evolution of New Romes that emerged from Antiquity and into the medieval period.28 Indeed, the absence of a classical heritage in Venice (one of the few Italian city states without one) arguably contributed to its increasing competitiveness and ultimate overthrow of Byzantine influence in the Mediterranean. Some of these issues will be discussed further in Chapter 5 of this thesis, but the classical concept of Empire and its medieval evolution are compelling models to consider, particularly in regards to the Venetian Stato da Mar.

One particular element from Said’s original methodology does have applicability to the case of medieval Zadar and its cult of the saints: the contrasting concepts of the familiar and ‘Other’ mentioned above. In their studies of Venice and the Stato da Mar, Miller and O’Connell examined how ambiguous - to Venetian eyes - these territorial subjects were. The Zaratini and other Dalmatians were quite similar to the Venetians, sharing Catholicism, a constitutional framework (the city state) 29 and social structures. This contrasted with the contact between Venetians and their Greek population in Candia, where language, religion, government and society appeared profoundly different.30 But in both instances, the communes of Dalmatia and the territories of Venetian Romania, hybridisation and the blurring of boundaries between

coloniser and colonised soon occurred and became manifest in administrative policy and culture.

By contrast Hungary's role as an imperial power over Zadar is little discussed in scholarship. This is probably because archival evidence of imperial relations between Venice and Zadar still exists in both cities, yet virtually nothing documentary remains of the Hungarian administrative presence. Nonetheless, some analysis of Hungarian strategies in Zadar is necessary, at least in comparison with the Venetian administration of the city. The cult of the saints provides a means by which other sources, not just archival, give us some insight into the success of these imperial programmes. Finally, it is also important to consider that the discourse and currents of influence were not just one way, i.e. from centre to periphery. Events and cultural developments in the territories could and indeed did have an impact upon the centre. Without this discourse, hybridisation would not have been possible. The saint cults of medieval Zadar will present numerous examples of this.

0.3 The Cult of the Saints

But first, what evidence remains for the patronage and veneration of saints in Medieval Zadar? There is a substantial body of medieval metalwork, of which reliquaries make up a significant part, kept in the Museum of Sacred Art at the convent of St Mary in Zadar. This is one of the most impressive collections to have survived anywhere in Europe and is why Zadar demands scholarly attention. The Museum contains the material wealth and tangible cultural production of the commune’s saint cults. This vast array of metalwork has been the subject of a number of studies, starting with Valerio Ponte and Lorenzo Fondra in the seventeenth century, to the 2004 catalogue of Zlatarstvo by Nikola Jakšić and Radoslav Tomić as well as Marijana Kovačević’s 2009
doctoral thesis on fourteenth-century metalwork in Zadar. In the case of Ponte and Fondra, they were able to see many of the reliquaries in situ before Napoleon’s early nineteenth-century suppression of many churches and monasteries in Zadar. Some of these pieces have gone missing, including a twelfth-century arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus, which is the subject of analysis in Chapter 3. Much fortunately remains and local scholars have continued to engage with these objects.

Zadar is also favoured with a large deposit of notarial documents from the medieval period, particularly from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Wills, inventories, contracts and Venetian colonial administrative documents have survived and go some way to recreating the social framework in which these saint cults flourished. Much is still only accessible in the city’s Državni arhiv (State archive) but some of these documents have been published. The original documents in the archives have formed the empirical and scientific basis for much of Zadar’s art historical scholarship.

Unfortunately difficulties arise beyond the archives. Just where were these reliquaries first housed and how were they used? Much of the city’s urban fabric has undergone dramatic changes. Churches have been destroyed and those that survive have undergone internal reconfigurations involving architectural space and liturgical furniture. Altars and churches have been rededicated. The original context for the material evidence of medieval saint cults is difficult to recreate. Scholars like Ivo
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3 Brunelli (1907); Brunelli (1908); Brunelli (1909); Fondra (1855); Jakšić and Tomić (2004); Kovačević (2009).
Petricioli and Pavuša Vežić have done much to reconstruct the layouts and church spaces of the medieval period with a combination of archeological and archival evidence. Yet the analysis of the more ephemeral aspects of medieval saint cults, such as rituals, experience, architectural modeling, the multiplication of relics, the interpretation of urban spaces and even patronage, have not been so readily scrutinized in Yugoslav and Croatian scholarship.

Scholars from other parts of Europe and America have been developing these more conceptual modes of interpreting the cult of the saints. Peter Brown’s seminal *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* paved the way for analyzing the influence of social and economic demands upon the burgeoning saint cults in late Antiquity. Cynthia Hahn then went further to discuss the experiential significance of early saint shrines and reliquaries for the faithful, with a particular focus upon the social and political implications of proximity to the sacred. Liturgical function and the significance of material in both shrine and reliquary were also the subject of analysis. A recent thesis by Francesco Lucchini that examines the relics of St Anthony of Padua, particularly their display and reception, continues on with these themes. Lucchini developed a fascinating hypothesis regarding the power of patronage - both sacred and temporal - that had an impact upon the multiplication of the holy
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relics and the diversification of the saint’s cult. As shall be seen in the Zaratine cases of St Chrysogonus and St Mark, the multiplication of relics and the political significance of patronage, both local and foreign, is something hitherto little discussed and worthy of further attention.

In addition to the reception and responses to the tangible remains of saint cults, the more ephemeral impact of civic ritual and collective memory must be considered. Maurice Halbwachs’s concept of social or collective memory and its manipulation by what he terms the ‘cult of the past’ certainly has resonance here. By referring back to what is often an idealized version of past events - events in which the saints were vital protagonists - then the less pleasant realities of the present are erased. Civic rituals and the rites associated with the veneration of the saints were a powerful means by which this was achieved. Barbara Hanawalt and Katherine Reyerson have written on the power of medieval spectacle as a means of granting legitimacy to rulers and the social norms over which they rule. Edward Muir’s work on civic ritual in Renaissance Venice is an important case study that continues this theme, adding concepts of charged sacredness and the experiential that permeated the urban space and ceremonial loci, primarily the basilica of San Marco. Political and temporal legitimacy were very much bound up with the sacred in the medieval period: Gábor Klaniczay’s work on the royal saint cults of Hungary’s Ārpád and Angevin monarchs provides another important example of this.
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This range of approaches to the medieval experience of the sacred will provide a glimpse of the polyvalent approaches to the cult of the saints and have the potential to provide a rich response to any given case study. So far, there has been very little application of these methodologies and frameworks to Zadar and its medieval pantheon of saints. This thesis will further develop the interpretations of Zadar’s saint cults beyond the reliquaries and archival evidence. Cold metal and dried bones are nothing without the richness of contemporary experience and meaning particularly - in Zadar’s case - when it was so intricately bound up in a range of political and social identities.

0.4 Thesis Structure

The main concern of this thesis is Zadar and its saints, but it is also vital to look at the powers that dominated the city’s fortunes. Chapter 1 is primarily a narrative, a history of the commune and region from Late Antiquity until the first Ottoman attack in September 1468. The imperial and political developments of both the Kingdom of Hungary and the Republic of Venice are important elements that defined Zadar’s history. The commune’s responses to their dynastic disputes, diplomatic manoeuvres, economic ambitions and territorial expansion helped shape their territorial policies.

Chapter 2 focuses on the intricacies of this particular society. Governmental frameworks, societal structure, trade and familial networks were all part of this. A large section of this chapter presents a study of testamentary bequests that help discern familial ties and patterns of patronage that bound individual, family, Church and community. Who were the people that helped shape Zadar’s political future during the later medieval period? Yet Zadar’s history was not confined to the perimeters of this peninsular town: foreign rule also created it. How the Hungarian and Venetian
colonial administrations fitted into the wealthy and complex communal society is also discussed and analysed.

Chapter 3 presents the first of the saintly case studies: that of Zadar’s patron saint St Chrysogonus. The theme of transmission is an important element in this chapter, revealing how the influence of royal saint cults in eleventh-century Hungary spread to Zadar through patronage and political need. This then had an impact upon the local cult of the Early Christian martyr, Chrysogonus, instigating its fragmentation from the permanent locus of a tomb into more portable and public manifestations. The chapter is concerned with the fragmentary nature of the saint, both in relic and image. The twelfth-century arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus is of particular importance, signifying the political allegiances between Zadar and Hungary. Yet by the fourteenth century the iconography of the saint had evolved within the Zaratine context to become a distinctly local symbol of confidence and identity. How and why this happened will be discussed, followed by the diffusion of the cult’s imagery across the Adriatic to Venice. Here is a fascinating example of how the periphery in fact influenced the centre and the modes of this transmission will be discussed in greater detail.

Chapter 4 continues these themes of transmission with the cult of St Simeon the Prophet. Unlike St Chrysogonus, Simeon’s cult was focussed on a full body relic that demanded a larger and permanent site as well as a different reliquary. The needs of the faithful, both local and foreign, had to be considered. International models of sacred shrines influenced Zadar, particularly the typology of elevated sarcophagae from the Angevin tombs of Naples and the mendicant shrines of Northern Italy. This transmission incorporated royal patronage with the demands of function and form that defined any important pilgrimage shrine during this period. Zadar’s silver casket reliquary for the saint’s body, commissioned in 1377 by Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić,
wife of Louis I of Hungary, provides another example of a local response to the grand cultural trends of contemporary Europe. As was the case with Chrysogonus, the local interpretation of St Simeon’s cult can again be discerned in Venice. The Venetian response to the saint’s cult again indicates the flow from territory to metropole. There is also a suggestion of imperial competition and ownership in the definition of boundaries between the metropole and its territories.

The final chapter of this thesis examines the cult of St Mark the Evangelist. Mark was patron saint of the Republic of Venice and the subject of elaborate civic rituals and urban development on a monumental scale. Therefore it is not surprising to find such an important manifestation of imperial identity in Zadar and other territories of the Stato da Mar, primarily Candia (Heraklion) in Crete. What is compelling about St Mark’s cult was how its tangible remains - the saint’s relics - became less and less important. The narratives of cultural memory and communal character that combined the ephemera of rituals and the permanence of architecture were what gave meaning to the cult. Could these be translated into the territories of the Stato da Mar? If so, was it an easy fit or was an attuned response necessary? The early manifestations of the cult in Zadar were apparent in a range of modes, from a church dedication to a confraternity as well as an unusual scapula relic. By the fifteenth century, Venice had a more developed sense of imperial identity and its ritualisation, which in turn had an impact upon St Mark’s cult in Zadar. Coinage and feast days became significant carriers of the cult’s civic manifestations. The most impressive example of this was the development of the cathedral of St Anastasia in Zadar. Its chancel and choir was clearly modelled upon that of the Basilica of San Marco. However, even with such an important model dictating the space and its significance, increasingly hybrid local demands took precedence.
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*   *   *

It is clear that Zadar is an important case study. Its local identity was one constantly buffeted by the larger narratives of European history and this had a profound effect upon the city's fortunes and culture. One important facet of that culture was the cult of the saints. Zadar's incredible collection of medieval silver and gold is second to none and as a result a varied range of objects contribute to the study of its saint cults. Themes of portability, permanence and invisibility define the veneration and celebration of Saints Chrysogonus, Simeon the Prophet and Mark the Evangelist and in turn articulate contemporary concepts of identity and ambition.
Chapter 1

The History of Zadar and the Adriatic c. 1000-1468

The history of Zadar is a complex and polyvalent narrative. In order to understand the context in which its local saint cults were founded and flourished this history must be explored. What adds to this challenge is that, as a traditionally ‘peripheral’ territory, Dalmatia demands of a scholar a thorough knowledge of not only the native history but also the scholarship of at least two other important regional literatures: those of medieval Venice and Hungary. Instead of placing Zadar at the edge of these discourses or remaining so focussed on the commune to the detriment of recognising external influences, this chapter will engage in a more nuanced intercultural dialogue. Whilst the demands of larger regional forces frequently buffeted the commune, often the needs of Zadar and its population would shape and define policy back in the metropoles, particularly that of Venice.

Beginning with Zadar’s earliest origins and geographic appeal, this chapter then traces Venice’s early territorial growth into the Adriatic and Zadar’s place within that early empire. Venetian expansion spurred the imperial ambitions of the Hungarian Árpád monarchs, keen to consolidate their land-locked hinterland with a strategic coastline. Zadar in particular, with its mercantile wealth and superlative anchorage, was an important target. Over the course of the twelfth century, the pressures and overtures of both Venice and Hungary heavily influenced the city’s
fortunes. In the Venetian case, involvement in local ecclesiastical affairs as well as the repeated installation of autocratic colonial counts resulted in revolts and tensions between territory and centre. The thirteenth century began with the dramatic sack of Zadar in 1202, the pillage of a Catholic city by Crusader and Venetian forces. Venice’s superior military force as well as a lack of Hungarian support at this time resulted in a subdued commune for much of the century, a peace usually only broken by empty promises of Hungarian involvement. As the Árpád dynasty began to unravel after 1250, Neapolitan Angevins, keen to claim another throne through canny marital connections, added to regional tensions. This instability allowed for ambitious nobles throughout Hungary to expand their powers. Zadar was under pressure from Venice, the Angevins, Árpád and local Croatian noble families such as the Šubići Counts of Bribir. Which one would ensure the military stability so keenly sought by the commune, yet preserve its autonomy and mercantile success?

So began the fourteenth century, with many of the same themes defining its major events. The call for more independence from an increasingly sophisticated Venetian colonial administration could result in conflict. The revolts of 1313 and 1345-6 ended when the besieged Zaratini succumbed to the naval power of the Venetians. Domestic troubles for the Republic and an increasingly desperate war with Genoa created the opportunity in 1358 for Zadar to pledge its allegiance to a stable and strong Angevin regime in Hungary. Zadar’s stability and prosperity lasted until the end of the century, during which it provided a bridge between Angevin concerns in both Hungary and Naples. At the end of the fourteenth century, Hungary was wracked by dynastic disputes and civil war creating a time of great vulnerability for Zadar. The commune briefly submitted to the Neapolitan claimant of the Hungarian throne, Ladislaus of Naples, but finally returned to Venetian rule in 1409. By now the Republic had refined its responses and control of its colonial territories to such a degree that the commune
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would remain subject to it until the end of the eighteenth century. Only the Ottoman threat to Zadar that began in 1468 - the end of this thesis's ambit - dramatically changed conditions for both the city and Venice. Although primarily a historical narrative, this chapter provides the historical framework that explains the elaborate networks between metropoles and territory, the commune and individual, the community and its saints.

To begin with, what made this port city so appealing to the Kingdom of Hungary and the Republic of Venice? The commune of Zadar is situated on the East coast of the Adriatic, at the northern end of the Dalmatian coast, in what is today Croatia. (Fig. 1.1) The surrounding archipelago is made up of nineteen islands, ranging in size from 3.7 km² to 114.4 km². Behind this screen of islands the city of Zadar juts out on a small peninsula only 1.5 km long and 200 to 300m wide. Surrounded by water on three sides, it also has a sheltered deep-water port on its east side that, like other communes of the Dalmatian littoral, provides unparalleled anchorage and maritime security. (Fig. 1.2) The city's origins are those of a Greek colony, later becoming the settlement of Jadra in the Roman province of Illyria. This province stretched from the banks of the Danube in central Europe to the Eastern coast of the Adriatic, incorporating the two regions of Pannonia and Dalmatia. Zadar's survival beyond Antiquity was because of its location in the middle of important trade routes between East and West. Maritime traffic needed secure harbours in which to rest and restock as it made its way up or down the coast, transporting good and chattels between the Italian peninsula and the Levant.

---

1 Škarda and Vrgada are the smallest and the Dugi Otok, which translates appropriately as 'Long Island, is the largest. Tomislav Raukar, Zadar u XV stoljeću; ekonomski razvoj i društveni odnosi (Zadar in the 15th Century: Economic Development and Societal Relations), ed. Sveučilište u Zagrebu - Institut za Hrvatskom Povijest (Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1977), p. 16
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This central location in the Mediterranean world of Antiquity, poised between Rome and the East, meant Zadar was host to early Christian evangelists and missionaries. The most famous was Saint Paul, who wrote in his letter to the Romans ‘...from Jerusalem and all around, even as far as Illyricum, I have fully carried out the preaching of the Gospel of Christ’.⁴ Where within the large province of Illyria Paul preached is not clear, but later commentators and historians such as Farlati, Luccio and Bianchi were keen to suggest that the Apostle converted Dalmatia.⁵ Paul’s companion, Titus, patron saint of Candia in Crete, also went to Dalmatia.⁶ To further enhance Dalmatia’s Christian credentials, the nineteenth-century Zaratine canon and local historian, Carlo Bianchi, even went so far as to suggest that Saints Peter and Luke not only visited Dalmatia but also must have stayed in Zadar.⁷ Whoever actually visited Zadar, the work of numerous missionaries during the early centuries was successful; by the fourth century Zadar was granted an episcopal seat, thus confirming its spiritual alliance with the Western Church.⁸ After the fall of the Roman Empire in the West, Zadar and the other Dalmatian communes were quickly absorbed into the Byzantine fold following emperor Justinian’s (c. 482–565) reconquest of Italy.⁹ Economic and political stability were tied together, so trade routes and communications needed to be maintained and protected. The city later became a Byzantine theme, a territorial administrative centre of the empire.¹⁰ The urban and

---

⁷ The basis for this claim lay in the fact that numerous churches within the city were dedicated to Peter or Luke. Bianchi unfortunately made no comparison with the numbers of churches in other cities - Dalmatian or otherwise - that were dedicated to the two saints, so whether or not Zadar was unusual in its high number of such titular churches is not clear. Bianchi (1877), pp. 2–3 & 9.
⁸ The documents supporting its episcopal status were much later in coming, not appearing until the tenth century. Joan Dusa, The Medieval Dalmatian episcopal cities: development and transformation, American University Studies, Series 9, History (New York: Lang, 1991), p. 35.
military development of Zadar and the other Dalmatian communes reflected their increasing importance as mercantile and maritime hubs. Joan Dusa has described this process as the transformation from Roman ‘villae’ to medieval ‘castrae’, where commercial enterprise within Antique urban plans were enclosed and protected by medieval fortifications.\(^{11}\)

As well such an advantageous maritime location, the Velebit mountain range - also known as the Dinaric Alps - to the city’s northeast ensures that the warm, Mediterranean temperatures stay on the maritime side. Zadar is therefore protected from the harsher continental climate of the hinterland.\(^{12}\) This has meant that Zadar and the islands of the district could produce a range of agricultural commodities, such as wine and olive oil, fruit and vegetables, wood and fish. The Balkan hinterland was also a vital source of cereals,\(^{13}\) and Zaratine connections with the mines of Bosnia and Serbia created a supply of silver and lead into the commodity markets of the Adriatic.\(^{14}\) The most important product, though, was salt. It was this that made Zadar rich. A combination of currents and driving northerly winds during winter, called *bura* in the local dialect, ensured high levels of quality salt production from Antiquity until the Early Modern period.\(^{15}\) The Adriatic’s fine salt crystals, the *sali minuti*, were highly

\(^{12}\) Raukar (1977), p. 16.
\(^{14}\) It should be noted that metals only made up a small part of Zadar’s economy in contrast to that of medieval Dubrovnik (Ragusa). Raukar (1977), p. 18; Marijana Kovačević, Umjetnička obrada plemenitih meta na Zadru u 14. stoljeću (The artistic working of precious metals in fourteenth-century Zadar), Ph.D thesis (University of Zadar, 2009), p. 626.
desirable in contrast to the larger salt crystals found in the rest of the Mediterranean, the sali grossi.¹⁶

1.1 Zadar and Venetian territorial expansion, 1000-c. 1200

Byzantium controlled Zadar and Dalmatia until the end of the tenth century when Venice began its ascendancy as an imperial force within the Mediterranean world. Before 1000 AD the sailors, traders and pirates of the Dalmatian littoral were so effective in their privateering and mercantile endeavours that, should they ever join forces, theirs would have been the only power within the Adriatic that could compete with Venice. Doge Pietro II Orseolo (991-1008) recognised the threat and responded with both diplomatic and military methods. Venice was poised between East and West and in the tenth century that meant a precarious position between Byzantium and the Holy Roman Empire.¹⁷ Fortunately, a succession of canny and shrewd Doges garnered trading and diplomatic privileges from both empires that secured the fledgling Republic’s position.¹⁸ In the case of Orseolo, he upheld both empires’ claims as heirs of Rome, yet maintained Venetian independence.¹⁹ One of Orseolo’s diplomatic coups was the marriage of his eldest son, Giovanni, to Maria Argiro, niece of the Byzantine emperors.²⁰ He also managed to procure generous trade agreements from Byzantium and the Holy Roman Empire, which in turn stimulated trade along Adriatic coast and between the two empires. The boost in maritime traffic resulted in more activity amongst the pirates. This justified the Venetian case to extinguish this threat, which

---

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 21 & 39-42.
would secure both trade and the unspoken reality of Venice's increasing regional
dominance.\textsuperscript{21}

In the year 1000 confidence amongst the pirates was so high that a group from
the Neretva region in southern Dalmatia, known as the Narentini, attacked the area
surrounding the Brenta river in the Veneto.\textsuperscript{22} Such an audacious strike well beyond the
known boundaries of their territory was an opportunity for Orseolo to attack, which he
did with precision and success. The Doge then launched an expedition down the East
Adriatic, routing the Narentini and demanding support from the Dalmatian
communes. One of the Doge's advisors who went on the campaign, John the Deacon,
wrote in his \textit{Istoria Veneticorum} that prior to this expedition only the citizens of Zadar
from the entire territory of Dalmatia obeyed the authority of the Venetian duke.\textsuperscript{23} He
claimed that the various communes of Dalmatia were so fearful of the Narentini that
they sent ambassadors to the Doge requesting that he send an army to free them from
the cruelty of 'the Slavs'. In return they promised perpetual submission to the power of
the Doge and all his successors.\textsuperscript{24} This image of the Dalmatian communes voluntarily
turning to the Republic for help from the predation of other external forces was a
leitmotif amongst medieval Venetian chroniclers.\textsuperscript{25} In reality pragmatism rather than
any true affection or affinity for the Republic is what drove the communes, Zadar in
particular, into treaties and arrangements with the Venetians.

\textsuperscript{22} The Neretva river spills out into the Adriatic at Ploče, tucked behind the Pelješac peninsula which lies
south of the island of Hvar.
\textsuperscript{23} ‘...in Dalmaciarorum confinio non plus quam lateranenses cives Veneticorum ducis ditioni
Dandolo wrote this line virtually verbatim. See Andrea Dandolo, ‘Andreea Danduli Ducis Venetiarum
\textsuperscript{24} ‘...Dalmaciarorum populi omnes poene simul convenientes, Petro Veneticorum duci sui internunciis
hoc demandaverunt, quod si ipse venire aut exercitum mittere vellet, qui eos a Scavorum severitate
liberaret, ipsi et illum civitates perpetua stabilitate suae suorumque successorum potestatibus subditos
manerent.’ Diacono (1999), p. 188.
\textsuperscript{25} Suzanne Mariko Miller, \textit{Venice in the east Adriatic: Experiences and experiments in colonial rule in
Dalmatia and Istria} (c. 1150–1358), Ph.D thesis (Stanford University, 2007), pp. 142-143.
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Nonetheless, due deference was paid to the Doges and their representatives as and when relations were close. In May of 1000, following his victory over the Narentini, Orseolo continued down the Adriatic. He visited the cities of Zadar, Biograd, Split and Lastovo whilst embassies from Rab, Osor, Krk, Trogir and Dubrovnik attended his visits. In Zadar the bishop, clerics and all the people of the city met the Doge, whereupon ‘...they freely gave themselves to his dominion.’ At Lastovo, Orseolo completed his victory over the remaining pirates and so began almost eight hundred years of Venetian involvement in Dalmatia and its communes. Venetian involvement had not only secured its own trade networks but was also a significance step towards increasing its regional dominance.

In addition to John the Deacon’s dramatic scene of the Dalmatians welcoming the Venetian force with open arms, later Venetian chroniclers further embellished events to justify Orseolo’s campaign and thus later Venetian imperial policy in Dalmatia. Andrea Dandolo’s Chronica Extensa of the mid fourteenth century and the Venetiarium historia of c. 1354-58 wrote that the Dalmatian city-states were so frustrated with the Narentini that the Byzantine emperors, Basil and Constantine, gave the Venetians permission to intercede on the Dalmatian’s behalf. John the Deacon did not record such an alliance. Yet the Chronica Extensa and Venetiarium historia were composed after centuries of a developing imperial presence on the Dalmatian

---

28 Lane (1973), p. 26
29 ‘Qua de causa Veneti ab illis evocati cum permisione Blaxii et Constantini imperatorum Constantinopolitiorum, a quibus antiquitus illius sceptri reges recognoverunt, Dalmacie dominium primitus acceperunt... Unde Dalmatini non valentes Narentinorum dominium tolerare et contra eos a Venetis defendi pose rationabiliter extimantes, suis duci nuntiis delegatis, preffatum ducem in suum generalem dominum ellegerunt’. Iustiniani (1964), p. 66-67; See also Dandolo (1938), p. 197; For more about the rhetoric of medieval Venetian chroniclers when discussing relations with and history of Dalmatia see Miller (2007).
coast. In this context, these literary attempts to enhance Orseolo’s claim of domination over the region should come as no surprise.

Even without this apocryphal support from Byzantium, Orseolo and his successors took the title of Duke of Dalmatia. Whilst Orseolo enjoyed military triumph in the region he did not leave in place a secure colonial administration for the communes. Whilst the Dalmatian cities would often choose a Venetian to take the role of their rector or count, this advantage was not at first exploited. The Doges had other concerns. The Republic was consolidating its control over the Venetian lagoon, an area known as the **Dogada**. Byzantium was also increasing its Mediterranean presence under the Comnenos emperors. Venetian foreign policy had to look further east again, appeasing relations and strengthening trade relations with Constantinople before returning its focus to Dalmatia.

Even during this early period of relative autonomy for Zadar, there were revolts against Venetian counts and their influence. The first was in 1015 and a second occurred in 1050. The third uprising happened in 1094 and the fifteenth-century Venetian chronicler, Giorgio Dolfin, asserted that the ‘counsel and help of the King of Hungary’ instigated it. By the end of the eleventh century Dalmatia was becoming a theatre of conflict between the Republic of Venice and the Kings of Hungary as both attempted to draw the littoral and its communes within their particular spheres of influence. Venice was keen to control Zadar. The commune had the potential to

---

32 Miller (2007), p. 34.
33 Ibid., pp. 34 & 55.
35 ‘La seconda volta rebello Zara... contra Venetiam cum consiglio et auito del Re d’Ungaria in tempo de m[esser] ordolafo falier nel anno del signor 1094.’ BMV, Mss. It. VII, 794 (8503), fol.28r.
become as powerful and as fickle a force in the Adriatic as Dubrovnik, or possibly an Angevin or Norman stronghold in the region. This would disrupt Venice’s lucrative trade routes with the Levant.³⁶

1.2 Zadar and Hungary, 1000 to c. 1200

In the eleventh century Hungary developed as a new force in the complex and delicate political web that characterised the medieval Mediterranean. After the death of the Kingdom’s first Christian monarch, Stephen of the house of Árpád (1000-1038), the eleventh century was defined by dynastic disputes and the machinations of an unruly landed aristocracy. Tensions between pagans and Christians led to further unrest in the Kingdom.³⁷ It was King Ladislaus I (1077-1095) who created peace in the Kingdom and confidence in the monarchy. A politically shrewd man and important patron of the Church, Ladislaus became one of the most revered Kings of Hungary and was canonised in 1192. Under his auspices the cult of the monarchy began, a framework of dynastic promotion similar to that developed by the Ottonians around the figure of Charlemagne.³⁸ By creating a cult of dynastic sanctity around members of the Árpád dynasty - primarily Stephen and his son Emeric - Ladislaus would have an impact upon

³⁶ Although Dubrovnik had initially sworn allegiance to Orseolo in 1000, by 1030 they had returned to the Byzantine fold before throwing that off in the 1080s in favour of the increasing Norman presence in the region. This only lasted until the early twelfth century when Dubrovnik favoured a return to Byzantine rule, a rule that was increasingly weak and which afforded more political and economic autonomy than that offered by Hungary, Venice or the Normans. Trade treaties with the Italian peninsula and Balkan hinterland ensued, along with the increasing erosion of the privileges of the foreign counts as the power of the local nobility increased. Bariša Krikić, Dubrovnik in the 14th and 15th centuries: a city between East and West, The Centers of Civilization series (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971), pp. 9-16; Hocquet (1978), p. 177.

³⁷ There was a small window of opportunity when the Republic of Venice could have extended its influence beyond the seas and into the continental hinterland; soon after King Stephen’s death it was decided that his cousin Vasul or Basil was unfit for the crown and that a foreign choice might prove more amenable. Peter Orseolo, son of the Venetian Doge, was chosen and his reign lasted until 1041. Unfortunately, Peter not only brought with him a rowdy entourage of ‘shouting Germans and chattering Italians’ but was also rumoured to have denied the widow of popular Stephen her financial dues. The acute cultural differences between the Hungarian barons - a political force whose taming was a constant issue for the Kingdom’s monarchs be they Venetian or otherwise - and Peter Orseolo brought about his downfall. Pal Engel, The Realm of St. Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895-1526 trans. by Tamás Pálósfalvi, ed. Andrew Ayton, International Library of Historical Studies (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2001), pp. 28-34.

saint cults throughout Medieval Europe, from Naples to Marseilles, and from Zadar to Venice. The particular influence upon the Zaratine cults of saints Chrysgonus and Simeon the Prophet are examined further in Chapters 3 and 4.

Ladislaus also oversaw the expansion of Hungarian territories. In 1089 Zvonomir, last King of Croatia (1075-1089) and Ladislaus’ brother-in-law, died. Although Zvonomir had declared Croatia a papal fief upon his death, Ladislaus asserted his claim to the Kingdom in 1091.\(^9\) Hungary was not the only regional power who wished to exploit the vacuum left by the last of the Croatian Kings. During the dogate of Vitale Falier (1084-96), the Venetian Doges added the honorific of ‘duke of Croatia’ and created the title *dux Venetiaram, dux Dalmatiae et dux Chroatiae.*\(^{10}\) The Republic was never actively involved in the Croatian hinterland but there was grave concern about the proximity of Hungarian influence to the Dalmatian communes now that the buffer of an independent monarch and his Kingdom was gone.

It must be borne in mind that the medieval Kingdom of Croatia did not follow the same borders as the modern state. At this point, ‘Croatia’ included Dalmatian Croatia (excluding the coastal communes of Roman-Byzantine heritage), Pannonian Croatia (defined as the space between Hungary, Bosnia and Dalmatia) and parts of Bosnia.\(^{11}\) (Fig. 1.3) The capital was the town of Biograd, just south of Zadar. In 1102 King Coloman of Hungary (1095-1116) was also crowned King of Croatia in the city, an event witnessed by the heads of the various Croatian aristocratic families. Although the Hungarian Kings ruled Croatia it was granted what Pál Engel has defined as an ‘associate status’ and was never fully absorbed into the Kingdom of Hungary.\(^{12}\) Over the course of the twelfth century Croatia’s borders were realigned; Pannonian Croatia

---

\(^{10}\) Dandolo (1938), pp. 279-80; Miller (2007), p. 58.
\(^{12}\) Engel (2001), p. 35.
was divided into Slavonia and Croatia. (Fig. 1.4) The latter region extended from the Dalmatian coast in the west - a stretch of coastline that began at the headland of the Kvarner Gulf in the north to the mouth of the Neretva river in the south - to the Vrbas and Neretva rivers in the east.43

Both Slavonia and Croatia were granted a viceroy or governor, known as the Ban or banus, who administered their respective territories.44 Following Coloman’s coronation, a covenant was confirmed with the Croatian nobility wherein the Hungarian King recognised their autonomy and particular privileges. The Croatian nobility generally proved themselves stable allies of the Hungarian King, working well with the Ban of Croatia. From 1197 the position of the Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia was created, a relatively autonomous vassal to the King of Hungary. The duke’s power was considerable. He provided military forces for the King, could wage war against neighbouring states, minted his own money, installed bishops, settled disputes between the regional nobility, and issued charters of privilege and land grants. The duke enjoyed his own entourage and court, closely modelled on the court that surrounded the King in Hungary. Often the duke was either the brother or son of the Hungarian King so his time as duke provided a training opportunity before he took over the reigns of power in Hungary proper. The duke’s deputy was the ban, usually a Croat or Hungarian nobleman.45

From Coloman’s coronation in 1102 sprung an effective working relationship between Croats and Hungarians. But this rule did not extend as far as the semi-autonomous cities of the Dalmatian coast. Coloman could not ignore the commune’s strategic locations and mercantile wealth. In 1105 whilst the First Crusade in the Holy

---

43 The source of the Vrbas is in Western Bosnia and Herzegovina and is a tributary of the Sava river. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 22.
44 Engel (2001), pp. 35-36.
45 Beneath the ban was the position of župan, a hereditary position amongst the nobility that was in charge of a particular county or županija. Fine Jr. (1987), pp. 22-3.
Land distracted Venice, Coloman attacked. His main targets were Split and Zadar, the former an archbishopric and the latter an important regional political centre. Zadar fell after a short siege, while Split and its neighbouring city of Trogir swiftly surrendered to the Hungarian terms. In 1108 the communes’ privileges and autonomy were confirmed but at a cost of two thirds of their customs duties which had to be paid to the King.

Following this success in Zadar and the other cities of Dalmatia, Coloman then went on to enjoy the full title of ‘King of Hungary, Croatia and Dalmatia’, a title he passed on to his fifteen-year-old son, Stephen II (1116-1131). In the same year of Coloman’s death, Doge Ordelaffo Falier (1102-1117) lived up to his own title as ‘duke of Dalmatia’ and returned to the region by retaking Split, Trogir, Zadar and also conquering Rab, Šibenik, Nin and Novigrad. However, Falier was himself killed outside Zadar in 1117 - possibly by Zaratini still loyal to the Hungarian cause - and the military campaign lost momentum. The Venetians retreated to Zadar and the Kvarner islands whilst the land-based Hungarians captured Split, Trogir, Šibenik and the towns of the Croatian hinterland. In 1123 the Venetians briefly retook these territories but the Hungarians ousted them again the following year. In all of this turmoil the Venetians held onto Zadar.

---

46 Dandolo (1938), pp. 228-29.
49 Dandolo (1938), p. 231.
The twelfth century was characterised by this toing and froing of imperial claim and counterclaim over the Dalmatian communes. The Zaratini, far from being passive elements in these proceedings, were often active drivers of imperial policy. An important example was that of the 1154 elevation of the bishopric of Zadar to the status of a metropolitan seat. The bishopric of Zadar was a part of the greater archdiocese of Salona, situated just outside Split. However, the Primate of Salona was also an important ecclesiastical figure whose support for the Hungarians was well known. The secular power wielded by local prelates was considerable so control of these men was a powerful tool in the imperial management of the Dalmatian territories.\textsuperscript{51} Venice still ruled Zadar at this point so the Republic was keen to counter Salona with another regional archbishop.\textsuperscript{52} This not only irritated the Hungarians but also proved an issue that exacerbated an intense local rivalry between the Zaratini and the Spličani, particularly between the years 1129 and 33. The thirteenth-century chronicler Archdeacon Thomas of Split described the communal tensions reflected in ecclesiastical relations;

At that time Bishop Micha, son of Caloprestancius, headed the church at Zadar. But Archdeacon Dobre [of Split] had promised him the archbishopric of Split. On this account the archdeacon received many offerings and presents from him. But what he had promised concerning the archbishopric he had no intention of fulfilling. But as the bishop kept pressing, the archdeacon made him a promise but played the following trick on him. He fixed a date on which the bishop should come to Split to sing mass, and while doing so urged them not to allow their church to remain bereft of a pastor for such a long time. And the archdeacon promised that when these words were delivered he would


\textsuperscript{52} Dandolo (1938), p. 245.
be the first to speak in favor of electing the bishop...The bishop came, celebrated mass, and delivered his exhortation, and the archdeacon who had promised to speak out in favour of the bishop’s election said nothing! On seeing that he had been made a fool of by the archdeacon, the bishop departed in a fury, announcing that he intended to withdraw the submission that Zadar owed to the metropolitan of Split and to exempt himself completely from its jurisdiction.\(^{53}\)

By the 1140s, internal competition between clerics in Zadar meant that the bishop’s seat was vacant. The pro-Venetian count, Petrana,\(^{54}\) chose Lampredius, a candidate he felt would be the easiest to work with. Thomas of Split wrote that ‘[Petrana] believed that life with [Lampredius] would be relatively agreeable, because Lampredius was not a haughty man himself, nor was he of haughty stock. In the event, Lampredius was made bishop of Zadar.’\(^{55}\) Although Lampredius (1154-1180) may not have been ‘of haughty stock’ he was certainly ambitious and began lobbying the Papal Curia for Zadar’s elevation to a metropolitan seat. In 1154 Pope Anastasius IV (1153-4) finally granted the city the new status. The archbishop’s jurisdiction increased to include the

---


\(^{55}\) ‘Hic cepit fovere partem Lampredii sperans se cum eo suavius vivere, eo quod nec ipse per se superbus nec erat de superbo sanguine procreatus. Tandem Lampredius iste Iaderensis episcopus est effectus.’ Ibid., p. 108.
bishoprics of Hvar, Krk, Osor and Rab in addition to Zaravecchia, Nin and Pašman. Yet within a year, following the installation of a new Pope Adrian IV (1154-9) and intense Venetian pressure, a new decree was announced: the metropolitan seat of Zadar was now subject to the Patriarch of Grado.

Situated between Istria and the north of the Venetian lagoon the patriarchate of Grado had traditionally been a Byzantine counterpoint to the Patriarch of Aquileia, a prelate chosen by the Holy Roman Emperor to lead a diocese described as ‘an imperial stronghold’. Over the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Venetian control of the Grado patriarchy increased. Dogal family members often held the position, for example Orso Orseolo, son of Pietro II Orseolo, and later Enrico Dandolo (1131-86), and made for more amenable patriarchs. In 1150 Pope Eugene III confirmed the right of the Doges to choose the candidates for the patriarch. At this point the Venetian Enrico Dandolo was patriarch and his connections to the Papacy may have contributed to this decision. Certainly, it was this influence that helped Enrico gain the title of Primate of Dalmatia in 1155, and thus extended the Patriarch’s jurisdiction over Krk, Osor, Rab and the recently elevated archbishopric of Zadar.

---

59 Enrico was the uncle of Doge Enrico Dandolo who led the Crusaders against Zadar and Constantinople in 1202-4. Demus (1960), p. 39.
Venice now had its ecclesiastical counterpoint to Salona and this had come about because of local rivalry between the Zaratini and Spličani.

Back in Zadar, archbishop Lampredius and his supporters were not about to tolerate this perceived interference in the commune’s secular and ecclesiastical autonomy. The commune was so angry at this infringement that in 1155 it rose up with the support of the Hungarians and threw out the Venetian count, Domenico II Morosini, and his administrators. Four years later, Doge Vitale II Michiel sent out a fleet led by Domenico that attacked Zadar and brought it back under Venetian control. All men over twelve years of age were forced to swear allegiance to the Doge. Both the ecclesiastical and the secular authorities confirmed that they would no longer question the rule of Grado over them. This did not bring about lasting peace in the commune. The Venetian authorities swiftly crushed small revolts that occurred in 1164 and 1168.

In 1171 the Zaratini declared their allegiance to Byzantium, again ousted Domenico Morosini and voted the archbishop Lampredius as count instead. Morosini soon returned with a naval flotilla and recaptured the city. Relations continued to deteriorate between the commune, Morosini and, by extension, Venice. Unhappy at its ecclesiastical subjugation to the Patriarch of Grado, Zadar appealed to the Papacy to change the situation. The appeal was rejected. This combination of circumstances led to Morosini’s final removal in 1180 when Zadar pledged allegiance to the Hungarian King Béla III (1172-96). By 1182 the Hungarians had taken over much of Dalmatia again. Morosini would not be dissuaded. In 1187 he and his son Ruggiero, former count of Pag who had also been deposed by the local community, led a naval

63 Dandolo (1938), p. 250.
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strike against Zadar. Venice’s Maggior Consiglio funded the expedition, an instance where personal ambitions (in this case those of the Morosini family) coincided with the greater imperial aims of the Republic. The attack, however, was a spectacular failure. In 1190 the Republic tried again to take Zadar but the resultant Battle of Treni, a maritime battle fought between the islands of Cres and Mnun in the Kvarner Gulf, proved disastrous. The Zaratini were victorious and the Venetians humiliated. This triumph proved a turning point in Zadran identity and the development of its patron saint cult around the figure of St Chrysogonus, an important aspect that shall be considered in Chapter 3.

1.3 Zadar under Venice, 1204-1358

The Battle of Treni ushered in a decade of relative peace, stability and autonomy for Zadar. Meanwhile, Béla III died in 1196 and his son Emeric (1196-1204) shifted the focus of Hungarian foreign policy toward the Balkan hinterland. Writing in the 1250s Archdeacon Thomas of Split painted a colourful image of the Zaratini in the 1190s, whose crimes and sins included piracy, heresy, greed and pride.

At that time the Zaratins were particularly hostile towards the Venetians. They attacked the Venetians in whatever way they could, seizing their goods, inflicting injury, and slaughtering them, and strove with all their might to inflict on them whatever harm it was in their power to do. For they were vastly rich and were carried away by great and wanton impudence. Swollen with pride, elated with power, boastsings of the outrages that they inflicted, exulting

---

71 This occurred for two reasons; the first was territorial expansion. Emeric hoped to add the Kingdom of Serbia to his realm. Second, Emeric was a great supporter of Pope Innocent III who was keen to prohibit the rise of Orthodoxy in Serbia as well as the Patarene heresy that was taking hold of parts of Bosnia. Engel (2001), p. 88.
in their evil deeds, they mocked their inferiors and defied their superiors. They believed that there were none equal to them. And although they had been corrupted by so many vices, they heaped on them even a further wickedness; that they rejected the true and Catholic faith, and allowed themselves to be defiled with the sickness of heresy. For almost everyone who counted among the nobles or the higher-born of Zadar gladly received and encouraged heretics.\textsuperscript{73}

Some context should be provided for Thomas’ comment as his words do not provide an objective account. Communal rivalry often defined political relations between the Dalmatian cities and indeed the earlier tensions between the archbishop of Salona and the bishop of Zadar provide a good example of this. Writing in the seventeenth century, Giovanni Lucio recorded in his \textit{Historia di Dalmatia} Trogir’s four wars between Split and Šibenik in the period 1240 to 1280 as well as two ecclesiastical controversies between the Šibenčani and the bishop of Trogir.\textsuperscript{73} As we shall see, the communes would also join forces against a particular city, such as was the case in 1345-6 during the siege of Zadar (of which more later). Archdeacon Thomas’ description was penned in this context of regional rivalry, but it nonetheless creates a vivid picture and a local justification of the events that occurred in 1202.

In 1198 Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) had announced a call for participants in the Fourth Crusade.\textsuperscript{74} In 1201 Northern European Crusaders arranged for Venice to

\textsuperscript{73} ‘Erant autem eo tempore laderenses Venetis multum infesti. Quacumque enim ex parte poterant, Venetos invadabant, bona eorum diripientes, inuriantes, trucidantes et quicquid mali exercere valebant in ipsos, toto viribus conabantur. Quippe divitis affluentes multa lascivie insolentia raptabantur, erant enim superbia tumidi, potentia elati, de inuriis gloriantes, de malitiis exulantibus, deridebant inferioriores, contemptebant superiores, nullos sibi fore pares credebant. Et cum pluribus essent vitii depravati, hoc etiam ad nequitiae suum cumulum addiderunt, ut catholice fidei normam spernerent et heretica se permitterent tabe respergi. Name pene omnes, qui nobiliiores et maiores ladere censebantur, libertur hereticos et sivebant.’ Thomas of Split (2006), pp. 144-147.

\textsuperscript{73} See Giovanni Lucio, \textit{Historia di Dalmatia. Et in particolare delle Città di Trau, Spalatro e Sebenico} (Venice: Stefano Curti, 1674).

\textsuperscript{74} Thomas of Split (2006), p. 145.
prepare a fleet to cross the Mediterranean. The Frenchman Geoffroy de Villehardouin recounted the Crusaders’ response to the Republic’s efforts once they arrived in Venice in 1202.

No one has ever seen so great a fighting force, nor one so imposing either...

The fleet [the Venetians] had got ready was so fine and well equipped that no man in the whole of Christendom has ever seen one to surpass it. It comprised so great a number of warships, galleys, and transports that it could easily have accommodated three times as many men as were in the whole of the army.

However, enthusiasm soon vanished when it became apparent that not all the Crusaders who had said they would come to Venice had actually arrived. Much to the embarrassment of those who were present, there was simply not enough money available to pay for the goods and services provided by the Venetians.

The Doge Enrico Dandolo (1192-1205), then stepped in and offered a compromise.

‘The King of Hungary has taken from us our city of Zara in Sclavonia, one of the strongest places in the world; and we shall never recover it, even with all the forces at our disposal, except with the aid of the French. So let us ask them to help us reconquer it and we will allow them to postpone payment of the

---

73 Since 1171 tensions had increased between Venice and Byzantium as the privileges and monopolies enjoyed by the Venetians in Constantinople were whittled away and markets opened up to competitors, such as the Genoese and Pisans. Doge Enrico Dandolo was keen to prevent further impairment of Venetian commercial interests in the region so it would seem likely that he had already considered the possibility of using the Crusader force in an incursion against Constantinople. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 61. See also Dandolo (1938), p. 276; Thomas of Split (2006), p. 145.


34,000 silver marks they owe us until such time as God shall permit our combined forces to win this money by conquest.\textsuperscript{78}

The crusaders agreed to Dandolo’s terms and set sail in September 1202 arriving outside Zadar on the 10\textsuperscript{th} of November.

Our army arrived before Zara in Scalonia on Saint Martin’s Eve, and saw the city enclosed by high walls and lofty towers. You would have sought in vain for a more beautiful place, or one more strongly defended, or more prosperous. As soon as the pilgrims caught sight of it they were filled with amazement, and said to each other: ‘How could such a city be taken by force, except by the help of God Himself?’\textsuperscript{79}

Nonetheless, the attack began the next day on the 11\textsuperscript{th} of November. By the 17\textsuperscript{th} the city had surrendered.\textsuperscript{80} Archdeacon Thomas of Split played on his theme of a people truly forsaken by God: ‘Divine judgement was manifested against them on the day of Saint Chrysogonus, the saint most venerated among them’.\textsuperscript{81} In fact the feast day of St Chrysogonus is the 24\textsuperscript{th} of November, but Thomas of Split’s creative device gives extra emphasis to the loss and horrors suffered by the Zaratini, ostensibly due to their own pride. After the Zaratine capitulation the invaders wintered in the city and just before their departure on Easter Monday of 1203 ‘the Venetians razed the city to the ground, with all its walls and towers’.\textsuperscript{82} Archdeacon Thomas went further; ‘as they [the

\textsuperscript{78} ‘Le rois de Ungrie si nos tost Jadres en Esclavonie, qui est unes des plus forz citez del monde; ne ja por pooir que nos aions, recovree ne sera, se par ceste genz non. Querons lor qu’il le nos aient a conquerre, et nos lor respiterons le XXXIII. M. mars d’argent que il nos doivnent trosque adont que Dieux les nos laira conquerre ensemble nos et els.’ Villehardouin (1938), pp. 64 & 65; Villehardouin (1963), p. 43.

\textsuperscript{79} ‘La veille de la sain Martin vindrent devant Jadres en Slavonie et virent la cité fermee de halz murs et de haltes torz, et por noient demandesiez plus bele ne plus fort ne plus riche. Et quant li pelerin la virent, il se merveillerent mult et distrent li un as autres: “Comment porroin estrer prise tel ville par force, se Dieux meisme nel fait?”’. Villehardouin (1938), p. 78; Villehardouin (1963), p. 46.

\textsuperscript{80} Villehardouin (1963), p. 48. See also Dandolo (1938), p. 277-8.

\textsuperscript{81} ‘Die autem sancti Crisogoni, qui apud illos celeberrimus habebatur, divinia ultio patuit super eos.’ Thomas of Split (2006), pp. 146-8.

\textsuperscript{82} ‘...et li Venisien firent abatre la ville et les tors et les murs.’ Villehardouin (1938), p. 11; Villehardouin (1963), p. 54.
Venetians] withdrew they reduced the whole city to a wilderness. They demolished all
the encircling walls and towers and every single house inside, leaving nothing but the
churches standing’.  

This destruction forced many of the Zaratini to flee the city. Some resorted to
piracy, others attacked and took over the fortress on the island of Ugljan. The
Venetian garrison forcefully removed them and in 1204 the commune negotiated the
terms of surrender. The Republic demanded a Venetian count but the Zaratini
retained the right to approve or dismiss any candidates. The archbishop also had to be
Venetian. The clerics of Zadar had to sing laudes twice a year, at Christmas and at
Easter, in the city’s major churches. These laudes would praise the Doge, patriarch of
Grado, archbishop and count. The Zaratini would also have to pay an annual tribute
of marten and rabbit skins as well as money. The citizens were, however, able to
reclaim their property within the city and the island of Pag with its wealth of saltpans
was returned to Zaratine jurisdiction.

At no point before, during or after the Sack of Zadar did the Hungarian King
come to his vassal’s aid. For the next few decades the Kings withdrew from Dalmatia

85 ‘Clerus autem bis in anno in nativitate domini et in pascha resurrectionis laudes cantabunt in maiori
ecclesia solemnriter domino Duc i et domino patriarche atque archiepiscopo suo et comiti omni anno,
propter quod benedictionem recipient consuetam. Eilient Jadratini semper comitem de Venetiis...’ Šime
Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (960 -1333) (Documents
regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et
Artem Slavorum Meridianalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridianalium, 10 vols
(Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Friedler), 1868), 1, pp. 21-2; Tade Smičiklas, Diplomatiički Zbornik Kraljevine
Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije, Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavorum (1201-1235), ed.
Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, 12 vols (Zagreb: Tsak Dioničke Tiskare, 1905), 3, p. 45.
See also Bianchi (1877), p. 537; Ernst H. Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations
86 ‘omni anno in calendis marciis mensis unum miliarium et dimidiunm curcularior bonarum.’ Ljubić
(1868), p. 21; Smičiklas (1905), p. 45; Praga (1925), p. 8. In the fourteenth century the Venetian chronicler
and Doge, Andrea Dandolo also noted the terms of the 1204 surrender: both the demand for lauds and, he
wrote, 3000 rabbit skins a year. Dandolo (1938), p. 278.
to consolidate their position and rule over the Hungarian barons. In the Kings’ absence, Croatian noble families such, as the Šubići counts of Bribir and Kačići of Omiš, began to exert increasing influence over the Dalmatian communes, especially those of Trogir and Split. Internal factionalism and communal rivalry grew too. This was further exacerbated by King Béla IV’s (1235-70) escape from the Mongol army’s devastation of Hungary and his arrival in Trogir in 1241. Béla’s patronage of the Trogirani, curtailment of Šubići power and sudden departure in 1244 for a ravaged Hungary all proved catalysts of a conflict between Split and Trogir that lasted until 1250.

In the forty years since the Venetians and Crusaders attacked Zadar, the Zaratini were increasing in confidence again. Archdeacon Thomas of Split described an arrogant and vain community in October 1242, one that had apparently not learned from its past transgressions:

For although they enjoyed power and richness over all their neighbours on land and sea, they conceived a distaste for pursuing wealth by seaborne trade, and foolishly desired to taste military glory. They took delight in dashing hither and yon in knightly fashion, through made-up villages and towns. So they then broke the terms of their old alliance, and, ignoring the sanctity of their oath, they revealed themselves openly as enemies of the Venetians.

---

89 Andrew then began a process of consolidating the crown’s position and power in Hungary by granting titles and vast tracts of land to allied barons. Revolts and civil disorder ensued as those disenfranchised by these gifts of royal favour demanded recompense. In 1222 the Hungarian nobility of Slavonia demanded that Andrew issue a charter, known as the Golden Bull, in which their rights and privileges were defined. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 149; Engel (2001), pp. 92-94.

90 In 1241 the Mongol army led by Khan Batu invaded Hungary. Béla was thoroughly beaten at the battle of Muhi near the River Sajo and fled to safety in Trogir whilst the Mongols pillaged Hungary and Slavonia. Fortunately the unexpected death of the Great Khan Ögödey caused Batu to retreat as he was keen to participate in the election of the new Khan. The Mongol invasion may have been brief but its destruction was intense. 1243 saw famine and a demographic implosion on an unprecedented scale. Vast tracts of land were left depopulated and barren. Béla had to rebuild. Engel (2001), pp. 99-102.


92 Cum enim inter ceteros comprovinciales suos terra marique forent potentia et divitiae sublimati, fastidio habere ceperunt nauticis lucris incumbere, voluerunt militie pompas inaniter experiri. Constructis
Throughout the Middle Ages the recurring image of the Zaratini was of a proud people, keen to maintain their own autonomy and wealth but unable to without the support of a regional superpower. The precise catalyst for the uprising in 1242 is unclear, but a number of factors probably contributed, such as the unpopularity of count Giovanni Michiel and ongoing discontent with the 1204 submission treaty.\textsuperscript{93} King Béla’s presence in the region may have offered the Zaratini an appealing alternative ruler. The revolt of 1242-43 was not, however, a success.\textsuperscript{94} The Hungarian forces proved capricious and unable to withstand the Venetian naval siege led by Raniero Zen. The Zaratine rebels fled the city and sought shelter in Nin. King Béla had by this point left Dalmatia to return to Hungary before finally renouncing his claim to Zadar in 1244.\textsuperscript{95}

Meanwhile the Zaratini in Nin continued to harry the Venetians. The Venetians, instead of vanquishing the rebels, invited them to come back to the city in the hope of pacifying the community.\textsuperscript{96} When the rebels returned Venice reiterated many of the terms of the 1204 submission treaty. The Venetians demanded that every ten years all men over the age of fourteen had to swear allegiance to the Doge. The right to choose the count was striped from the people; only the Doge and Maggior Consiglio had that privilege but now the counts were only installed for two years.\textsuperscript{97} Finally, the Zaratini had to pay for the city’s reconstruction.\textsuperscript{98}

\textsuperscript{93} In fact after the siege the commune sued Michiel for his poor government. Jackson (1887), p. 114; Miller (2007), p. 81.
\textsuperscript{94} See Dandolo (1938), pp. 299-300.
\textsuperscript{97} Venice, Archivio di Stato (hereafter cited as ASV), Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.
\textsuperscript{98} Ljubić (1868), pp. 68-74; Miller (2007), p. 81.
The remainder of the thirteenth century was a relatively stable period for Zadar. In Hungary developments were underway that would have a significant impact upon the Dalmatian commune during the fourteenth century. By the 1260s, after years of tension and disagreements, Béla had begun collaborating with his son and heir, Stephen. In 1266 Stephen was entrusted with developing the foreign policy of the Árpád Kings and in 1269 he successfully forged an alliance with Charles I of Anjou (1265-85). Pope Urban IV had made Charles King of Naples and Sicily following the death of the last Hohenstaufen. Stephen married his seven year-old son, Ladislaus, to Charles’ daughter, Elizabeth, whilst Mary (c. 1255-1232), Stephen’s daughter, married Charles II, successor to the Angevin throne in Naples. After these diplomatic coups, the Árpád dynasty began to lose control of Hungary. A child King, Ladislaus (1272-90), followed by a puppet and childless monarch, Andrew III (1290-1301), created a political vacuum into which the Hungarian barons, Croatian nobility, Neapolitan Angevins, Papacy and Bohemians jostled for position. Zadar would not prove immune to the

100 A year after the Neapolitan marriage alliances were confirmed, Béla died and Stephen became Stephen V (1270-72). The brevity of his reign threw that of his son, Ladislaus (1272-1290) into chaos as the child was only ten years old when crowned King. The nobility of Hungary, Slavonia and Croatia began a grab for power and independence as the Árpád dynasty started to unravel. King Ladislaus was unable to contain the ambitions of his barons. The Ban of Croatia was not influential enough to ensure his choice of counts for the Dalmatian communes were voted in, providing an opportunity for the Subić to restore the regional power they had lost in 1250. Indeed, so strong did the Subić become that in 1278 Ladislaus had virtually no choice but to make the head of the clan, Paul, Ban of Croatia. Paul’s brother Mladen became the count of Split and another brother, George, count of Trogir and Šibenik. Ladislaus’ weakness and unpopularity grew so great that he was finally assassinated in 1290. He also died childless and the Hungarian barons decided to nominate his cousin, Andrew III (1290-1301), son of Béla IV’s half brother Stephen. Stephen had been the son of Andrew II and his third wife, Beatrice d’Este. She had fled Hungary following the death of Andrew II in 1235. Stephen had been raised in Italy and married the Venetian noble woman, Tomasin Morosini. Together they had had a son, Andrew. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 206; Engel (2001), pp. 98, 108 & 110.
101 It was at this juncture that the Angevins began to exert their claim upon the Hungarian throne. Pope Nicholas IV (1288-92) declared that there was a papal prerogative to choose the King of Hungary. Had that not been the case for King Stephen in 1000? As a result, the papal choice was Charles Martel, son of Charles II of Anjou and Mary of Hungary, thus Ladislaus’ IV’s nephew. Boniface VIII (1294-1303) also hoped to extend papal influence into Central Europe with Charles Robert on the throne. See Appendix A - Royal Family Trees; Fine Jr. (1987), pp. 207 & 8; Engel (2001), p. 110.
102 The majority of the Hungarian barons preferred Wenceslas of Bohemia as a contender for the Hungarian throne. His claim came through the female line of the Árpád dynasty but a branch with which the anti-Anjou barons felt a greater affinity. Wenceslas was only nine-years’ old when his short reign began in 1301. The child was crowned twice, once in 1301 and again in 1304 in attempt to shore up his rule but returned to Bohemia in 1305, embattled following hard conflict with Charles Robert’s supporters. After Wenceslas left though, the country was plunged into civil war until 1310 when Charles Robert had commanded enough support from the Hungarian barons as to provide some stability. János M. Bak, ‘Sankt
turmoil and later found itself subject to the regional ambitions of the Croat nobility, especially the Šubić counts of Bribir.

Meanwhile Venice had also noted the havoc in Hungary. In 1272, keen to eliminate the threat of piracy that plagued the Republic’s fleets along the Dalmatian coast, the Venetians attacked and took over Omiš. The Kačići family, the main force behind much of the piracy that menaced the merchant navy, were destroyed. The Venetians conquered other Kačići holdings of Brač and Hvar. After this successful incursion, the Second Genoese War, as well as strained relations with the papacy between 1298 and 1311, distracted the Republic.103 What happened next indicated that no matter how proud the Dalmatian communes were or how keenly they demanded their political and economic autonomy, without the support of a regional super power they were very vulnerable. A weak Hungarian monarchy and a preoccupied Venice gave the Šubići Counts of Bribir an opportunity to expand their powers and become almost a law unto themselves. By 1287 Paul Šubić, Ban of Croatia, had taken the hinterland properties of the Kačići and took Omiš from the Venetians.104 After 1300 and the death of the last Árpád King, Andrew, Šubići declared their support for the Neapolitan Angevin claimant, Charles Robert (1301-42).105 Charles Robert’s problem was that the only local backing for his claim to the Hungarian throne was from the Šubići, one Hungarian baron and the archbishop-elect of Esztergom.106 He had to allow the Šubići free rein in order to consolidate his position. As a result Šubići rule and influence extended unfettered over all of the Kingdom of Croatia and much of Bosnia.

---

103 Jackson (1887), p. 82; Miller (2007), pp. 99-100.
105 The Šubić also helped bring the young Charles Robert across and the twelve-year old was crowned King of Hungary in 1301. Ibid., p. 208.
as well as a number of islands and communes of the Dalmatian coast.\textsuperscript{107} Inevitably Zadar, with its wealth and strategic location, was a target.

Venice only dealt with the Šubići problem in 1310. After a failed coup against the Republic, one of the main ringleaders Baiamonte Tiepolo fled to Dalmatia. Paul Šubić not only offered Tiepolo refuge but also the position of count of Nin.\textsuperscript{108} Paul then began to besiege Zadar. At first the city remained under Venetian control until a faction within the commune declared its allegiance to the Angevin claimant Charles Robert and revolted against the Republic. The Šubići rushed in, declaring their support for the Zaratini and crushing the Venetian forces. The commune then offered its submission to Charles Robert, who accepted it. He did not, however, send any additional troops to help the latest territorial addition to his dominion. Indeed, Charles Robert and the Angevins continued to treat Zadar as a frontier territory, a useful area to control but secondary to the demands of their Hungarian ambitions.

After Zadar’s submission, Paul’s son Mladen II Šubić became count. In May 1312 Paul died and Mladen II was elevated to the position of Ban of Croatia, a consequence being that his attentions were distracted from the commune’s needs. The Venetians had, by now, raised a fleet large enough to retake Zadar. Within the city a number of Zaratini had been unhappy with the ongoing economic hardship of the sieges and began negotiations with the Republic to return to its rule. Mladen II and the pro-Angevin faction within the city remained in charge until 1313, but the lack of military support from Charles Robert meant the commune reverted back to Venetian control.\textsuperscript{109}

Throughout Dalmatia the Šubići began to lose their territorial gains and status as a regional power. Šibenik capitulated to Venice in 1320, followed by Trogir the next

\textsuperscript{107} In 1299 Paul Šubić also claimed the title of Ban of Bosnia, passing it on to his brother, Mladen and then his own son, Mladen II in 1305. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 210.
year, then Split in 1327 and Nin in 1329. By the beginning of the 1330s Venice also controlled Brač, Creš, Dubrovnik, Hvar, Krk, Korčula, Osor and Pag. In order to reinforce its imperial presence and secure its commercial interest in the region, the Signoria began sending out diplomats to Serbia and Croatia. However, an obstacle to this expansion soon appeared. In 1342 Charles Robert died and his son, Louis became King of Hungary (1342-82).

Ambitious and shrewd, Louis would prove a much more complex and difficult rival to Venice in Dalmatia than the Šubići. Louis’ goal to unite the Angevins of both Naples and Hungary was an alarming development for the Venetians. The Hungarians had a powerful army but lacked naval strength. The Neapolitan connection could provide Louis with this maritime might and could threaten Venetian interests in the Adriatic. To make matters worse, Louis was piqued by Venice’s expanding diplomatic network in the Balkan hinterland, areas traditionally considered vassals to the Kingdom of Hungary. In response, the Hungarian King brought his attentions back to the Dalmatian communes.

At first, Venice was not concerned about the security of Split, Trogir and Šibenik: a recent alliance with the remaining Šubići Counts of Bribir meant the lands surrounding these communes were loyal to the Šubići and thus Venice. By contrast, Nin and Zadar were vulnerable. The hinterland was the domain of Croatian noble families, such as the Nelipčići of Knin, whose acquiescence was not so certain. Zadar itself was still volatile, unwilling to countenance a Venetian military presence in the city, a caveat of the treaty made following the revolt of 1313. In 1345, Louis came with an army into Croatia and demanded the submission of the local nobility. The Nelipčići

---

21 Bianchi recorded that as late as 1342 Zadar struck a deal with Venice in which the Zaratini would accept a Venetian count but could maintain their own military garrison and legal framework as outlined in the city’s statutes. Jackson meanwhile stated that this caveat came about as a compromise following the revolt in 1313. Bianchi (1888), p. 41; Jackson (1887), pp. 86 & 96-97.
acceded but the Šubići remained loyal to Venice.\textsuperscript{113} In Zadar, Louis’ presence in the vicinity had a similar effect as Béla IV’s sojourn in Trogir during the early 1240s: the commune’s confidence in Hungarian military support was absolute and in August 1345 Zadar threw out the Venetians and submitted to Louis.\textsuperscript{114} The Venetians mustered a great fleet, not only filled with their own galleys but with contributions from Creș, Dubrovnik, Krk, Hvar, Pag Rab, Split, Šibenik and Trogir. This was another manifestation of the region’s bitter communal rivalries.\textsuperscript{115} Although Louis sent military support to the commune, his forces were defeated in July 1346. Louis’ Neapolitan ambitions were also of more pressing concern to the young King and Zadar was left to fend for itself against the Venetians.\textsuperscript{116} The city was finally starved into submission and surrendered in December 1346.\textsuperscript{117}

The terms of the surrender were severe; the city walls were pulled down, weapons had to be handed in and ships were confiscated from their owners. Pag and its salt pans were stripped from Zaratine jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{118} No more than four months’ worth of food could be stored in the city and the Republic demanded that a number of the most rebellious nobles be taken hostage and kept in Venice.\textsuperscript{119} This was a strategy

\textsuperscript{113} Don Jacopo Morelli, Monumenti veneziani di varia letteratura per la prima volta pubblicati nell’ingresso di sua eccellenza messer Alvise Pisani cavaliere alla dignità di procuratore de San Marco (Venice: Stamperia Carlo Palese, 1796), pp. 3 & 19. Morelli’s book is an Italian translation of a Latin manuscript, the Cronica jadretina. BMV, Mss.Lat.X, 300 (=3801), ff.31r-37v. This in turn is a fifteenth-century copy of an earlier original, whose whereabouts are unknown.


\textsuperscript{115} Morelli (1796), p. 4.

\textsuperscript{116} The anonymous Venetian chronicler also suggested that Louis was keen to take over Zadar so that he would have a suitable port from which to launch a naval attack on Puglia in revenge for his brother’s death. As we shall seen, this did not occur until 1350. Ibid., pp. 13 & 28-29.


\textsuperscript{118} Šime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavensvta i Mletačke Republike (1336-1347) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1870), 2, p. 427.

\textsuperscript{119} Although a larger group of hostages were taken to Venice after the siege, a company of noblemen who accompanied the ambassadors to negotiate the terms of Zadar’s submission also offered themselves up as hostages. These men were Matteo de Michele de Rosa, Matteo di Gregorio de Botone, Matteo di Mauro Grisogono, Matteo di Giacomo Fanfogna, Paolo di Giovanni Varicasis and Giovanni de Bartolomeo degli Asgornati. The ambassadors were Paolo de Varicassi, Pietro de Matarfari, Bartolomeo de`Fioravanti, Niccolo Galletis, Marino Calcina and Michele de Čadulin. Morelli (1796), p. 35; Ljubić (1870), pp. 413-5; Branimir Glavičić and Vladimir Vratović, eds, Obsidio Iadrensis, Monumenta spectantia historiam
deployed on numerous occasions during Venetian rule of Zadar during the Medieval period and will be discussed further in Chapter 2. There was calm for a short period, especially after 1348 when Louis signed an eight-year peace treaty with Venice. But the next decade proved difficult for Venice. Genoa was becoming increasingly confident as a maritime presence in the Adriatic, attacking the Venetian subject territories of Hvar in southern Dalmatia and Pula and Poreč in Istria. War was declared. In 1355 the Genoese destroyed the Republic’s fleet and Doge Marino Falier was caught plotting a coup d’état that would have made him supreme ruler of Venice, an autocrat in the mold of the Carrara of Padua or the Visconti of Milan. Falier was beheaded for his treachery. The Venetian government, considered an ideal model of the Aristotelian ideal of mixed government invulnerable to tyranny, oligarchy and anarchy, was severely shaken. Militarily vulnerable and politically weakened the Republic signed a peace treaty with the Genoese, hoping for respite and recovery.

It did not come. In 1356, as soon as the treaty between Hungary and Venice had lapsed, Louis attacked. He had forged an alliance with Pope Innocent IV, Emperor Charles IV and the Carrara lords of Padua and launched a two-pronged strike against the Republic. The allied forces came as close as Treviso. Venice sued for peace and it was granted, but only lasted until the summer of 1357. In the Croatian hinterland, Louis had gathered together an army - a force that the Venetians had thought was mustering for an assault on Serbia - that was unleashed upon the King’s enemies on the coast: the Venetians and the Šubići. The Hungarians wrested Skradin and Omiš from the Šubići and finally extinguished the family as a regional force. Split and Trogir threw out their Venetian counts and declared their allegiance to Louis and it was not
long before the other Dalmatian islands and communes had followed suit. Only Zadar was still subject to Venetian control, and that because of the presence of the Venetian garrison in the city.\textsuperscript{123} Meanwhile, the Republic also had to abandon its interests in Cyprus to the Genoese and to crush an uprising in Crete that lasted from 1363 until 1364.\textsuperscript{124} Venice at this point, both at home and abroad, was very weak.

In December 1357 the Zaratini overwhelmed the Venetian garrison.\textsuperscript{125} The Venetians chose to withdraw and recover, with rule over the Dalmatian communes deemed secondary to the security of the metropole. On the 18\textsuperscript{th} February 1358, Venetian representatives signed a final treaty with Louis of Hungary in the sacristy of St Francis in Zadar. This ‘Peace of Zadar’ demanded that Venice cede its claims on all the territories in an area that stretched from the Kvarner Gulf in the north to Durrës (Durazzo) on the modern day Albanian coast in the south. Venice was already struggling under the weight of the Monte Vecchio, or public debt, and the loss of income from salt, Balkan metals and the security afforded by sheltered ports in the region was another mighty blow.\textsuperscript{126} The Hungarians granted the Zaratini increased privileges as well as restoring the commune’s jurisdiction over the city’s castle and the island of Pag.\textsuperscript{127} Thus Venice bowed out of Dalmatia for the rest of the fourteenth century, quietly gathering its strength before reappearing in the fifteenth century as the most powerful imperial presence in the Mediterranean.

\textsuperscript{125} Bianchi (1888), p. 45.
1.4 Angevin Zadar, 1358-1409

Louis’ ambition and strength ensured that his reign provided peace in Hungary and its territories, including Zadar. Before focussing on the fortunes of the Dalmatian commune, it is important to consider the greater regional developments of this period, as they would have profound ramifications for Zadar and its people. Political stability and the continuity of the Angevin line in Hungary dominated Hungarian foreign and domestic policy. Yet these were often impeded by the febrile nature of the dynasty’s complex familial and client networks. Difficulties arose for Louis following his marriage to Elizabeth Kotromarić, daughter of Ban Stjepan Kotromarić of Bosnia in 1353. Seventeen years passed before she had any children and all three were girls: Catherine, Maria and Hedwig.\(^{128}\) Before the birth of his daughters, Louis turned to the Neapolitan branch of the family for additional support. The connections with his Neapolitan cousins had been fraught, a situation begun in part by Louis’ father, Charles Robert. During the 1320s Charles Robert had claimed primogeniture to the Neapolitan throne through his father, Charles Martel. He had been the first Angevin claimant to the Hungarian throne and he died in 1295. In 1333 a compromise was struck between King Charles Robert and his uncle, Robert the Wise. Charles Robert’s second son, Andrew, would marry Robert’s granddaughter, Joanna. This way, Charles Robert believed, Andrew would become King of Naples and Sicily.\(^{129}\) Andrew was left in Naples whilst Charles Robert and his wife, Elizabeth Piast of Poland, returned to Hungary. In 1342 Charles Robert died and his eldest son, Louis (1342-1382) became King of Hungary at the age of sixteen.\(^{130}\)

Back in Naples, the union between Joanna and Andrew was a disaster. Between 1343 and 44 King Louis and his mother, Elizabeth, travelled to Rome to lobby for papal

support for Andrew’s claim to the crown of Naples and Sicily. Unfortunately, in September 1345, Andrew was murdered, strangled at Aversa, north of Naples. 139 Although the purported assassins were caught after a mishandled papal investigation, suspicion and blame still fell on Joanna. 140 Soon after Andrew’s death she married her cousin, Louis of Taranto, and Pope Clement VI (1342-52) immediately crowned him King of Naples, an honour never granted to the wretched Andrew. In 1347 King Louis of Hungary invaded Italy in response to the insult. Joanna and her new husband fled to the Angevin territories in Provence, leaving Naples defenceless. Louis took the city in January 1348 and called his Neapolitan relatives together. In retribution for Andrew’s murder, Louis executed Joanna’s brother-in-law, Charles of Durazzo, and held the rest of the family prisoner. 141 The arrival of the Black Death in Hungary meant that Louis had to return home and Joanna swiftly retook Naples. After a final naval sortie against Naples in 1350, Louis realised distance would prevent the union of Naples and Hungary under one crown. In 1352 he signed a peace treaty with Joanna and focussed his attentions on the Hungarian hinterland and the Adriatic. 142

Twelve years later and with no child of his own, Louis began making consolidatory gestures towards Naples. In 1364 he arranged for his younger cousin, Charles ‘The Small’ of Durazzo (nephew of the Charles executed by Louis in Naples sixteen years previously) 143 to come and live with the family in Hungary. Seven years on, as the only male Angevin present in Hungary aside from Louis, Charles became Duke of Dalmatia and Croatia and took up residence in Zadar. 144 Yet Louis’ ambitions to control both Naples and Hungary had resurfaced. In 1376, with Louis’ support and

---

139 In the decade since arriving in the city Andrew had been mocked and marginalised by the Neapolitan court. He was only granted the title Duke of Calabria, a mere consort to the Queen. In addition Joanna was having an affair with her cousin, Robert of Taranto. Engel (2001), p. 159; Klancicay (2002), p. 336.
141 See Appendix A - Royal Family Trees; Ibid., p. 160.
142 Ibid., p. 160.
143 See Appendix A - Royal Family Trees.
encouragement, Charles sailed to Naples to claim the throne. He strangled Queen Joanna and was crowned Charles III.\textsuperscript{37}

Whilst Charles was in Naples, Louis’ eldest daughter, Catherine, died in 1378. The year after her death, Louis tried to prop up the claims of his second daughter, Maria. In 1379, a betrothal alliance was made between Maria and Sigismund of Luxembourg, the son of Emperor Charles IV and in his own right King of Bohemia and Marquis of Brandenburg. Like Charles of Durazzo, Sigismund also moved to Hungary in preparation for his role as consort to Maria when she would become Queen of Hungary and Poland. Factions at court developed, however, split between those keen to support Louis’ direct heirs and those who wanted a male Angevin on the throne.

At the age of eleven, Maria became Queen of Hungary (1382-95) and her mother, Elizabeth Kotromarić, became regent. Immediately, dissent against Queen, regent and Sigismund appeared. In 1383 John of Paliţna, prior of the Knights Hospitallers at Vrana, rebelled against Queen Maria. The Queen’s supporters swiftly quashed the revolt but this did not put an end to the intrigues of the Angevin faction.\textsuperscript{38} For two years afterwards, Paul Horváti, bishop of Zagreb, along with his brother John, Ban of Mačva and the disgraced John of Paliţi, courted King Charles III. The cabal finally convinced Charles to return to Hungary and make his claim to the throne. In September 1385, Charles arrived in Dalmatia and travelled north for his coronation and possible marriage to Maria. Before Charles arrived, Sigismund swiftly married Maria and then departed for the safety of Prague. Maria was left behind and abdicated in favour of Charles, allowing his coronation as Charles II of Hungary (1385-86) in December.\textsuperscript{39} One male Angevin ruler, it seemed, had finally united the thrones of Naples and Hungary.

\textsuperscript{39} Engel (2001), p. 196.
This did not last. Forty days after his coronation, Charles’ local noble
supporters returned home and he was alone. The new King was promptly assassinated
by order of Elizabeth Kotromarić. She immediately reinstated Maria as Queen and her
own position as regent. Sigismund returned to Maria’s side in April of 1386. This was
not enough to restore peace and stability. The Angevin faction chose to support
another contender for the throne, Charles’ young son, Ladislaus of Naples. Elizabeth
set out with the young Queen and a small retinue to the farther reaches of the
Kingdom to amass support for Maria. But Elizabeth and her supporters had
underestimated the determination and anger of the Angevin rebels. In July, Maria’s
travelling entourage was attacked. The rebels captured Elizabeth and Maria and
imprisoned them in Novigrad on the Dalmatian coast. Barons loyal to Louis and his
daughter stepped into the political vacuum. Keen to have Maria safely returned, they
offered the Angevin rebels a general pardon but to no avail.\textsuperscript{140} In January 1387,
Elizabeth Kotromarić was strangled at Novigrad. In March of that same year the
barons crowned Sigismund and gave him the title of ‘leader and captain of Hungary’\textsuperscript{141}
In June, with the support of the Venetians, a small flotilla attacked Novigrad and Maria
was rescued.\textsuperscript{142}

Sigismund and Maria were reunited but without the barons’ support

Sigismund’s political standing was weak. Meanwhile, civil war ravaged the Kingdom, \textsuperscript{143}
and a new threat to the Dalmatian comunes had also appeared: the Bosnian King,
Tvrtko, and his second in command, Hrvoje Vukčić, both of whom claimed to support

\textsuperscript{143} Allegiance had to be bought by granting money, castles and vast tracts of land to the barons. Not only
did this quickly draw down the Angevin wealth - by 1396 it was virtually all gone - but it also decentralised
and destabilised power. As Engel has noted: ‘the vast honours of the Angevin period were now replaced by
magnate family estates of a size that had hitherto been unheard of.’ Engel (2001), p. 200.
the Neapolitan cause. By the time of Tvrtko’s death in 1390, Omiš, Šibenik, Split, Trogir and some of the islands of the Dalmatian littoral had submitted to him and he had begun calling himself King of Croatia and Dalmatia. When Hrvoje took over the rule of the Dalmatian communes, he reaffirmed his allegiance to Ladislaus of Naples and became Ladislaus’ regional deputy in Dalmatia.145

For a brief period in the mid 1390s, Sigismund had enough control of Hungary to focus on Dalmatia as the Angevin faction had been dispersed and a truce signed with Bosnia.146 Stability was, however, fleeting. In 1395 a pregnant Queen Maria was killed in a riding accident. Sigismund’s claim to the throne was now even more questionable and in addition to these domestic troubles, the Ottoman threat to the Kingdom’s eastern borders was growing.147 In Croatia and the Dalmatian communes support for Ladislaus of Naples was also on the rise. In 1401 barons in the north of Hungary led a rebellion, toppled Sigismund and imprisoned him.148 Hrvoje had swept through Dalmatia and the communes swiftly submitted to him. Zadar succumbed in 1401 and Split in 1403. Ladislaus was by now secure enough in his position as King of Naples to consider his Hungarian claims. With encouragement from Hrvoje and exiled Hungarian, Dalmatian and Croatian supporters, Ladislaus of Naples arrived in Dalmatia to stake his claim.

Ladislaus landed in Zadar on the 19th July but rather than rushing to Hungary for the coronation, as his local supporters requested him to, he hesitated and remained in Zadar. Meanwhile, the Hungarian barons had released Sigismund. Upon hearing of

147 In 1396 Sigismund led a huge army against the Ottoman forces at Nikopolis, but was thoroughly beaten by the enemy. He only just escaped with his life. The defeat was apparently due to the over enthusiasm of French knights, who charged before the rest of the Christian army was ready, rather than military incompetence on Sigismund’s part. Nonetheless the blame was laid at his feet. Jackson (1887), p. 135; Fine Jr. (1987), p. 458; Engel (2001), pp. 203-4.
Ladislaus’ arrival in Zadar, Sigismund had the crown of Hungary publicly placed upon his head in defiance of the Neapolitan claimant. In response, on the 5th of August Angelo Acciajuoli, legate of Pope Boniface IX, crowned Ladislaus King of Hungary at the church of St Chrysogonus in Zadar.\textsuperscript{49} Chapters 2 and 3 shall go into further detail about the symbolic role of the abbey as a connection between Zadar and the Hungarian Kings. The role meant that the abbey church was an ideal setting for the coronation of Ladislaus, but ultimately its significance was for a local audience. This suggests a lack of legitimacy on Ladislaus’ part. Indeed, rather than consolidating any claim to the Hungarian royal power after this coronation, Ladislaus never went further inland. In November 1403 he sailed back to Naples, leaving Hrvoje in charge as his deputy in Dalmatia with the title the Herceg or Duke of Split.\textsuperscript{50}

Ladislaus’ presence in Zadar had not provided the security and patronage so desired by by his Dalmatian and Hungarian supporters. Sigismund tried to counter the dissent by offering an amnesty to all of Ladislaus’ Hungarian supporters. This strategy proved so successful that by 1404, less than a year after Ladislaus’s coronation, Sigismund had reclaimed much of Croatia and had a regained firm grip on power in Hungary proper.\textsuperscript{51} Yet before he could take the Dalmatian communes away from Ladislaus’ nominal rule, the Kingdom of Bosnia began to revolt. Bosnia would not be quelled until 1408. By now, Ladislaus’ deputy, Hrvoje, had realised that the Neapolitan King’s interest in any Hungarian and Dalmatian territorial ambitions was negligible and furthermore that Ladislaus was already negotiating the sale of Dalmatia to Venice.

Without Neapolitan support Hrvoje had been depending on an unruly Bosnia as a buffer to protect him from Sigismund. Now that Bosnia had been quelled Hrvoje capitulated to Sigismund, informing him of Ladislaus’ plan to sell his Dalmatian claims

\textsuperscript{49} Bianchi (1888), p. 56; Šišić (1904), p. 34
to Venice. On the 9th of July 1409, when Ladislaus signed over Zadar, Creš, Nin, Novigrad, Osor, Rab and Vrana to Venice for 100,000 ducats, Hrvoje moved inland and joined the Hungarian court. From there he tried to maintain his authority over the remaining Dalmatian communes.

Sigismund retaliated against the Venetian ownership of and presence in Dalmatia by attacking Friuli and Istria in 1411, but his mandate over Dalmatia was weak. Šibenik ceded to Venetian rule in 1413 following a two-year siege and by 1420 Brač, Hvar, Korčula, Kotor, Pag, Split and Trogir had all submitted to the Republic.

Aside from another brief war with Venice in 1431, Hungary was no longer the regional force it once was. Once Sigismund was crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1411, he turned his focus inland and abroad. After his death in 1437, his successor, Albert (1437-39), proved a weak King. Without a firm hand and with the additional threat of the Ottomans (by now in Bosnia and Serbia) Hungary descended into civil instability. The Venetians enjoyed secure control over their Dalmatian territories until the end of the 1460s.

But what of Zadar during the second half of the fourteenth century? Where did the commune sit within this febrile dynastic context of Hungarians and Neapolitans?

---

154 Hrvoje stayed in Buda until 1413 when he was accused of treachery by Sigismund; Hrvoje had attacked the lands of the nobleman Sandalj Hranić of Hum for his own gain whilst Sandalj was away fighting the Ottomans and in this manner, Sigismund argued, had made manifest his support of the Ottoman cause. Hrvoje’s privileges and authority over the remainder of Dalmatia was stripped from him and he fled, later to become a mercenary for the Ottomans. Fine Jr. (1987), p. 468; Engel (2001), p. 235.
156 Although Sigismund had been crowned Holy Roman Emperor in 1411 he had to wait more than twenty years until the Pope would personally oversee a coronation. Arriving in Rome in 1431 he was immediately crowned King of Italy. However Hungary was at war with Venice and the Pope at that time supported the Republic. Therefore the imperial coronation did not occur until the 21st May 1433 and only when Sigismund had agreed to a peace treaty that ceded Dalmatia entirely to the Venetian Republic. This was signed on the 4th June. Engel (2001), pp. 231 & 35.
157 Ibid., pp. 214 & 231.
At times it held an important role as a bridge between to the two powers, but in other instances Zadar’s peripheral location left it vulnerable and exposed. The period immediately after 1358 was a fruitful one for the commune with King Louis doing much to cultivate the commune’s allegiance. After 1358 he confirmed the city’s statutes and privileges and returned Pag island to Zaratine jurisdiction.659 Aside from the demands of tribute and naval support, Louis left Zadar’s commercial and economic infrastructure well alone and the city enjoyed a long period of mercantile success and affluence.660 Louis’ popularity was assured by these political and economic gestures of support for the commune’s sense of autonomy. More public displays of patronage and reciprocal fealty were also an important tool of Angevin territorial consolidation. These softer and subtler tactics shall be examined further in Chapter 2.

Louis had also reinstated the role of Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia as a training post for male successors to the Hungarian crown. Charles of Durazzo was resident in Zadar as Duke from 1373 until 76 and his daughter, Giovanna, was baptised in the abbey church of St Chrysogonus.661 This was arguably the decade of greatest stability for the commune. After Louis’ death in 1382 the insecurity that shook Hungary also had repercussions for Zadar.662 The 1380s were punctuated with oaths of fidelity given by Zaratine representatives from the moment of Maria’s coronation663 until 1394.664 A royal visit in October 1383 was another attempt to foster the commune’s confidence and support.665 Oaths and a visit did not, however, allay factionalism amongst the Zaratini, and some members of the nobility were unhappy with a young Queen as

---

663 Maria’s coronation on the 17th September 1382 would have been an intimidating affair for a small girl of nine. Paolo di Paoli noted that within twenty-four hours of her father’s funeral she was crowned at Székesfehérvár. During the ceremony event many soldiers were present (‘in cuius coronatione multi milites facti sunt’). The Zaratine ambassadors were Cressio de Civalleliis, Damianus de Nassi, Ludovic de Georgius, Saladino de Saladinis, Cressio de Nassis, Cosa de Begna and Paulo di Pauli himselfol. Sistić (1904), p. 5.
664 Oaths were made in 1383, 1384, 1390, 1391 and the last in 1394. Ibid., pp. 6, 8-9, 14-15 & 18.
665 The visit was from the 24th October until the 4th November. Ibid., p. 7.
ruler. Charles of Durazzo’s successful time in the city during the 1370s had also helped foster increasing support for his claim to the throne. Yet by the late 1380s, Zadar was still seen as supportive enough of Maria’s cause to allow her mother, the murdered Elizabeth Kotromarić, to be buried in the graveyard of St Chrysogonus’ church.\textsuperscript{166}

In 1394, an event occurred that was to define Zaratine relations with Sigismund as well as Venice in the fifteenth century. As we know, in 1358 Pag had been restored to Zaratine rule.\textsuperscript{167} In addition, Louis had also confirmed that Pag’s ecclesiastical institutions would be subject to the archbishopric of Zadar.\textsuperscript{168} Many members of the Zaratine nobility owned significant numbers of saltpans on the island; assets that were important generators of personal wealth.\textsuperscript{169} On the 11\textsuperscript{th} March 1394 the citizens of Pag revolted, threw out the Zaratine count and installed their own rectors. Parallels between this event and the various Zaratine rebellions against Venetian rule are marked but the brutality with which the Zaratini responded was extraordinary. Within a day, a galley had been dispatched from Zadar and the militia unleashed upon the population of Pag. Men and boys over the age of thirteen were decapitated or mutilated, their arms and feet hacked off or eyes cut out. Women and nuns were raped. Pag town was pillaged and burned and its cathedral treasury looted. Eighty-six of the men who did survive, both lay and ecclesiastic, were bound up and brought back to Zadar. At the city’s loggia one of the clerics promised that the Church of Pag would submit to the Zaratine archbishop. The lay prisoners were all tortured and one of the pseudo-rectors was hanged. A few days later, three more of the prisoners were hanged

\textsuperscript{166} Elizabeth Kotromarić’s body remained in St Chrysogonus’ graveyard until 1390 when it was exhumed and escorted back to Hungary by the patricians Benedictus de Gallo, Marino de Matafarri and Gregorius de Nassiis. Ibid., pp. 10 & 14.


\textsuperscript{168} In 1352 Zadar was producing ‘de meliori et pulcriori (salis), a second sort qui non erit tam bonus et pulcher’ and finally a type which was ‘minus quam bonus et mercadante’. Ljubić (1872), p. 235 as quoted in Hocquet (1978), p. 129; Raukar (1981), p. 152.
and their bodies left to rot from the gallows. The two final participants in the rebellion had their eyes gouged out.\textsuperscript{70}

The next year, Sigismund responded. He sent his representatives to Nin to meet with the Zaratine rectors. Although Zadar defended its position and the rule it enjoyed over ‘our’ island of Pag, the Hungarians found favour with the Pagani and Sigismund stripped Zadar of its jurisdiction over the islands. Reparations for the ravaged city were also demanded.\textsuperscript{71} The decision provoked similar levels of discontent amongst the Zaratini as had been the case in the 1340s when the Venetians had also removed Pag from Zaratine rule.\textsuperscript{72} Support grew in Zadar for Ladislaus of Naples until 1397 when Sigismund intervened and removed the most rebellious factional elements. He decreed that all those who had supported the 1385 uprising against Maria (essentially those who had supported Charles of Durazzo’s coup) would have their wealth and goods confiscated as punishment. Jacopo Raduchis, Andrea de Grisogono, Mazolo de Gallo, Georgio de Çadulin and the three Matafarri brothers, Archbishop Petrus, Guido and Ludovico, were all named.\textsuperscript{73} Following the confiscation of their property, the brothers were forced into exile.\textsuperscript{74} The known Angevin sympathies of the Matafarri family might explain why, in 1390, Petrus had publicly sworn an oath of fidelity to Sigismund and Maria over the arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus. This would be a symbolic gesture his support for Louis’ direct heir rather than the Neapolitan claimant.\textsuperscript{75} Soon after Petrus’ exile to Rome, Sigismund installed a Hungarian cleric in the archbishop’s cathedra, a certain Giovanni, who was archbishop elect in Zadar until


\textsuperscript{72} Ljubić (1870), p. 427. See also Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{73} Bianchi (1888), p. 54; Šišić (1904), pp. 22-3.

\textsuperscript{74} Šišić (1904), p. 24 ; O’Connell (2009) p. 64.

\textsuperscript{75} Bianchi suggests that as Petrus was made archbishop at a very young age in 1376 this may have been due to the familial connections with Charles of Durazzo, at that time resident in Zadar in his capacity as Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia. This could indeed explain the Angevin associations with the family and Petrus in particular. Bianchi (1877), p. 50.
1400.76 If one considers how deeply unpopular Venetian involvement in Zadar's ecclesiastical matters had been, Sigismund's installation of a Hungarian would have done little to further his cause.

Even after the banishment of Ladislaus' supporters, Sigismund's standing in Zadar did not improve. In 1398 the abbot of St Chrysogonus complained about the excessive levy demanded by the King's tax collectors to pay for the royal army.77 The situation was further exacerbated, as Sigismund could not provide maritime defence for the commune. Venetian ships were prowling the waters of the Adriatic, frequently attacking other vessels.78 On 2nd June 1399, possibly realising that his popularity was waning in Zadar, and probably in dire need of money, Sigismund offered to return Pag to Zadar's rule. It would be at a cost though: four thousand ducats a year for ten years, with the first instalment of one thousand ducats due within twenty days. Five thousand was immediately raised from pledges given by the nobility, wealthy members of the citizenry as well as the monasteries and churches. The citizens of Pag were not pleased with this development and within a week they had stocked up the city's fortress with munitions, armed their galleys and threatened to rebel against Sigismund. At first, Zadar had military support from the island of Rab,79 but soon the commune's council discovered that Sigismund would not help Zadar recapture Pag nor continue to pay for the maintenance of Zadar's fortifications.80 The commune was vulnerable to attack from both the enraged Pagani and the Venetians. An alternative to Sigismund's rule had to be found.

In May 1400, representatives of Zadar's ruling council set out to Šibenik to negotiate a coalition between the communes of Dalmatia. This was the first and only

76 Giovanni was never confirmed as archbishop proper by the Pope, probably because Petrus was still technically archbishop of Zadar and was based in Rome therefore conceivably had access to and influence over the decision. Ibid., p. 51.
78 Lane (1973), p. 198.
79 Sišić (1904), p. 28.
80 Ibid., p. 29.
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occasion such an endeavour was attempted, and it is perhaps not surprising that given the cities’ historical rivalries, it did not succeed.\textsuperscript{26} In 1402, pro-Angevin nobility, such as Guido de Matarfarri and members of the Rosa and Fanfogna families, returned to Zadar and it was clear that Ladislaus of Naples was the preferred option to both Sigismund and Dalmatian unity. On the 24\textsuperscript{th} August, the city sent envoys to Ladislaus’ deputy, Hrvoje, at Ostrovica, where they submitted the city to the Neapolitan Angevin’s rule. On the 27\textsuperscript{th} Aloysius Aldemarisco, another envoy of Ladislaus, arrived in Zadar accompanied by six ships. The standard of the King of Hungary was raised and members of the pro-Angevin faction - Jacopo de Raduchis, Andrea de Grisogono, Georgio de Ćadulin, Simon Detrico and Thomas de Petriço - greeted Aloysius before he entered the city at the gateway of St Chrysogonus. Ladislaus’ standard was raised again, this time with the banner of the city’s patron, St Chrysogonus. Lauds were sung, mass was celebrated and the whole city rejoiced.

On the 5\textsuperscript{th} September, the city’s council, archbishop, clerics and abbots swore fidelity and homage to Ladislaus over the Gospels.\textsuperscript{27} By November, Aloysius, in the name of Ladislaus, had restored Pag back to Zadar.\textsuperscript{28} Members of the Zaratine nobility who had remained loyal to Sigismund and were stationed in other parts of Dalmatia, Croatia and Slavonia had until Christmas to return to the city. This would prove their allegiance to Ladislaus, otherwise their goods and chattels would be forfeit.\textsuperscript{29} Preparations were underway for Ladislaus’ arrival and in summer of 1403 he landed at Zadar. His sister, Giovanna, accompanied her brother. The Neapolitan Cardinal and Papal Legate, Cardinal Angelo Acciajuoli, was also in attendance. Hungarian barons who supported Ladislaus also appeared and tried to persuade him to come to

\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 31.
\textsuperscript{27} Bianchi (1888), p. 55; Šišić (1904), pp. 33-34.
\textsuperscript{28} Šišić (1904), p. 36.
\textsuperscript{29} Two months earlier troops loyal to Ladislaus, including a number of Zaratine noblemen, had attacked Sigismund’s stronghold at Vrana. Fighting for Sigismund was Philip de Georgi who refused to submit to Ladislaus. His actions were considered treacherous to the commune and his assets were confiscated. Aloysius Aldemarisco moved into Philip’s house next to the cathedral of St Anastasia. Ibid., pp. 35-36.
Székesfehérvár for the coronation. But on the 2nd August, Ladislaus was crowned in St Chrysogonus. This was arguably the political denouement between Sigismund and Ladislaus, an event symbolically held in Zadar, a frontier city poised between the culturally distinct Italian peninsula and the hinterland of Central Europe.

Ladislaus returned to Naples three months after his coronation and soon proved a weak defender of Zadar’s interest and security.\(^5\) By 1409 the Zaratini who had been members of the pro-Angevin faction had again switched their allegiance, but not to Sigismund. Instead the Republic of Venice attracted their support.

**1.5 The Return of Venice, 1409-68**

1358 had been a great humiliation for the Venetians. Thrown out of Zadar, it was not clear if they would ever recover, let alone re-emerge as a regional superpower. Following the Peace of Zadar, there was no immediate respite from both external and internal strife. The 1360s and 70s were defined by ongoing wars, social instability and reconstructing the Republic’s maritime forces after the demographic disaster of the Black Death in 1348.\(^6\) Meanwhile, Genoa remained a major commercial and military threat to Venice. In 1376, the Fourth and final Genoese war was declared and at first Venice struggled. In 1378, the Venetian naval captain Vettor Pisani and his fleet of fourteen galleys were wintering at Pula in Istria. A Genoese force appeared unexpectedly and, in order to avoid what would otherwise have been a crushing rout, Pisani retreated. Tactically, this had been the wisest course of action, but the image of cowardice proved too much for the Signoria and Pisani was imprisoned.\(^7\) The following year the alliance of Hungarians, Genoese and Paduans took Chioggia from

---

\(^5\) Bianchi (1888), pp. 56-57.  
\(^6\) Lane (1973), p. 175.  
\(^7\) After the debacle a case was brought against Vittor Pisani (and a young Michele Steno, later Doge of Venice when it regained Dalmatia) for misconduct in battle and cowardice. The Signoria demanded the death sentence but Pisani was imprisoned instead. ASV, Avogaria di Comun, RASPE, Reg. 3644, fol.15v-16r; Lane (1973), pp. 191-92.
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Venice. In the Adriatic, Louis had also granted the Genoese safe access to all the Dalmatian ports. In desperation, the Signoria finally released Vittor Pisani from prison in 1380 and ordered him to lead the Republic's navy against the Genoese. The Battle of Chioggia in June that year proved a comprehensive victory for Venice and forced both Genoa and Hungary to sign the Treaty of Turin in 1381. Peace and the resumption of Venetian mercantile activities in the Mediterranean were the result.

This cessation of maritime and terrestrial hostilities provided Venice with a much-needed opportunity to consolidate its position. Indeed within five years the Republic was stable enough within the Dogada to begin a new programme of territorial expansion, beginning with the acquisition of Corfu in 1386. By 1420 the Republic's population and subject territories had doubled. A vast array of strategies including 'diplomacy, military action, inheritance, purchase, and voluntary submission' all contributed to this success. By the turn of the fifteenth century, Venice had regained some of its reputation as a regional force. As early as 1401, Zadar had offered to submit to the Republic because civil war in Hungary threatened chaos in Dalmatia and Neapolitan Angevin support was insecure. Venice rejected the Zaratine offer, preferring to bide its time and thus impelled Zadar in 1402 to submit to Ladislaus. By the middle of the decade Sigismund was consolidating his power and the Genoese presence in the Adriatic was growing. It became increasingly important

---

88 Chioggia had been an important source of salt for the Venetians. Lane (1973), p. 192; Hocquet (1978), p. 77.
89 Jackson (1887), p. 122.
91 Lane (1973), pp. 196-97.
92 After Corfu Venice acquired Argos, Nauplion and Andros in 1388; Tinos, Mykonos and Negroponte (Euboa) in 1390; Durrës (Durazzo) in 1392 and Alessio the following year; Scutari and Drivasto in 1396; Lepanto and Patras in 1407; Zadar Osor, Rab, Cres and Nin after the sale of 1409; Šibenik in 1412; Zonchio in 1417 and the rest of the larger Dalmatian communes and islands (Split, Trogir, Korčula, Brač, Hvar, Pag and Kotor) in 1420. Venice began its conquest of the Terraferma in 1404 with Vicenza, Feltre and Belluno; Rovigo, Verona and Padua followed the next year; Udine was acquired in 1420 with Brescia six years later and Bergamo submitting in 1428. Ibid., p. 198; O'Connell (2009), pp. 22-3.
for Venice to acquire at least one Dalmatian port to secure its own ambitions and economic success.\footnote{...considering about all how important for our state it is that regions of Dalmatia are favourable and not contrary to us.] Ljubić (1875), p. 26 as translated and quoted in O'Connell (2009), p. 27.}

It was soon apparent that Sigismund was more focused on ruling Hungary and Ladislaus of Naples was weak. The loyalty of the Dalmatian communes was available again. In 1408 Ladislaus approached the Republic and put up for sale his claim to Dalmatia. His initial price was 300,000 ducats. Venice rejected the offer but during negotiations Šibenik, Nin and Trogir cast aside their allegiance to Ladislaus and submitted again to Sigismund again. With the loss of three cities Ladislaus returned to Venice with a new price of 100,000 ducats.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 209-13; O’Connell (2009), p. 28.} The offer was accepted, much to the chagrin of the Zaratini who had not been consulted. In response the Zaratini locked up the Neapolitan militia in the city’s garrison and welcomed the Venetian representatives with open arms. They raised the standard of St Mark as a sign of Zadar’s fidelity to the Republic.\footnote{Šime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (1409-1412) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1878), 6, p. 12} Respected members of the nobility and those who had lobbied for a return to Venetian rule publicly swore oaths of allegiance to the Republic in the city’s main square.\footnote{O’Connell (2009), p. 28.} Those in favour of a Hungarian administration fled from Zadar.\footnote{O’Connell (2009), p. 28.} After this Venetian Santa Intrada of 1409 Zadar would remain under the banner of St Mark until the fall of the Republic at the end of the eighteenth century.

The start of Venetian rule was positive. Possibly realising that past relations with Zadar had been fraught - as well as witnessing the more recent deterioration of the alliances between the commune, Sigismund and Ladislaus - the Republic granted a number of concessions to the city. Local officials were allowed to keep their jobs and
certain legal proceedings remained under Zaratine jurisdiction. Those who had fled the city fearful of the new Venetian rulers could return in safety. Finally, the Zaratini would enjoy the status of a Venetian de intus citizenship. Those noblemen who had been part of the city’s Angevin faction had now become the Republic’s most ardent supporters. In September 1409 Guido de Matafarri, Palus de Giorgi, Jacopo de Raduchis, Simon Detrico, Michael de Soppe, Thomas de Petriço and Cosa de Begna all swore fidelity to the new regime. The Signoria also acknowledged the loyalty of the absent, aged and infirm Anthonio de Grisogono and Cressio quondam Raynerius de Varicassius. Many of these families would do very well out of the political and personal connections forged with the Venetians and this shall be an aspect considered in the next chapter.

Along with these early concessions, however, came changes that would undermine the city’s autonomy and wealth. The Venetian reprieve for exiles to return to Zadar without fear of punishment did include the caveat that the Signoria wanted information on those still missing. Those considered ‘malevolent and scandalous’ would suffer perpetual banishment, although it was not made clear how this malevolence and scandal would be assessed and by whom. In the realm of criminal law, although the local judiciary would deal with most crimes, the Venetian count would judge offences such as rape and piracy. The count also had the power to make final decisions on all judgements passed by the local judiciary. Only Venetians could fill the advisory and administrative positions that supported the count. The local

---

199 In April 1410 Michael de Gallelis was encouraged to return from Trogir with the promise that he would have all his goods and chattels restored and could live in freedom and peace. Ljubić (1878), pp. 82-3.
200 There were two levels of Venetian citizenship. The de intus was a half status, granted after ten years of residence and the avoidance of what Lane has described ‘mechanical labour’. Those with de intus citizens could engage in trade within the city. After twenty-five years of residence the full citizenship, de extra, was given. Equality with Venetian-born citizens was complete which meant access to international markets and shipping although with the associated customs and excise duties. Ibid., pp. 7-12 & 78; O’Connell (2009), p. 28; Lane (1973), p. 152.
201 Ljubić (1878), p. 12.
202 ‘...quod expellantur aliqui malivoli et scandalosi de Jadra, et sint in intelligentur perpetuo banniti...’ Ibid., p. 9.
populace had access to positions in the secondary tier of administration, such as the roles of civil notary, criminal notary, a doctor and magister scolarum. 203

Zadar’s influence in Pag was also curtailed. The Signoria rejected Zadar’s request for a Zaratine to become the island’s count. Instead, only Venetians could be count or any other associated administrative officials on the mineral-rich island. 204 This decision was the cause for concern amongst part of the Zaratine community, as influence, power and wealth was beginning to pour away into Venetian hands and those most loyal to them. In June 1411, during the war between Venice and Sigismund for control of Šibenik, a number of the discontented Zaratine nobility revealed their support for the Hungarian King. 205 The Signoria quickly punished the rebels, shipping most off to Venice and banishing the remainder to Nin. 206 Twenty-seven rebellious nobles were sent to Venice, at one point so poverty-stricken by their exile that they requested the Republic grant them a stipend of fifteen ducats a month. They were given five. 207 The Republic would not tolerate unrest in Zadar and declared that those who voiced dissent would be severely punished.

As well as undermining the political power of the Zaratine elites, the Venetians also began weakening the commune’s economic backbone by taking control of the salt market. Now that it controlled Pag, the Republic was keen to exploit the island’s commercial possibilities. Venice quickly imposed a dazio, an export tax, upon the salt sold from the island’s salt pans and the Venetian count would collect the tax in Zadar. 208 By 1414 the Republic demanded that, for ease of taxation, an annual collection

203 Ibid., pp. 8 - 9 & 72-73.
204 The Zaratini were not allowed to become rectors of Rab or Cres either. Ibid., pp. 9, 12 & 72.
205 Damiano quondam Bivaldi de Nassi was considered a particularly notorious rebel. Ibid., pp. 167-8.
206 Ibid., pp. 180 & 197-8.
207 Ten years later this stipend had not increased. This case shall be analysed further in Chapter 2. Ibid., pp. 213-4 & 269; Josip Alačević, ‘Prva knjiga “Dukala i Odredaba” (Il Libro I delle Ducali e Terminazioni Venete che comincia coll’anno 1409’), Arhivi u Dalmaciju II / 3 (1902), p. 56.
208 16 April 1410 Ljubić (1878), p. 84; Raukar (1981), p. 147.
of all the salt gathered in Pag and the district of Zadar occur in October.\textsuperscript{209} A number of the officials who oversaw the taxation and collection of salt were local nobility, mainly those who were closely allied to Venice such as Simon de Nassi and Andrea de Grisogono.\textsuperscript{210} This was an important perk for the nobility who supported Venetian rule.

Over the course of the next two decades the dazio was increased and restrictions placed upon where the Zaratini and Pagani could sell their salt. This process shall be discussed further in Chapter 2. The result was that over time the Venetian monopoly on salt prices and the increasing dazio for local salt producers destroyed any incentives to maintain the saltpans and harvest the salt. The value of the saltpans tumbled and by the end of the fifteenth century salt production had virtually ceased in the area.\textsuperscript{211} This slow economic decline was reflected in other markets as higher Venetian excise duties and the use of the staple impacted the merchants and landed nobility of Zadar. By the 1450s Zadar’s port was no longer a vibrant merchant hub.\textsuperscript{212} The Venetian desire for quick commercial returns meant that the long-term economic and social health of Zadar was never considered and suffered considerable damage.

Beyond the slow internal decline of Zadar, Venice had begun expanding onto the Terra Ferma. Wars with other Italian city-states, such as Milan, also punctuated this period.\textsuperscript{213} Whilst the Republic’s focus was firmly in the West, the Ottomans were increasing their power and presence in the Balkans and Eastern Mediterranean. By the 1420s Bosnia was on the front line of Western Christendom with King Tvrtko II only

\textsuperscript{209} Summer winds and sun help the water evaporate from the saltpans so an autumn harvest of the salt would be possible, hence the annual collection in October. Hocquet (1978), p. 76; Raukar (1981), p. 147; Alačević (1902\textsuperscript{2}), p. 65.

\textsuperscript{210} Šime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (1412-1420) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1882), 7, p. 173.

\textsuperscript{211} Raukar (1981), pp. 152-6.


\textsuperscript{213} Lane (1973), p. 29.
clinging to power through the Ottoman Empire’s patronage and support.244 Meanwhile Hungary’s internal chaos meant that it was no longer an effective buffer between East and West. A number of French and German attacks on the Ottomans also failed. This highlighted the increasing strategic weakness of Central Europe and the Balkans against the Ottomans.245 Realising the increasing threat, Venice knew it would fail should it engage the Ottomans in a terrestrial war. All of the Venetian land campaigns on the Terra Ferma were led and fought by foreign mercenaries. Venice had no standing army, never mind one comparable in scale to that of the Ottomans.246 So the Republic tried to protect its Mediterranean territories and commercial interests with a combination of naval force and diplomacy. In the years before the fall of Constantinople, Venice was at war with Florence and Milan, too busy to give credence to rumours of a succession of military victories led by a nineteen-year-old sultan, Mehmed II.247 When Constantinople was lost, all of Christendom was shocked, but arguably none more so than the Venetians: the Ottomans were now on the doorstep of the Republic’s Greek colonies.

The threat to the Dalmatian territories also increased dramatically. By 1459 the Ottomans had absorbed Serbia and dynastic disputes in Bosnia paved the way for a takeover in 1463. The Duchy of Hercegovonia also fell and by the late 1460s many of the Venetian territories of southern Dalmatia were surrounded.248 On the 9th September 1468 the Ottomans attacked Zadar, heralding an extraordinary shift in regional concerns and defence that would define the fortunes of the commune and Venice for the next three centuries.249

---

246 Ibid., p. 229.
247 Ibid., p. 235.
249 For more about the economic and demographic impact of the Turks on Zadar and its surrounds after 1468, see Raukar (1977), pp. 23-5; Tomislav Raukar, Prošlost Zadra III: Zadar pod mletačkom upravom 1409-
In conclusion, the medieval history of Zadar and its place in the regional politics of the Adriatic, Balkan and Central European hinterland is indeed complex, even febrile. The city’s liminal location and small size subjected it to the imperial ambitions of several contemporary superpowers. Yet Zadar’s internal demand for political autonomy, economic strength and pride in a distinctive communal identity often came into conflict with these larger regional forces. New allies were sought depending on the commune’s particular needs, sometimes successfully and on other occasions disastrously. The events of this narrative are essential to understanding the significance of the commune’s medieval saint cults, but they are not enough. A greater comprehension of the societal frameworks is also necessary. What sort of society survived and indeed seems to have flourished on occasions during this turbulent history? What were the societal networks and allegiances that drove policy, trade and cultural development? How did the foreign rulers respond to these nuances, if at all? This shall be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 2

Medieval Zaratine Society

In order to understand Zadar’s saint cults, we need to understand the city’s medieval society. At first instance its governmental structure, evolving noble elite and mercantile class appear to have much in common with those of contemporary Italian city-states. Yet Zadar’s location, on a boundary between the Adriatic’s maritime trade routes and the feudal agricultural societies of the Balkan hinterland, made it a melting pot of Latin and Slavic identities. Like the other Dalmatian communes, this mélange gave Zadar a very distinctive character and we shall see how that instigated marriage, forged trade connections and generated the personal wealth of its citizens.

During the medieval period, lay life was intertwined with the spiritual demands of the day. This can be seen in the connections between the Church and the body politic, manifest at first in familial alliances and then becoming connected with greater political developments in the region. Piety had a temporal significance. An abundance of notarial documents from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, primarily wills and testaments, has made it possible to plot local allegiances with particular religious houses. Did these ties reflect political associations with certain institutions such as the cathedral of St Anastasia or the Benedictine abbey of St Chrysogonus? Wills are very important in helping piece together the material manifestations of familial and personal aggrandisement in the public spaces of churches. These were crucial sites where the citizens played out the ritual manifestations of civic identity.
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Atop all of this was the hegemony of the Venetians and Hungarians. How did they fit in to this complex and confident community? A key section of this chapter examines the strategies deployed by both superpowers, analysing their evolution over the course of the medieval period. What were the conspicuous differences in imperial policy and why were they so divergent? Or were the similarities greater than anticipated? How did the local population respond to the overtures from both Venice and Hungary? The success or failure of these strategies defined Zadar’s complex societal tapestry.

2.1 The Structure of Government

Zadar was a modest-sized European urban centre, but this belied a sophisticated political framework, the hybrid result of centuries of intercultural influence. During the societal and urban evolution of Zadar from Late Antique villae to Early Medieval castra, the bishop was the main figurehead of continuity and permanence. He was the representative of an external power (the Papacy) that promised longevity and stability in the face of great social change and whose ambit included the spiritual wellbeing of his flock.1 Aside from the secular powers of the Byzantine colonial administration and native counsellors, the bishop also had an important role regarding policy decisions. As the Church increasingly controlled land both within and without the city walls (in addition to the privilege of tithes and other donations), any temporal decisions that could have repercussions upon these assets were first discussed with and approved of

---

1 The role of the bishop within translation legends of saints in a number of Dalmatian communes is significant. The bishop was the member of society who welcomed the saint to its new home. This indicates the bishop’s social status not only as the community’s spiritual leader, but an important secular one as well. Trpimir Vediš, ‘Martyrs, relics, and bishops: representations of the city in Dalmatian translation legends’, Hortus Artium Medievalium, 12 (2006), p. 179; The Synods of Split in 925 and 928 also confirmed that the Dalmatian church was within the ecclesiastical sphere of Rome and not Byzantium. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1946), p. 148.
by the bishop. Not only was he the highest ecclesiastical officer but he also functioned as the city’s highest magistrate.

Over time, members of the laity established the post of prior, a prominent secular position within the commune that complemented the role of the bishop. Beneath the prior were three judges and the tribunes. The latter became a hereditary title and it was from the families of tribunes that the judges and priors were elected. This monopoly on power, held by a closed circle of families, was curtailed after 1100 as the role of prior evolved into that of count or comes. This was an office commonly held by a foreigner and originally intended as a way of countering internal factionalism.

The commune would also employ a podestà or deputy, often a foreigner too. Only after the deputy was one of the positions of a judge, later renamed that of rector, available to the local nobility. This post had a judicial function as well as an advisory element for the count. The noblemen who were voted in as rectors only held the office for two months before a new set came in. Should both the count and the deputy be absent the three rectors were in charge of Zadar.

A Major Council - also known as the Full, General or Universal Council - existed from the middle of the thirteenth century. It consisted of about a hundred

---

4 The city tribunes were probably early military commanders that represented each city quarter and there were as many tribunes as there were city quarters. Zrinka Nikolić Jakus, *The Formation of Dalmatian Urban Nobility: Examples of Split, Trogir and Zadar*, Ph.D thesis (Central European University, 2004), p. 24.
9 Ibid., p. 532.
members of the commune’s elite, who could only join once they came of age at
twenty-one. The count, his personal counsellors and the three rectors supervised
proceedings. The Major Council’s responsibilities included the election of officials,
public ministers, chancellors and the salaried positions of notaries, scribes, medics and
pharmacists. The Council chose from amongst the nobility city tribunes, the count of
Pag, castellans in the district of Zadar, examiners of notarial documents, ambassadors,
military and naval captains, administrators of the arsenal, guardians of the night
guard, ports and prisons, procurators of the commune and for churches and
monasteries and finally commissioners for charitable funds.⁴⁹ Between thirteen and
sixteen of the most experienced noblemen from the Major Council were chosen to sit
on the Council of Requests and the Minor or Secret Council. The three rectors chaired
both committees, which prepared agendas and issues ready for debate and voting in
the Major Council.⁵⁰

In 1280 Italian legal experts were brought in to codify the commune’s laws, the
lex antiqua, which had evolved from Roman and Byzantine notarial and legal
traditions.⁵¹ The result was the city’s first statute book, the lex nova. By the 1305 a lex
novissima included alterations that provided a strong legal framework for the decrees
of the Major Council, rectors and foreign counts.⁵² Crime and punishment, maritime
laws and infringements, rules regarding common land were all included. These not
only created judicial boundaries for the commune’s citizens but also defined those
areas of civic life that were subject to taxation or dazio. The commune’s public income
was derived from fines, tolls, the usufruct of public land and waters, the trentesimo for

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 535.
⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 533-4.
CHAPTER 2. ZARATINE SOCIETY

foreign goods, the *arboratico* for ships anchored in the city’s port and the more
standard taxation of particular industries and consumables.\(^4\)

2.2 Society and Language

Zadar’s medieval government appears quite similar to contemporary city-states of the
Italian peninsula, and so too did its societal and economic structure. But it would be
incorrect to assume that the city’s civic identity was a culturally ‘Italianate’ commune
separated from the Italian peninsula by geography. It was this geography that defined
the city and its people. Zadar’s liminal position, poised between the Croatian
hinterland and a Mediterranean coastline had implications for its culture, society and
economy. This regional melting pot created a community unique from both
contemporary Croatian and Italian societies (and indeed modern definitions of these
particular nationalities and identities).\(^5\) Suzanne Mariko Miller elegantly conveyed
this sense of the particular identity of the Dalmatian communes when she wrote:

[The] portrayal of a Dalmatia distinct from but connected to and influenced
by the Croatian hinterland is both subtle and convincing. This interpretation
of medieval Dalmatia proposed a unified eastern Adriatic zone with a
common social and cultural background; its focus on civic communal identity
and mixed Slavic and Latin cultural roots distinguished it from both Croatian
and Italian societies.\(^6\)

One means of gauging the particularity or liminality of Zadar’s civic identity is by
looking at the range of languages that its citizens used daily. In the seventeenth
century Valerio Ponte noted that, although in terms in of costumes and Catholicism
the Zaratini were no different to the Italians of the peninsula, they spoke two

\(^5\) See Introduction.
\(^6\) Suzanne Mariko Miller, *Venice in the east Adriatic: Experiences and experiments in colonial rule in Dalmatia and Istria (c. 1150–1358)*, Ph.D thesis (Stanford University, 2007), p. 45.
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languages: Romance and Slavic. In the medieval period these languages both had public and private forms. Latin was the language of choice for notarial and legal documents, be it wills, contracts or the city statutes, while a volgare venezianeggiante - a local Romance dialect heavily influenced by Venetian - was commonly spoken amongst the merchants and noblemen of the city. Rare written instances of the volgare can be found in private notes, the occasional will and contracts when a more technical vocabulary could not be translated into Latin.

The Slavic language was the same, divided between a ceremonial manifestation in the ecclesiastical realm - a Croatian redaction of the Church Slavonic described as littera sclava in the archival documents - and a spoken Croatian vernacular in the domestic sphere. Although both Slavic were more common amongst the thirty-six parishes of the islands and rural hinterland, they were also used in the city proper. Bianchi noted that in the churches of Saints Anastasia, Catherine, Nicholas, Silvester, Andrew and Anthony Abbot parts of the liturgy were read in Illyrian (the local version of the Church Slavonic) on the titular feast days of these churches. In 1177 when Pope

---

17 Email from Dr. Nikola Vuletić, lecturer, Department of French and Ibero-Roman Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia, to Zoë Willis, 25th November 2009.
18 The account book of Donato de Matafarri of 1449 is littered with instances of the volgare. DAZD, Spisi Obitelj Matafar, God. 1449, Kut. 1, Sveš 1, Inven. Br. 360, ff. 267v-71r. Charmingly, the notary Vidulić in the second half of the fifteenth century, in addition to some of his entertaining doodles and caricatures, wrote a number of asides in his official notarial documents including two recipes: one for a savoury dish and the other for a dessert. Tomislav Raukar, Prošlost Zadra III: Zadar pod mletačkom upravom 1409-1797 (Former Zadar III: Zadar under Venetian Rule 1409-1797) (Zadar: Narodni List, 1987), p. 167.
19 The nobleman Thomas de Petriço’s substantial will of the 7th July 1426 was written entirely in the volgare. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, ff. 289r-292r.
20 On 16th June 1431 the notary Theodore de Prandino wrote a contract in which the archbishop of Zadar, Luca Venier, and the procurators of St. Anastasia commissioned the artist Giovanni di Pietro of Milan to gild and polychrome a number of wooden sculptures intended for the cathedral’s new presbytery screen. This screen shall be the subject of further analysis in Chapter 5. For the purposes of highlighting the use of vernacular volgare during this period, it is interesting to note that when the contract became increasingly technical in its language, Prandino slipped into the volgare venezianeggiante. Ivo Petricoli, Umjetnička obrada dreveta u Zadru u doba gotike (Wood carving of the Gothic period in Zadar) (Zagreb: 1972), pp. 56 & 59. For a full transcription of the contract, see pp. 123-4.
21 Email from Dr. Nikola Vuletić, lecturer, Department of French and Ibero-Roman Studies, University of Zadar, Croatia, to Zoë Willis, 25th November 2009.
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Alexander III arrived in Zadar the commune sung lauds in Croatian. A number of wills mentioned the priests of the *littera sclava* and sometimes the testator would request prayers and masses in that language. Tantalising reference to written examples of this ceremonial Slavonic also survive in the archives. In 1440 the priest Guirssa quondam Mathei *de littera sclava* wrote his will and mentioned a Slavonic missale and breviary. Six years later Paulus Ratchovich, priest *de littera sclava* of the lepers’ hospital just beyond the city’s walls, left his nephew the deacon Matheo, ‘one of his breviaries written in the Slavic language.’

An ecclesiastical institution also provides a rare instance of the written Croatian vernacular. In 1345 the nuns of the Dominican convent of St Demetrius wrote their *Red i Zakon* or Statutes in the local Croatian dialect. This suggests that the daughters of the nobility spoke this language more frequently than the *volgare venezianeggiate*. A year later in August 1346 the Venetians offered the besieged Zaratini conditions of surrender and read out the public proclamation in both the

---

25 Two wills of 1439 and 1440 respectively mentioned a particular priest, Georgio Zubina. In 1439 Grubula, noblewoman and widow of Paulo de Sira, gave a financial bequest to Georgio who was noted as a ‘presbitero...de litera sclava.’ Her 550 also came with the request for ‘unam sclavinarum ut tenetur ... orare per anima sua.’ In 1440 Georgio was recorded as the confessor of Niza, widow of Ratchy Bunili and then wife of Zanino de Francia the barber. Georgio received 55 in her will. 10 October 1440. DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 137v-141r; 16 March 1349, DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), fol. 1v.
26 The missal was to be sold for 550 and this sum given to Guirssa’s brother, Johannis. The breviary is a much more interesting object. Originally bequeathed to the church of St Mary in Modrusa, Guirssa’s codicil changed this element of the will. Instead he wished to sell the breviary. From the money generated ten gold ducats were left for the reparations of the parish church of St Michael in Zadar and another ten would help with the construction of St Anastasia’s campanile. Any remaining money was to be distributed equally amongst his executors. Therefore we can assume that the price of this breviary written in the ‘littera sclava’ was more than twenty ducats in total. This is an impressive amount if one compares it with the cost of an ancona for the church of St Peter in Znoiac, a village in the district of Zadar. This was commissioned in 1442 at a cost of 14 ducats. DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 77r-8r; Giuseppe Praga, *Documenti per la storizza dell’arte a Zara dal medioevo al settecento*, ed. Maria Walcher, Studi e recerche d’arte veneta in Istria e Dalmazia (Trieste: Edizioni ‘Italo Svevo’, 2005), p. 228.
27 Both Paulus and his executor, the hospital’s chaplain Carinus, were noted as clerics of ‘de littera sclava’. As the leper hospital stood outside the city walls and supported sufferers from both the city and rural district, it might be the case that the use of vernacular Slavonic was more appropriate for the needs of the patients. 28 October 1446 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 44v-45r.
29 ‘...unum suum breviarium scriptum in littera sclava...’ Ibid.
'Slavic language and Latin language'. Signifying this event implies that the language was readily understood by a cross-section of Zaratine society. And the use of Croatian continued in the fifteenth century. The 1426 mariegola or statutes of the confraternity of St Silvester required a chaplain to read the Gospels, Letters and the Passion at Easter in Croatian. The chaplain would also hear confession in that language. A century later, the confraternity’s 1540 version of the statutes was written entirely in Croatian.33

What this brief discussion reveals is a community geographically poised between two distinct linguistic families, neither completely part of one nor the other. The names of Zaratini in the notarial archives exemplify this hybridity. The Croatian surnames of a number of the nobility, surnames that appear to have derived from earlier nicknames, such as ‘Slorado’ (‘the malicious one’ or ‘evil-doer’) and ‘Varicassis (‘porridge-cooker’),32 were easily combined with the Latin-sounding saints’ names like ‘Philippus’ 33 and ‘Damiano’.34 Italianate surnames with Croatian first names also existed such as that of Cressio (a local diminutive of Chrysogonus) de Civallulis,35 Colanus quondam Begnolus de Gallo36 or Zuviza quondam Paulo de Georgi, a nun at the convent of St Mary from 1379 to 1405.37

31 Both manuscripts were lost during World War II. Ivo Petričioli, ‘Dvije matrikule bratovštine sv. Silvestra u Zadru (Two statutes of St. Silvester’s confraternity in Zadar)’, Radovi Filosofskog fakulteta, Razdio društvenih znanosti (Zadar), 7 (1977), p. 147.
33 See the will of Philippus quondam Bardi de Sloradis, priest of St Peter the New in the Plathea Magna, 23 September 1387. DAZD, SZB, Articulii de Rivignano (1385-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), fol. 48r. For Praga’s proposed family trees of the Sloradis family, see BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 101 & 102.
34 See the will of Pasina, widow of Damiano of Varicassia, 16th January 1391. DAZD, SZB, Articulii de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 23, fol. 11r-v. See also BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 113.
35 See his will 23rd October 1384. DAZD, SZB, Raymundus de Modis (1384-1388), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti Registrati (1384-1388), Br. 1, ff. 37-6v; Appendix C 1- Zaratine Family Trees; Jakov Stipišić, ‘Iventar dobara zadarskog patриции Grezogona de Civallulis iz 1384. godine (The 1384 inventory of Grigogono de Civallelis, Zaratine nobleman)’, Zbornik Historijskog zavoda Jugosavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, 8 (1977), pp. 375-410.
36 BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 57.
37 BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 60.
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Such a fusion of the Slavic and Romance in different aspects of communal, social and economic life, not only distinguished the Zaratini from Medieval Croats and Italians, but the populations of other Dalmatian communes as well. For instance in Dubrovnik, the fourteenth century was in a period of immigration for Croats, Bosnians and Serbs into the city probably because of the increasing trade networks with the hinterland. Added to this mix was a Latinate noble class and foreign traders, primarily from Italy.\(^3\) To define Dubrovnik or Zadar as either ‘Croatian’ or ‘Italian’ is an anachronistic and simplistic response to bilingual and complex medieval identities. What was important was the communes’ sense of autonomy and personal identity: \textit{Civitas} defined a people as Dubrovčani, Spličani or Zaratini, not which foreign overlord held power nor which language was spoken.

2.3 Class

By the late medieval period Zadar’s social stratification had settled into three levels. There was the urban elite who consolidated political authority into a relatively select group of families;\(^3\) a mercantile and professional middle class that, although excluded from the centre of political power, was able to exert influence through its economic dominance;\(^4\) finally, the \textit{populares} or the \textit{populo minuto} that supplied the sailors, fisherman, agricultural workers, labourers, domestic staff, soldiers and so forth.\(^5\) Out of a population of approximately 7,000 people living \textit{intra muros} and about 8,000 in


total if the suburbs are included, the urban elite of Medieval Zadar made up about forty families.

2.3.1 The Urban Elite

The geographic origins of the urban elite are uncertain. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries increasing numbers of families from the Croatian hinterland arrived in the city, such as the Nosdroga from the village of Draginići and the Gliubavac from Skradin. Others like the de Georgis, de Grisogono and de Pauli have more ‘Italianate’ surnames. Whether these names came from the city’s earliest Latin population, or from immigrants from the Italian peninsula or emerged as corruptions of Croat nicknames, is unknown. But from the twelfth until the fourteenth century elevation into the highest and most powerful echelon of society was relatively easy if wealth or a venerable enough heritage were on one’s side. Marriage was another way to forge and maintain familial connections and networks, reinforcing political alliances and increasing wealth. By the fourteenth century members of the urban elite were keen to follow the model of strict social and political stratification initiated in Venice at the end of the previous century: the serrata of the Great Council. In Zadar only those whose fathers and grandfathers had served on the city’s councils were

---

45 One example of this can be seen with the de Curtis or Kurtiša family. Arriving in Zadar in the late twelfth-century, by the thirteenth they were known as de Curtiscia or Lacurtiscia and a century later the name had evolved again into de Cortesia or de Cortesia. Ibid., p. 32.
46 During Pietro Gradenigo’s dogate (1289-1311) members ship of the Great Council became hereditary and for life. However, it was also closed to new members thus creating a very distinct line between those who were and those who were not considered of the elite or noble. This serrata also limited the pool of talent for official posts to only members of the nobility. Edward Muir, Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), p. 38.; Frederic C. Lane and Reinhold C. Mueller, Money and Banking in Medieval and Renaissance Venice. Volume I Coins and Moneys of Account (Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1985), I, p. 96. See also Brunelli (1974), p. 531.
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considered true members of the elite,\textsuperscript{47} effectively restricting participation in local government to a privileged few. As shall be discussed later, this was an important part of negotiations between the Zaratini and Republic of Venice.

2.3.2 The Merchant Class

By contrast, passage into the developing middle or professional class - the citizens or cives of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries - was easy enough if one had the skills and capital necessary.\textsuperscript{48} Certainly, a number of Italian merchants who arrived during the second half of the fourteenth century were within a generation respected members of the cives class.\textsuperscript{49} This reflects the rise of twelfth- and thirteenth-century newcomers who became established nobility within a short period of time. Although the cives of the late Middle Ages were excluded from political power, some of Zadar’s wealthiest citizens came from this class. These men made their money from metal, textiles, spices and salt as Zadar’s location made it a conduit between the luxury goods markets of the Mediterranean and the mineral resources of the Balkan hinterland.\textsuperscript{50} The fourteenth century was a time of economic success for these merchants, with Micovil quondam Petrus\textsuperscript{51} and Nicola quondam Micovil \textsuperscript{52} - the father and son textile dealers or *draparius*

\textsuperscript{47} Klaic and Petricioli (1976), p. 223.
\textsuperscript{48} The 1436 will of Gregorio quondam Blasio Longini was written in the local volgare and defined Gregorio, or ‘Grigor’ as a mercadante and citadin of Zadar. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 12, fol. 16r.
\textsuperscript{49} Klaic and Petricioli (1976), p. 437-8; Sabine Florence Fabijanec, ’Profesionalna djelatnost zadarških trgovaca u XIV. i XV. stoljeću (The professional activities of Zaratine merchants in the 14th and 15th centuries), Zborniku Zavoda za povijesne i društvene znanosti HAZU, 17 (1999), p. 59.
\textsuperscript{51} Mihoivil’s substantial will and inventory survive, giving us a glimpse of the sort of wealth that he and his family enjoyed, everything from the expensive textiles upon which his fortune was founded to silver, gold, pearls and jewellery as well as substantial property holdings in both Zadar, the district and islands. See his will \textsuperscript{20} June 1385, DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff.151-16v; Mihoivil’s inventory has also recently been transcribed and published in Jakov Stipišić, ed., *Iventar dobara Mihoivila suknara pokojnog Petra iz godine 1385 (Inventarium bonorum*
- being amongst the wealthiest men of the period. In the fifteenth century the dominant figures were the three generations of merchants or mercarii of the Venturini family: grandmother Ventura, sons Iuliani, Petrus and Georgio followed by the grandsons Pazino quondam Iuliani, Gregorius quondam Petrus and Nicolaus quondam Georgio. Other affluent representatives of the mercantile class and important members of the local community were the Longini family and the exceptionally rich Gregor Morganic.

2.3.3 Non-Zaratine

As this discussion has shown, within a generation outsiders could establish themselves as Zaratine. But what of those still considered ‘foreign’ in the context of this port city? Trade attracted a number of Italian merchants to settle in the city. Artists and craftsmen, such as the Venetians Meneghelo and the Moronzon family, also spent

---


52 Nicola’s three wills written over the course of twenty-five years provide some insight into the fortunes of such a successful luxury textiles merchant of this period. 20th May 1388 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 190v-195v; 24th April 1408 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 6, ff. 261-277; 23rd March 1413 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 6, ff. 131c-137r.

53 For a summary of the business activities of the Venturini family, the founder of which, Pazino, originally hailed from Cesena in Italy before arriving in Zadar in the third quarter of the fourteenth century, see Fabijanec (1999), pp. 52-6.

54 His inventory was lodged on 20th August 1409 Zadar, DAZD, Magnifica Comunitas Jadrae, (Inventari 1325-1495), Busta 1, Fasc. 1 (1-120), Br. 90, ff. 1r-3r.

55 Forty years later, Petrus q. Ventura lodged his own inventory on 13th December 1447 Zadar, DAZD, Magnifica Comunitas Jadrae, (Inventari 1325-1495), Busta 1, Fasc. 1, Br. 103, ff. 1r-5r.

56 Georgio’s will of 14th November 1418 still survives. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 8, ff. 182r-184v.

57 Family relations were not always easy. On the 2nd March 1442 relations between Petrus and his son had become so bad that the dispute was taken to the highest level of arbitration: the Signoria in Venice. ASV, Cassiere della Bola Ducale, Grazia del Maggior Consiglio, reg. 25, fol. 58r.

58 Nicolaus’ will was lodged fifty years after that of his father on 21st December 1468 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1349-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 118r-121r.

59 Gregorio Longini’s will of 28th December 1436 survives. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 12, ff. 162r-20r.

60 Morganic’s will of 28th April 1460 is transcribed in Roman Jelić, 'Grigor Mrganic', Radovi Institut JAZU u Zadru, 6-7 (1960), pp. 502-7. See also Fabijanec (1999), pp. 56-9.
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much of their working careers in Zadar.66 During the fifteenth century, German perfume makers were based in Zadar, for example Johannes, Hermanus and Simon Teutonico, all described as aromataris.67 A small community of Jews also existed.68 Trade was not the only reason that foreigners settled in Zadar. Marriage alliances were another, particularly between the nobility of the various Dalmatian communes. Historical rivalries and a fierce sense of communal identity may have existed between the cities of the Dalmatian coast, but this did not hinder pragmatic matches between the families of the urban elites.

An interesting case study is that of Pasina, widow of Nicolas de Crisanis, whose will was written on 31st March 1454. Her testament gives us an insight into the familial connections between the nobility of the Dalmatian coast and Kvarner islands. Pasina’s will revealed her to be of the noble family de Cuchulis of Split. Her nephew from Split, Jeremia quondam Francesco, was one of her executors. She still owned a large number of properties in Split and the district, leaving almost all of them to her own son, Marino quondam Nicola de Crisanis. The fact that Jeremia de Cuchulis was able to act as Pasina’s executor and that Marino de Crisanis could maintain properties well beyond the district of Zadar suggests that travel and contact between the Dalmatian communes was not too difficult. Pasina’s sister, Stadia, a nun at St Mary in Split, was given a vineyard in the district of Split.

Not only did individuals benefit from the distribution of Pasina’s wealth, but she also gave £50 to the friars of St Mary de Palude, also in the district of Split, with which to celebrate mass for her soul. The poor lepers in Split proper received £30 and the hospital of the Holy Spirit was also a beneficiary. In Zadar, the convents of St Mary

66 There will be more about the Moronzon in Chapters 3 and 5. Regarding Florentine merchants in Zadar, see Klaic and Petricoli (1976), p. 436.
67 Giuseppe Praga had compiled notes from Zadar’s archival sources on these practitioners. See BMV, Praga fondi, Mss.I.t.VI, 505 (=12299), Fasc. 20.
and St Catherine as well as the women of the Franciscan Third Order who staffed the hospital of St Mary were the main recipients of Pasina’s largesse. The Observant community of Holy Cross was bound up in a general bequest of £50 to all of the Observant friaries in the area.\textsuperscript{64}

Pasina’s will also shows shrewd matchmaking on the part of the de Crisanis family. They not only acquired properties and wealth from Split but also alliances with the island of Rab. Pasina’s other son, Johannis, had married a Catarina of Rab and at least two daughters came of this union, a Mandalena and a Clara who was the wife of Marino Baduaio, also of Rab. Dalmatia was not a unified region but kinship ties provided informal channels of connection and wealth between the communes, countryside and islands. Pasina de Crisanis’ family was a particularly illuminating example of that phenomenon.

2.4 Piety

Having examined the temporal frameworks of Zaratine society, what of its spiritual and ecclesiastical structures? So profound was the role of the Church in daily life it should come as no surprise to find how intertwined it was in the networks and allegiances of civic life. The history of the Church in Zadar is as turbulent as the commune’s political history.\textsuperscript{65} Since the seventeenth century local scholars of Zadar, such as Valerio Ponte,\textsuperscript{66} Donato Fabianich,\textsuperscript{67} Carlo Federico Bianchi,\textsuperscript{68} Vitaliano

\textsuperscript{64} DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 91v-92v.
\textsuperscript{65} See Chapter 1.
\textsuperscript{67} Donato Fabianich, Storia dei Frati Minori dai primordi della loro instituzione in Dalmazia e Bosnia fino ai nostri giorni (Zadar: Tip. Fratelli Battara, 1864), 2.
\textsuperscript{68} For the most thorough history of the ecclesiastical history of the commune, hinterland and islands of Zadar see Bianchi (1877), Vols 1 & 2.
Brunelli,69 Ivo Petricioli,70 Pavuša Vežić,71 Maren Freidenburg72 and Eduard Peričić73 have written much about the commune’s ecclesiastical history. These texts include grand historical narratives as well as smaller case studies like parish churches and convents. This is not the place to reproduce a comprehensive account of their findings, rather to present a brief outline of the role of Zadar’s churches and monastic institutions within the medieval life of the commune.

The most significance role was that of the bishop and then archbishop, a man who straddled the temporal and spiritual domains of society. Traditionally the bishop was chosen from the families of the urban elite.74 Once the seat was elevated to the status of an archbishopric in 1154, control of the position became even more important. This explains the Venetian policy of promoting its own candidates for the position of archbishop instead of local men. This was achieved primarily with the support of the

---

69 Brunelli (1974).
Patriarch of Grado and then, after the 1202 sack of Zadar, through the submission
treaty with the Zaratini.\textsuperscript{75}

2.4.1 The Church

The setting for liturgical celebrations that connected the temporal and secular spheres
of civic life was the cathedral of St Anastasia. After 1154 the new archbishopric had a
metropolitan diocese that included six collegiate churches. These were: St Mary the
Great or St Mary of the Priests; St Stephen (today St Simeon); St Michael the
Archangel; St Peter the Old; St Peter the New and St Anthony Abbot.\textsuperscript{76} These remained
until 1393 when archbishop Petrus Matafarri suppressed the collegiate status of these
six churches and reinstated a college of canons at the cathedral.\textsuperscript{77} In the ecclesiastical
hierarchy of churches, beneath the collegiate foundations were the parishes,
approximately 31 in total.\textsuperscript{78} (Fig. 2.1)

What is noteworthy about Zadar's parish churches during this period is how
infrequently they are beneficiaries of testamentary bequests. Wills only refer to them
in an administrative capacity, in that the city's parishes (contrate or contrade) defined
where an individual lived and worked. The inclusion of a parish was important in the
endorsement of notarial documents. For example, on the 4\textsuperscript{th} February 1389 the
draperer Crisano quondam Martino signed his will at his home in the 'confines of St
Lawrence'. No bequest, however, was made to his closest church.\textsuperscript{79} Thus parish
boundaries were about physical divisions of the city space rather than spiritual centres
that commanded loyalty. This suggests a lack of development and local support of the

\textsuperscript{75} See Chapters 1 and 5; Bianchi (1877), p. 17; Dusa (1991), pp. 49-51.
\textsuperscript{76} See Bianchi (1877), pp. 334, 356, 383, 390 & 430; Brunelli (1908) p. 193-5.
\textsuperscript{77} Bianchi (1877), pp. 168-73; Ferdo Šišić, 'Ljetopis Pavla Pavlovića patricija zadarskoga (The Memoirs of
Paolo de Paoli, patrician of Zadar)', in Vjestnik Kr. Hrvatsko-Slavonsko-Dalmatinskog Zemaljskog Arkiva,
ed. Ivan Kninski Bojnčić, (Zagreb: Tisak Kralj Zemaljske Tiskare, 1904), Godina VI, p. 19; Brunelli (1907),
pp. 132-3; Brunelli (1908), pp. 192-9 & 212.
\textsuperscript{78} For a full list and brief history of each parish church in the city see Bianchi (1877), Vol. 1.
\textsuperscript{79} DAZD, SZB, Articuliatus de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 65v-
67v.
institutions of the secular clergy, at least by comparison with the mendicant and monastic foundations.

Amongst the monasteries and convents, the Benedictine foundations were the oldest and most venerable. The Benedictines of Monte Cassino had established themselves at the abbey of St Chrysogonus by the mid tenth century. Over the next two hundred and fifty years it became the premier Benedictine house of Dalmatia. This was primarily due to the patronage of the nobility, Kings of Croatia and later the Crown of Hungary. In the first half of the tenth century, before the establishment of the Benedictine order in Zadar, King Krešimir of Croatia granted the church of St Chrysogonus some land in the areas called Yculus and Sablat. In 1029 Heleniza, sister of the Croatian Ban Godemir, gave the monastery property and servants as well as offered to build a church dedicated to St Chrysogonus next to the church of St Peter the Apostle in Ostrovica. In 1062 King Petar Krešimir IV (1058-1074) confirmed the abbey’s rights over land given by his predecessor, Krešimir. The abbey now owned properties throughout Zadar, the islands and hinterland.

Patronage of the Benedictines continued in other ways. The noble Madii family of Zadar, important allies of King Peter Krešimir, established the convent of St Mary, the sister house of St Chrysogonus, in 1066. The convent’s first two abbesses - Ćika

---

81 The document was written between 940 and 946 AD. Franjo Rački, Documenta historiae Croatiae periodum antiquam illustrantia, Monumentia Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium (Zagreb: Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, 1877), p. 20.
82 Ibid., p. 38.
83 Ibid., pp. 62-3.
84 These included land within the a number of parishes such as St George on the island of Maun, St Lawrence at Lukoran on Ugljan, St Michael on Pašman, St Martin at Diklo, St Jacob 'beyond the port’, St Martin behind the Main Gate in the city, St Mary Minor - later the Benedictine convent - and finally St Josca also within the city walls. Brunelli (1974), p. 290.
85 In fact the Madii were so closely allied to Petar Krešimir that the convent’s first abbess, Ćika, was described by Petar as his ‘sister’. This led to the local myth that Ćika was indeed a Croatian princess and that the establishment of the convent was a royal one. Bianchi (1877), p. 315; Ana Marinković, 'Constrvi et
and Većenega - also came from the ranks of the Madii.\textsuperscript{86} Two years after this foundation, Petar Krešimir granted the small island of Maun to the abbey of St Chrysogonus.\textsuperscript{87} By 1102, King Coloman of Hungary (1095-1116) had claimed the title and privileges of the Kings of Croatia and celebrated this with his coronation at Biograd. He invaded Dalmatia in 1105 and by 1108 enjoyed the full title of King of Hungary, \textit{Croatia and Dalmatia}.\textsuperscript{88} Coloman also united the traditions of Benedictine patronage established by the Kings of Croatia and King Stephen of Hungary.\textsuperscript{89} As a result both St Chrysogonus and St Mary benefited from his munificence.

Soon after his coronation Coloman confirmed the royal freedom of St Mary’s convent and its privileges.\textsuperscript{90} The King also commissioned a new bell tower.\textsuperscript{91} This is an impressive Romanesque edifice that even today, granted in a restored state,\textsuperscript{92} soars over the city. It is a monumental testament to Coloman’s patronage and power. (Fig. 2.2) Beneath the level of the convent’s wall, in a band that circles the tower, is a dedicatory inscription:

---

\textit{erigi ivsит rex Colomannvs:} The royal chapel of King Coloman in the complex of St. Mary in Zadar, \textit{Annual of Medieval Studies at CEU,} 8 (2002), pp. 39 & 59.

\textsuperscript{86} The church of St Mary Minor had been on the site since 906 but the monks of St Chrysogonus established the convent in 1066 with the financial support of the Madii family. Bianchi (1877), p. 315; Peričić (1967), pp. 10-11; p. 35; Marinković (2002), pp. 39 & 59.


\textsuperscript{89} Engel (2001), pp. 43-4.

\textsuperscript{90} Peričić (1967), p. 15.

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid., p. 16; Ivo Petričoli, ‘Umjetnička baština samostana sv. Marije u Zadru (Artistic heritage of St Mary’s convent in Zadar),’ \textit{Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru,} 13-14 (1967), pp. 64 & 68.

\textsuperscript{92} During the fifteenth century the tower was strengthened and modified. Petričoli (1967), p. 66; Raukar (1987), pp. 138-9.
1105 years since the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the permission of God after the victory and peace the reward of Zadar was entered. Coloman, King of Hungary, Damatia and Croatia ordered the construction and erection of this tower, a special expense for St Mary.\textsuperscript{93}

In addition, Coloman’s generosity supported the creation of St Mary’s high altar and ciborium (since destroyed) as well as the renovation of the chapter house. This space and the bell tower appears were part of a unified architectural programme that Ana Marinković has identified as a royal chapel for the King’s personal use.\textsuperscript{94} On a slightly smaller scale, but no less significant for the future of Zadar, Coloman gave the monks of St Chrysogonus an arm reliquary made of gold with a silver base for the relics of the abbey’s titular saint.\textsuperscript{95} Again, this was a means of forging and reaffirming the traditional ties that had bound this element of Zadar’s society with the Croatian Kings. 

As we shall see, the arm reliquary had increasing significance for the commune’s later identity and alliances with Hungary.

With such prestigious patrons as the Kings of Croatia and Hungary St Chrysogonus increasingly became a focus for the pro-Hungarian factions within the city.\textsuperscript{96} Prior to the twelfth century relations between the cathedral and the Benedictines had been good, mainly because the bishop and the abbot were members of the local nobility and sometimes the same extended family network. As foreign

\textsuperscript{93} INCAR\textsuperscript{.} NATION\textsuperscript{[NATIONIS]} . D[OMI]\textsuperscript{.} NI . N[OST]\textsuperscript{\textit{RI}} . IE[S]\textsuperscript{v} \textsuperscript{\textit{CHR\textsuperscript{[IST]}I}} . MIL\textsuperscript{[LESIMO]} \mbox{.} C\textsuperscript{.} V\textsuperscript{.} POST VICTORIAM ET PACIS PRAEMIA IADERE INTROITVS . A DEA CONCESSA || PROPRIO SVMPTV . HANC TVRR\textsuperscript{\textit{RI}}M S\textsuperscript{\textit{ANIC\textsuperscript{T}AE MAR\textsuperscript{\textit{IAE}} . VNGAR\textsuperscript{\textit{IAE}} . D[AL]\textsuperscript{\textit{MAT\textsuperscript{T}AE CHRO\textsuperscript{T}AE}} . CONSTR\textsuperscript{\textit{V}I} . ET ER\textsuperscript{\textit{IG}}I || IV\textsuperscript{\textit{SIT}} REX COL\textsuperscript{\textit{L\textsuperscript{\textit{OMAN}}}}VS.\textsuperscript{'} During the fifteenth century the bell tower underwent restoration and the donation inscription was covered up. It was only rediscovered in 1946. Petricioli (1967), pp. 66-7; Klači and Petricioli (1976), p. 151; Marinković (2002), p. 39.


CHAPTER 2. ZARATINE SOCIETY

patronage of these institutions grew the local rivalry between the two institutions became more polarised. This was to have a profound effect on the cults of the city’s patron saints, those of Anastasia and Chrysogonus. The Árpád Kings in the thirteenth century continued the relationship between Benedictine foundation and the crown, for example when King Béla confirming the abbey’s privileges in 1242. The culmination of Hungarian favour was in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In 1373 Giovanna, daughter of Charles of Durazzo, was baptised in the church of St Chrysogonus. (Fig. 2.3) Thirteen years later, in 1386, Elizabeth Kotromarić, widow of King Louis, was buried in the churchyard after her murder. Finally, in 1403, Ladislaus of Naples was crowned King of Hungary in the church.

For all the royal patronage and connections that the abbey enjoyed very few members of the nobility joined the order. Usually only the abbot was a member of the local elite. The number of monks was also quite small. During the thirteenth century there were approximately ten and this only increased to seventeen by the fourteenth century. By contrast at the turn of the fifteenth century there were about forty the nuns at St Mary. This was an establishment where the daughters of the nobility were sent. Indeed, the popularity of the Benedictine convent was such that in the late

97 See Chapters 1 and 4; Vedriš (2005), p. 34.
98 See Chapter 3.
101 Bianchi (1877), p. 310. See also Šišić (1904), pp. 10 & 33-4
fourteenth century the convent of St Catherine was founded for the daughters of the
cives.104

The primacy of the Benedictines as the main monastic order in the city was
undermined during the thirteenth century with the foundation and expansion of the
mendicant orders throughout Europe.105 The Dalmatian communes very quickly
became hosts to fledgling Franciscan and Dominican communities. The friars were
very popular amongst the urban populations of Europe, reconciling the responsibilities
of the secular clergy with a renewed emphasis on material poverty and spiritual
wealth.106 Local legend records that in 1220 St Francis himself, when he was returning
to Italy from the Holy Land, established Zadar’s Franciscan friary.107 (Fig. 2.4) We
cannot determine the truth of this foundation tale,108 but the community was certainly
in existence by the 1230s and a church was finally consecrated to St Francis in 1282.109
The Clarissan convent of St Nicholas was founded in 1261 and built next to the
Franciscan friary.110 (Fig. 2.5) As was the case with St Mary, St Nicholas was also to
prove a popular convent for the daughters of the nobility.

By contrast the arrival of the Dominicans seems to have been a more political
affair. They first began to appear in the Dalmatian communes during the 1220s. 111 This
was a decade when the Bogomil heresy was increasing in prevalence throughout the
Bosnian and Croatian hinterland and beginning to influence the liturgy and theology
of the territorial church in Dalmatia.\footnote{Malcolm Lambert, _Medieval heresy: popular movements from Bogomil to Hus_ (London: E. Arnold, 1977), pp. 14-17 & 142-3. See also Lawrence (1994), p. 4.} The Papacy was worried about the spread of the
heresy and sent out the Dominicans to counter the Bogomil development. In this
dispute Venice took the side of the Papacy and Dominicans rather than that of the
Dalmatian territorial Church.\footnote{Miller (2007), p. 64.} Any Bogomil influence upon the region’s Church could
undermine the position of the Venetian archbishop of Zadar and therefore destabilise
Venetian rule in an already volatile commune. The promotion of the Dominicans in
Zadar and Dalmatia was an important part of Venetian policy during this time.

The Order of Preachers had already found success and favour in Venice
proper. Doge Jacopo Tiepolo (1229-49) took a personal interest in the Mendicants and
helped them become established in the city. In 1234 he gave them a land grant for what
would later become the church of Ss. Giovanni e Paolo. His tomb, the first
monumental dogal sepulchre, was also be built there.\footnote{Deborah Pincus, _The Tombs of the Doges of Venice_ (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 15.} (Fig. 2.6) Deborah Pincus has
identified this as an important moment, from which

...surfaces... a special relationship between official Venice and the Dominican
order, an important prelude to the role of the Dominicans slightly later in the
thirteenth century in crafting state imagery.\footnote{The Dominicans themselves were to further enhance the relationship between their order and Tiepolo. By 1458 Giorgio Dolfin in his _Cronica_ told the tale of Tiepolo’s vision, in which he saw a beautiful green space in the sestiere of Castello. Angels with censers and white doves with crowns on their head showed him that this would be the site for the new Dominican church in Venice. During the sixteenth and
seventeenth centuries a number of Dominican writers recounted this tale including Giovanni Antonio
Flaminio’s _Vitae partum inclyti Ordini Preceptorum_, published in Bologna in 1529, Hernando del Castillo’s
_Dell’historia generale di S. Dominico et dell’ordine sup de’Predicatore_ that was published in Venice, 1589 and
finally Tomás Malvenda’s _Annalium sacri ordinis praedicatorum centuria prima_, from Naples in 1627. BMV,
Mss. It. VII, 794 (8503), ff. 197v-198r; Pincus (2000), pp. 17 & 188, endnote 48.}
Considering the Doge’s promotion of the Mendicants orders at home, it was perhaps no surprise that Tiepolo was keen to promote the cause of his new charges in the Venetian territories of the Adriatic and Mediterranean. Tiepolo’s commission of count to Leonardo Quirini in December 1243 finished off with the words:

Item the place of the preaching friars will be handed over to the preaching brothers in the city of Zadar just as it is ordered by ourselves and our council.\footnote{\textit{Item locum fraterm predictorum quem deberis consignare pro fratribus prediotoribus in civitate Jadere sicut ordinatum est per nos et consiliarium nostrum.} ASV, Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.}

The Dominicans arrived in Zadar after the unsuccessful revolt of 1242 but during a period when significant numbers of the pro-Hungarian nobility and their supporters were in exile in Nin.\footnote{Stjepan Krasić, ‘Inventar umjetničkih predmeta u nekadašnjoj dominikanskoj crkvi u Zadru (Inventario degli oggetti d’arte nella già chiesa dominicana di Zadar)’, \textit{Prilozi Povijesti Umjetnosti u Dalmaciji}, 27 (1985), p. 228; Miller (2007), p. 83.} By 1244 the friars were still without a suitable convent, causing Pope Innocent IV (1243-54) to write a letter demanding the situation be rectified.\footnote{The Papacy also announced an indulgence for the Dominican order in general. Bianchi (1877), pp. 42-43; Smičiklas (1906), p. 251.} The following year, the Venetian archbishop, Domenico Franco (1239-47), allocated the Dominicans a private house, adjacent to the church of St Thomas.\footnote{Smičiklas (1906), p. 232.} Yet in 1247 Doge Tiepolo wrote to the count in Zadar demanding to know why the Dominicans were still homeless.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 372-3.} The fact that Leonardo Quirini’s original commission requested that he ensure the Dominicans’ settlement in Zadar confirms that this was not simply an ecclesiastical matter but one that concerned the highest realms of Venetian government. The Dominican arrival in Zadar was an experiment that probably helped establish the order throughout the Venetian territories of the Mediterranean, primarily
that of Candia in Crete. In 1248 Tiepolo gave permission for the Dominicans to found a friary in that city.\(^{121}\)

Returning to Zadar, in 1247 the city’s archbishop Lorenzo Periandro (1247-1287) finally granted the friars the small Benedictine convent of St Platon with its church and adjoining land.\(^{122}\) (Fig. 2.7) In 1267 a new church was begun following an indulgence from Pope Clement IV (1265-68) and financial donations from the public. The building was finished in 1280 with a formal ceremony of consecration attended by Guido the Patriarch of Grado, Periandro, and the bishops of Nin, Rab and Senj.\(^{123}\) What was especially noteworthy was the rededication of the church and its high altar to St Mark the Evangelist.\(^{124}\) The implication of this consecration as a means of promoting Venice’s imagery of state in its maritime territories will be examined in Chapter 5. The church and friary were never known as St Mark’s, rather the local population used the names ‘St Platon’ and ‘St Dominic’ instead. By the Apostolic Visitatio of 1579 there was no altar at all within the church dedicated to St Mark.\(^{125}\)

After the slow introduction of the Dominican friary in Zadar, the commune began to support the Preaching Friars in much the same way that they did the Franciscans. By the fourteenth century, the Dominicans were a well-established part of the community and in 1311 a female Dominican convent, St Demetrius, was founded.\(^{126}\) Zadar was becoming an increasingly important focus of Dominican activity in the

---


\(^{124}\) Above St Platon’s main portal was a dedicatory panel carved into stone. It was destroyed in 1790 during restoration works. The inscription on the panel was as follows: *XIV. IA N. GVIDO P.G.D.P MCCCLXXX. DED. S. MARC ECCLESIAM HANC R.S.V. TEMPORIBUS D. LAVRENT, ARCHIEPISCOPI IRÆ ASS E NAA.* This translates as ‘on the 14\(^{th}\) January 1280 Guido, patriarch of Grado, primate of Dalmatia, dedicated this church to St Mark in the time of the lord Lorenzo archbishop of Zadar, assisted by the bishops of Nin, Rab and Senj.’ A transcription of this dedication was kept in the friary’s archive as well as the private archive of the Filippi family in Zadar. Brunelli (1974), p. 409 & 427, note 40.


region. In 1380, after it had received papal approval from Urban VI (1378-89), a new
Dominican province of Illyria was founded of which Zadar's was the principal friary.\footnote{127}

2.4.2 Lay Patronage and the Church

The churches of Zadar were recipients of some spectacular instances of patronage and support from the local community. One of the more monumental, the chapel of St Simeon the Prophet, comes under further scrutiny in Chapter 4. In life, the nobility and cives commissioned altars, embroidery, metalwork, tabernacles and architectural statements for both the glory of God as well as their own posterity.\footnote{128} Zadar's notarial documents also contain a large number of wills and testaments. These reveal personal networks of patronage and familial ties between the Church and laity.

A recent survey of 190 testaments and bequests from members of the Zaratine nobility - between the years 1228 to 1350\footnote{129} - revealed that the most popular recipients were the Franciscans and Dominicans with 47 bequests each,\footnote{130} followed by St Nicholas with 32, the convent of St Mary with 25, St Chrysogonus with 14 and finally St Demetrius with 6.\footnote{131} It should be noted that as St Demetrius was established in 1311 it
 only had thirty-nine years worth of wills in comparison to the other institutions. This pattern of posthumous patronage does continue in the later wills between 1350 and

\footnote{127} The new province essentially incorporated communes that stretched all the way down the Adriatic coast, from modern day Italy to Albania. This included Cividale, Dubrovnik, Durrës, Hvar, Kotor, Krk, Nin, Pag, Rab, Shkoder, Senj, Šibenik, Split, Starigrad, Trogir, Udine and Ulcinj. Bianchi (1877), p. 419. Paolo di Paoli recounted the arrival of Pope Urban VI’s papal legate, the Dominican Stephen of Faenza, on the 17\textsuperscript{th} March 1380. This visit precipitated the establishment of the Province. Śiść (1904), p. 3.

\footnote{128} Giuseppe Praga transcribed a large number of contracts and wills from the notarial archives in Zadar, of which those that pertain to the artistic and cultural life of the city in the late Medieval and Early modern period have recently been published. See Praga (2005).

\footnote{129} The survey and its results were originally published in Zoran Ladić, Urban Last Wills from Late Medieval Dalmatia with Special Attention to the Legacies pro Remedio Animae, Ph.D thesis (Central European University, 2002), and reproduced in Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 132.

\footnote{130} This very much reflects the comment made by Louise Bourdua in her book on Franciscans and art patronage in late Medieval Italy: ‘Thus at the heart of the city, the [Mendicants] became an integral part of the urban fabric... and enjoyed the benefits of the prosperity associated with civic growth and commerce.’ Indeed, as a wealthy and commercially dynamic commune it is small wonder that Zadar and its citizens were quick not only to adopt the Mendicants but also to ensure ongoing financial and cultural support of their convents. Bourdua (2004), p. 18.

\footnote{131} Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 131.
1468. My own review of 151 testaments from the period 1346-1460 has included bequests to St Anastasia. The majority of these testators were wealthier citizens and out of the 151 total, 87 were members of the nobility. 53 of the wills were those of women.

What my survey indicates is that the two oldest and arguably most venerable ecclesiastical foundations in the city - St Anastasia and St Chrysogonus - did not fare well. In fact the institutions that received fewest bequests were those associated with the secular clergy. Between 1387 and 1468 only 12 bequests were made to the collegiate church of St Mary the Great. The chapel of St Simeon, attached to St Mary the Great, received 23, with testators' peak period of beneficence occurring between 1400 and 10. 14 bequests were made to the chapel in this decade, a time when the new chapel was under construction.134

As for the cathedral, in the entire period of 1346 to 1468 it only achieved 14 bequests from this testatory sample. Bequests ranged from donations to the fabric of the building,133 the campanile project of the mid fourteenth century134 and to personal confessors who were priests at St Anastasia.135 Amongst the most interesting of the group are the two wills left by the Matafari brothers, Guido and Ludovico, in 1414 and 1421. Their brother, Petrus, had been archbishop (1396-98) as had their uncle Nicola

---

133 The chapel and its construction shall be the subject of further analysis in Chapter 4.
134 Will of Guidone de Matafari, milites, 15th November 1414 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 224r-225v; Will of Marcheta, widow of Antonio de Grisogono milites, 22nd August 1447 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 54r-55v.
135 Will of Gurissa, presbyter de litera sclava, 23rd Sept 1440 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 77r-88; Will of Donatus quondam Mazoli de Fanfogna, 29th October 1448 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 55v-57v; Will of Petrus Didach, marinari, 3rd February 1468 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 121r-122v.
136 Will of Magdalena, widow of Daniel de Varicassis, 21st February 1387 DAZD, SZB, Articuitias de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 59r-59v; Will of Michael de Nassis, 12th August 1392 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3; Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 202v-203v.
(1333-67). Guido left a very generous annual income of 100 ducats for six years to the cathedral fabbriceria, whilst Ludovico had much more elaborate and monumental plans for the cathedral. His will of 1421 asked that

Item... an altar be established in the church of St Anastasia of Zadar beneath the sepulchre or arca of one... lord Nicola de Matafar, Archbishop of Zadar. At this altar daily masses were to be celebrated for the souls of Nicola, Nicola’s brother Demitrius (the former bishop of Nin) and the testator himself. In addition to the altar, which along with the arca no longer exists, the sale of Ludovico’s library would pay for the decoration of cathedral’s chancel end, in memory of his brother Petrus. This development of the chancel, presbytery and choir is the subject of greater discussion in Chapter 5. The Matafarri bequests were the most generous to the cathedral and seem to suggest an attempt to create a memorial space dedicated to the memory of their ecclesiastical relatives. The monumental nature of Ludovico’s testamentary bequests in particular would also, in the eyes of the local community, forever associate the cathedral with the dominance of the Matafarri family in the fourteenth century. Yet Matafarri patronage was not just limited to the cathedral. They also supported other churches and monastic institutions in the city and this generosity shall be scrutinized later in this chapter.

According to my own testamentary survey between 1345 and 1453 the abbey of St Chrysogonus was the beneficiary of only 29 bequests, ranging in generosity from £10

---

197 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 224r-225v.
198 It is said that a sum of money was given to the archbishop and his cathedral. The archbishop is said to have used the money to build a church in Zadar. See Appendix C 3 - Zaratine Family Trees.
199 The tomb of Nicola de Matafarri was produced in 1386 by Paolo quondam Vanusio de Sulmona, one of the stonemasons hired to construct the chapel of St Simeon the Prophet. This chapel space shall be the subject of more discussion in Chapter 4. Prigmore (1984), p. 178. The transcribed contract for the tomb is in Praga (2005), p. 79.
200 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 9, ff. 220v-222v.
to 150 gold ducats. Like St Anastasia, money was given to St Chrysogonus for the celebration of masses, structural repairs to the building and artwork. It was mainly the noble families of the commune that left bequests, including the Begna, Boton, Butuano, Čadulin, Gallelis, Grubogna, Matafarri, Nosdragna, Petriço, Soppe, and Varicassis. Families from the cives class also contributed. The wealthiest of this group were Mihovil and his son Nicola, the textile merchants. Mihovil was buried in the church of St Chrysogonus. On the 3rd February 1399 Nicola commissioned the Venetian painter, Meneghelo, to create an ancona for the high altar of St Chrysogonus using St Anastasia’s high altar as the model.

---

143 Will of Jacobus quondam Micha de Varicassis, 17th May 1346 transcription by Giuseppe Praga in BM, Praga fondi, Ms. lt. VI, 532 (=12326), ff. 280r-282v; Will of Gabriel quondam Filippo de Nosdragna, 26th July 1405 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 54, ff. 1r-2v.
144 Will of Mathei quondam Damianus de Begna, 28th September 1385 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 20r-21v; Lucia, widow of Mathei de Begna quondam Damiano 7th June 1390 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 18, fol. 1r-v; Will of Gregorio quondam Zoilus de Boton, 10th June 1407 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 152r-154r; Will of Colanus quondam Martinusio de Butuano, 13th August 1385 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 177r-18v; Will of Michelina, daughter of Gregorij de Čadulin and wife of Georgij quondam Vito de Čadulin, 29th September 1391 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 21, fol. 1r-v; Will of Maćolus quondam Nicola de Gallelis, 2nd November 1406 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 1, ff. 17r-19r; Will of Francisco quondam Nicola de Grubogna 31st May 1405 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 51, fol. 1r-v; Will of Guido de Matafarri, milites, 15th November 1414 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 224r-225v; Will of Gabriel quondam Filippo de Nosdragna, 26th July 1405 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 54, ff. 1r-2v; Will of Thomaso de Petriço, 7th July 1426 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, ff. 289r-292r; Will of Blasius quondam Georgij de Soppe, 9th June 1400 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 142r-143v; Will of Cressio quondam Marino de Soppe, 12th May 1453 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcinia (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 67r-70r; Will of Jacobus quondam Micha de Varicassis, 13th May 1346 transcription by Giuseppe Praga in BM, Praga fondi, Marc. It. VI, 532 (=12326), ff. 280r-282v.
146 ‘Menegellus pictor promisit convenit et se obligavit eidem ser Nicolaio facere et pingere eidem ser Nicolaio unam anconam et dare factam et pictam positar in civitate Jadr in monasterio sancti Grisogoni et super altari maioris sancti Grisogoni de Jadra...que ancona esse debet eisudem designationis cuius est ancona que est super altari maiori ecclesie sancte Anastasie de dicta civitate Jadr...Et hoc ideo quia dictus ser Nicolaus promisit dare ipsi Menegello pro premio premiissemur libras septimegentas soldorum parvorum, videlicet ad presens libras quadrimcentas soldorum parvorum...’. 3rd February 1399 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 2a, Fasc. 3, Istrumenti (1397-1400), ff. 129r-130r as transcribed in Praga (2005), Doc. 2, p. 16. See also an early codicil of Nicola’s will written eleven days later on 14th February when he left an additional £40 towards the cost of the ancona. Codicil of Nicola quondam Micaelis, draparius, 14th February 1399 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 111v-112r. In his final will of 23rd March 1413 Nicola requested that masses be said for his soul before this altarpiece, whilst his body would be buried before the altar of St
During the 1380s the abbey received 5 bequests and only 2 in the 1390s. This was followed by two decades of more testamentary interest. Between 1400 and 1410 there were 9 bequests whilst 1411-20 brought in 7. The popularity of the abbey then appears to have dwindled with only 2 bequests between 1421 and 30, none during the 1430s, 2 more in the next decade and only 1 after 1450. Although a number of testators requested that masses be said for their souls without specifying location, only 8 wills required masses be celebrated at St Chrysogonus. The monetary gifts in these wills were not always for the abbey itself. In 1385 Mathei de Begna left £100 to his son Damiano, a monk at St Chrysogonus. Damiano would have to say masses for his father’s soul.\textsuperscript{145} In the case of Blasius quondam Georgio de Soppe, his brother Grisogonus - an executor of the will - was the abbot of St Chrysogonus so it is perhaps no surprise that Blasius left the abbey £100.\textsuperscript{146} On the 26\textsuperscript{th} June 1405 Gabriel quondam Filippo de Nosdragna requested a sepulchral chapel to be built for him. He also gave the church of St Chrysogonus a silver chalice worth fifteen ducats. The chalice would complement one already given in bequest by Gabriel’s brother, Stefanus.\textsuperscript{147} These familial connections are similar to those displayed by the Matafarri and their bequests for the cathedral.

The Benedictine nuns of St Mary did better with bequests than their monastic brothers and indeed better than the other convents in the city. Between 1346 and 1468 60, testators mentioned St Mary in their wills, whilst the Clarissans of St Nicholas received 57 bequests, followed by St Demetrius with 32 and finally the Benedictine

\textsuperscript{145} DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 20r-21r.
\textsuperscript{146} 9\textsuperscript{th} June 1400. DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 14r-14v
\textsuperscript{147} Will of Gabriel quondam Filippo de Nosdragna, 26\textsuperscript{th} July 1405. Again, one of the testators was Grisogono de Soppe, abbot of St Chrysogonus. The chalice would complement the one already given in bequest by Gabriel’s brother, Stefanus. DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 54, ff. 1f-2v.
convent of St Catherine with 31.\textsuperscript{148} These bequests were often small ones left for individual nuns, be they the testators’ sisters, nieces, daughters or aunts. This was a pattern was prevalent amongst all the convents.\textsuperscript{149} Requests were also made for the nuns to sing psalms or to pray for the testator’s soul.

The most successful recipients of testamentary bequests were the Mendicants, with the main houses of St Francis and the Dominican community at St Platon leading the way. Beginning in the later part of the fourteenth century the Observant Franciscan communities at St Doimus on Pašman, the later St Jerome on Ugljan, St Catherine in Novigrad and Holy Cross in Zadar’s own suburb also benefitted from bequests, with 31 in total across all four communities.\textsuperscript{150} A foundation for Franciscan tertiaries was established in the thirteenth century: St John the Baptist in the suburb. In the 1430s this foundation also benefitted from the patronage of Gregor Morganic.\textsuperscript{151}

\textsuperscript{148} The foundation date of St Catherine’s convent is unknown but it was rebuilt after a fire in 1190. Between 1382 and 91 the building underwent significant reconstruction with financial support from Pellegrina Saladini, widow of Francesco Grisogono. Another fire struck in 1405 and this time Agnese, wife of Nicola the textile merchant, provided the funds to rebuild. Bianchi (1877), pp. 442-43.

\textsuperscript{149} One example is the will Zurica, widow of Gregorio quondam Cressius de Çadulin that was lodged on 15\textsuperscript{th} July 1390. Not only was Franceschina de Civallelis, abbess of St Nicholas, one of the executors (and recipient of £30 for her efforts) but also the abbess of St Mary, Catarina de Butovano received £10. Mandica de Çadulin, Zurica’s ‘sister’, was also a nun at St Mary and was left £10. The same amount was bequeathed to the nun Catarina de Begna at St Demetrius. DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 19, fol. 1r-v.

\textsuperscript{150} The increased patronage of the Observants reflected patterns on the Italian peninsula following St Berardino of Siena’s revitalisation of the Franciscan order during the first half of the fifteenth century. Jasmine Wilson Cyril, \textit{The imagery of San Bernardino da Siena, 1440-1500: An iconographic study}, Ph.D thesis (University of Michigan, 1991), pp. 6-7; Cooper (2009), p. 94. The friary of St Doimus was established by members of the de Grisogono family in 1392 as a retreat for the friars expelled from Bosnia, whilst St Jerome was established in 1430 by Simon de Begna. Emil Hilje, ‘Utemeljenje franjevačkih samostana na zadarškim otocima (The foundation of Franciscan monasteries on Zaratine islands)’, \textit{Radovi zavoda za povijesne zanosti HAZU u Zadru}, 45 (2003), pp. 8 & 14; Cooper (2009), p. 82. Indeed, the earliest testamentary records of this Observant community in the 1390s describe the friars of St Doimus as the \textit{fratrem de bosna}. See will of Fantina, wife of Blaxius quondam Georgio de Soppe and daughter of Lombardini de Saladini, 11\textsuperscript{th} April 1394 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 26, fol. 1r-v; Will of Nucio quondam Pacino of Florence, spice merchant and \textit{habitator} of Zadar, 16\textsuperscript{th} November 1398 DAZD, SZB, Articitius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 109v-110r. By the mid fifteenth century the four houses were well established and the Grisogono support for the Observants continued. Marcheta, wife of Antonio de Grisogono and six years later, her son, Bartolomeo, both requested that masses be said for their souls in all four Observant friaries. 22\textsuperscript{nd} August 1447 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 547-55v; 19\textsuperscript{th} February 1453 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 75v-77r.

\textsuperscript{151} Giuseppe Ferrari Cupilli, \textit{I Francescani del terz’ ordine} (Zadar: Tipografia Battara, 1864), pp. 3-4.
Although the male conventual houses in Zadar - in contrast to the convents of St Nicholas and St Demetrius - did not have the familial connections between friars and the secular families of the city, they were greatly supported by the citizens. Between 1346 and 1468 the Franciscans received 70 bequests whilst the Dominicans were not far behind with 61. The bequests were comparable in number to those enjoyed by St Mary but those received by the Mendicants were different in nature. Although confessor friars were mentioned in wills they were never family members. Testators were more likely to ask for burial in mendicant churches, have masses celebrated for their souls and leave money for structural repairs and investments.

Particular families would have particular associations with one or another of the mendicant friaries and churches. Important examples were the Nassi family and their affiliation with the Dominicans and the Matarari with the Franciscans. The Nassi

\[135\] Maria, wife of Johannes quondam Nicola de Nassi, not only left £50 to her confessor, Nicolaus of Split and friar at St Francis but he was also one of her executors. 30th July 1392 DAZD, SZB, Articitus de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 25, fol. 1r-v.

\[136\] Crisano quondam Martino, draparius, wished to be buried in the chapel of St John the Baptist at the Dominican church of St Platon. He also left £20 each to St Francis, St Platon and St Chrysogonus for masses to be said for his soul. 2nd February 1389 DAZD, SZB, Articitus de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 65v-67v.

\[137\] Mara de Mance of Rugusa, wife of Cressio quondam Rayniero de Varcassie left £100 to go towards the repairs (reparationes) of the church of St Francis. 21st October 1385 DAZD, SZB, Articitus de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 21v-23r.

\[138\] See Appendix C 4 - Zaratine Family Trees. Of the wills by members of the Nassi family who specifically note their intended church of burial, 8 testators writing their wills between 1365 and 1468 requested to be buried in the church of St Platon. The 1447 will of Nicolaus quondam Doimo de Nassi stated that 'Item voluit corpus suum sepeliri in ecclesia Sancti Platonis in sepultura ... iacet corpus quondam parentis sui', which indicates a family tomb in the church. Of these 7 wills, 5 were male members of the family, one was a wife, Margarita, wife of Petrus de Nassi in 1391, and another was Marina, daughter of Johannes de Nassi in 1458. By contrast, the 5 wills between 1392 and 1455 of women who married into the family all wished to be buried in St Francis. This may indicate a preference for the paternal family's sepulchral church and indeed in 1443, Mariza, widow of Johannes de Nassi, asked to be buried in the tomb of her forebears at St Francis. See Will of Bivadi de Nassi, 15th Jan 1365 DAZD, SZB, Petrus Perecanus (1365-1392), B. 4a, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1366-1391) fol. 8r-v; Will of Margarita, wife of Petrus de Nassi, 11th July 1391 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), fol. 198r-v; Will of Nicolò quondam Doimo de Nassi, 10th August 1447 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 48v-50r; Will of Gregorio de Nassis, 7th June 1454 DAZD, SZB, Nicolò Lupovich (1446-1469), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1447-1467), fol. 18r-v; Will of Marina, daughter of Johannes de Nassi, 20th July 1458 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), fol. 105r-v; Will of Johannes quondam Michele de Nassi, 2nd February 1467 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 16r-118v; Will of Rafaelis quondam Jeronimo de Nassis, 19th March 1468 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 122v-123r; Will of Maria, wife of Johannes de Nassis, 30th July 1392 DAZD, SZB, Articitus de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 25, fol. 1r-v; Will of Boriza, widow of Cressio quondam Nicola de Nassis, 23rd May 1400 DAZD, SZB, Johannes de
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palace is situated opposite St Platon so proximity would explain the relationship between the family and the Dominicans. Those Matafari who were not members of the secular clergy preferred to be buried in the family tomb at the chancel end of St Francis. Returning to the 1421 will of Ludovico de Matafari, he demanded that:

... his [Ludovico's] body be honourably buried in the chapel in which lies the body of lord Mapheo de Matafari that exists and is situated in the church of St Francis near the high altar on the north east side, in which he wants a tomb be made in which his body be buried and that of his wife... lady Nicolota, can also be buried in the said tomb.

Fifteen years later, Nicolota requested burial by her husband's side in the chapel of St John the Baptist at the Franciscan church. Income from certain properties in the countryside and islands would pay for perpetual masses for herself and her husband, as well as a chalice worth sixteen ducats. Archival records indicate a number of other Matafari tombs in the north east chapel, or chapel of St John: that of Philippo quondam Vulpino de Matafari in 1385; the Mapheo of Ludovico's will; Ludovico's

Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), ff. 2141-2151; Will of Colliça, widow of Damiano de Nassis, February 1419 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 9, ff. 2267-2277; Will of Mariza, wife of Johannes de Nassis, November 1443 DAZD, SZB, Jacobus qm. Ostoje (1427-1445), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1430-1444), Br. 2, ff. 250-260; Will of Tomasin, widow of Simon de Nassis, April 1455 DAZD, SZB, Nicolo Lupovich (1446-1467), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1447-1467), ff. 277-271.


154 ‘Item voluit et ordinavit corpus suum honorífice sepelliri in capella in qua iacet corpus domini Maphei de Matafari esitente et posita in Ecclesia Sancti Franseschi prope altare maius parte traversali in qua voluit fieri una sepultura in qua voluit corpus suum sepelliri et domine nicolote eis uxor... alius possit sepelliri in dicta sepultura.’ DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 9, ff. 2201-2222. See also Appendix C 3- Zaratine Family Trees.

155 In the 1579 Apostolic Visitation the altar of St John the Baptist was noted as ‘ornament ut supra’ but no record was made of any Matafari patronage. Vatican City, Archivio Segreto (hereafter cited as ASVat), Congregatio Vescovi e Regolari, Visite Apostoliche, n. 80, fol. 45v.

156 June 1436 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 12, ff. 147-151.

157 See his will of 20 June 1385. DAZD, SZB, Articium de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 3, ff. 11-2r.
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brother Guidone, milites, in 1414; Guidone’s wife, Michilina, in 1419;\(^\text{61}\) Simon quondam Filippo de Matafarri in 1448\(^\text{62}\) and Ludovico quondam Colano in 1470.\(^\text{63}\)

This familial sepulchral focus complemented a rather splendid redevelopment of the church’s chancel end that took place during the 1390s. In his will of 1391 Georgio quondam Thomasio de Matafarri left 200 gold ducats to the friars of St Francis.\(^\text{64}\) This bequest made up a substantial portion of the 456 ducats that were paid in 1395 to the Tuscan wood carver, Giovanni di Sansepolcro, to produce a new set of choir stalls for St Francis.\(^\text{65}\) (Fig. 2.9) The Matafarri coat of arms can still be seen today, emphasising the particular alliance of the family with the Franciscans. (Fig. 2.10)

During the seventeenth century the high altar and chancel end of St Francis underwent dramatic changes. (Fig. 2.11) There was also a restoration after an earthquake in the eighteenth century, which resulted in the removal of the church’s original interior and its medieval tombs.\(^\text{66}\) Today the choir stalls are also situated behind the wall of the baroque altarpiece. But during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries both choir stalls and the Matafarri family tomb were in close proximity to the high altar. This was the liturgical focus of the church space. In addition masses for Matafarri souls would be celebrated at regular intervals in the chapel of St John the Baptist, close to the high altar. Thus the experience of the church’s holiest part was one imbued with both ephemeral and monumental reminders of the family. This was strikingly similar to the ambitions for the cathedral of St Anastasia. Such a method of

\(^{61}\) Although Guidone’s own will does not mention his burial site that of his widow Michilina records her desire to be buried with her husband in St Francis. 9\(^\text{th}\) December 1419 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 8, ff. 202v-204r.

\(^{62}\) Simon wanted to be buried ‘in illa sepultura ubi iacet corpus quondam parentis suis’. 18\(^\text{th}\) of March 1448 DAZD, SZB, Johanis de Calcinis (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3. Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 57r-58v.

\(^{63}\) ‘Item voluit corpus suum sepulchri in ecclesia Sancti Francisci de Jadre in sepultura suorum antecessorum.’ 25\(^\text{th}\) July 1470 DAZD, SZB, Johanis de Calcinis (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3. Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 125r-126r.

\(^{64}\) 14\(^\text{th}\) July 1391 DAZD, SZB, Johanes de Casulis (1381-1417), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1382-1414), fol. 199r-v.

\(^{65}\) Fabianich (1864), p. 11; Bianchi (1877), p. 362; Petricioli (1972), pp. 21 & 27; Cooper (2009), p. 79. For the transcribed contract between the friars and Giovanni, see Petricioli; (1972), pp. 117-8.

promulgating secular memory and blurring the boundaries between the temporal and sacred in what should be the most hallowed space of a church is the subject of further analysis in Chapter 5. At St Anastasia, however, the fifteenth-century redevelopment of the cathedral’s chancel and choir stalls became less about the posterity of the Matafari and much more about the city’s archbishops and its Venetian administrators.

2.4.3 Confraternities

The city’s confraternities provided another area of urban life in which which lay and ecclesiastical activities merged. Cives and members of the populares made their presence felt in the commune by their participation in these organisations. Confraternities fulfilled a number of important social functions and ensured civic cohesion and participation throughout Europe. In Zadar these groups began to appear in during the twelfth century. By the early fifteenth century there were approximately forty. The earliest were corporations of craftsmen, similar to guilds. A range of professions had their own scola or confraternity such as the butchers, sailors, fishermen and furriers.

In the early thirteenth century lay brotherhoods evolved that provided social services such as hospitals, charitable handouts for the poor and burial for victims of pestilence. These groups devoted their charitable efforts to a patron saint. The physical base for a confraternity was often a church or monastic institution, one that sometimes shared the saintly dedication. Within these churches, the ritual and

---

171 Similar to Venice, the Zaratini called their confraternities scole as well. Bianchi (1877), pp. 510-12; Novak-Sambralio (1972), pp. 6 & 12.
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devotional side of the groups’ activities were often focussed on a particular altar
dedicated to the confraternity’s patron saint. Confraternities dedicated to Saints
Anastasia, Chrysogonus,173 James of Galicia or Compostella, Mary, Martin, Mark the
Evangelist, Nicholas and Silvester all existed in the city.174 The confraternity of St Mark
shall come under particular scrutiny in Chapter 5.

After 1409 Venetian involvement in the confraternities increased. The first
demand from the Signoria was that it would confirm the rules and regulations of
Zadar’s scole.175 Indeed, a Venetian ducal order or ducale of the 25th November 1457
noted the changes to the statutes of the confraternity of St James of Compostella, or
Scola del Popola.176 These reforms were validated the following year. Amongst the
changes in the statutes, notably written in the volgare, were the demand for the
confrères to say three Pater Nosters and three Ave Marias to God, the Blessed Virgin
Mary, St Mark and finally St James of Compostella.177 The Venetian Council of Ten also
granted the confraternity’s statutes the same status as that enjoyed by the grander
scuole of the Republic.178

173 There are two early references to a confraternity or scole of St Chrysogonus. Ciprioni Osimec’s will of
1285 left a bequest to the ‘fratalie seu scola sancti Grisogoni.’ Cipriani’s amended will of 1287 left two
modia of wine (vini de vinea) to the confreres to pray for his soul and the souls of his father and wife.
However, no other documentary references survive that could give some indication of the confraternity’s
function or membership demographic. This lack of evidence might suggest that the confraternity was
short-lived, or at least did not last into the fourteenth century. It should be noted that these early notarial
documents have been damaged by age and so the transcriptions have a number of gaps in the texts. Mirko
Zjačić, ed., Spisi zadarskih bilježnika Henrika i Creste Tarallo 1279-1308 (Notariorum jadrensiun Henri et
44 & 46; Klaič and Petricioli (1976), p. 481.
177 Ibid., p. 15; Raukar (1987), pp. 110-11. For the full transcription of the statutes, see Novak-Sambrailo
(1972), pp. 11-31.
178 Stratico (1769), fol. 47r; Reinhold C. Mueller, ‘Aspects of Venetian Sovereignty in Medieval and
Renaissance Dalmatia’, in Quattrocento Adriatico. Fifteenth-Century Art of the Adriatic Rim. Papers from a
Colloquium held at the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1994, ed. Charles Dempsey. (Bologna: Nuova Alfa
The origins of St James’ confraternity can be traced back to the thirteenth century but in 1407, just before the return of the Venetians, the organisation underwent a revival.\(^{79}\) Paolo de Paoli wrote in his *Memoriale*:

On the feast of St James of Galicia, the 25\(^{\text{th}}\) July, the confraternity established itself in the city of Zadar, for which solemnity a mass was solemnly sung in the church of St Stephen of Zadar and the chapel of St James himself...\(^{80}\)

This chapel remained the devotional focus of the confrères’ activities until 1458 when the confraternity moved to the parish church of St Michael.\(^{81}\) This was a year after the Venetian confirmation of the revised statutes.

As indicated by the confraternity’s alternative name - the *Scola del Popola* - the confrères were not from amongst the nobility but its most important members came from the *cives* class. Gregor Morganić and Nicolò quondam Georgio di Venturino both became the head guardian of the brotherhood during their lifetimes.\(^{82}\) The merchant members of the confraternity also gave generous bequests.\(^{83}\) Gregor Morganić was the most munificent. In 1451 the Venetian authorities gave him permission to establish a hospital run by the confrères.\(^{84}\) Morganić’s will of 1460 left a substantial proportion of his wealth to the hospital and also dictated the institution’s precise remit.\(^{85}\) Overall the Venetian favour granted to the confraternity would have been a flattering gesture to the wealthy citizens of this territorial outpost in the *Stato da Mar*.

\(^{80}\) *In festo Sancti Iacobi de Galicia, 25. mensis iulii, incepit fratalea ipsius in civitate Iadrae, pro cuius solemnitate fuit cantata missa solemnis in ecclesia Sancti Stephani de Iadra et in capella ipsius Sancti Iacobi...* Stišić (1904), p. 42.
\(^{81}\) Bianchi (1888), pp. 57 & 64.
\(^{83}\) See the wills of Gregorio Longini and Georgio quondam Venturo de Venturini. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 12, ff. 16r-20r; DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 8, ff. 182r-184v.
\(^{85}\) For example a prior should be appointed to look after the thirteen paupers housed in the hospital. Ibid. pp. 505-7.
The city’s confraternities also provided an important ceremonial service, adding to the civic rituals that processed across the urban space on particular feast days. Indeed, for the Venetian *Santa Intrada* of 1409 the confraternities of the Annunciation\(^{186}\) and St Andrew\(^{187}\) led the solemn processions of prelates, clerics, and lay confraternities through the streets of the city until they reached the *Plathea Magna*, the city’s main square. There the two confraternities led the laudes for the ‘honour of God, the province’s protector saints, the Republic of Venice... the archbishop... the nobility and the people of the city’.\(^{188}\) Because of this the Venetian administration gave the two confraternities special dispensation to unveil their standards and process through the city on two days of the year: the 31\(^{st}\) July, the commemoration of the *Santa Intrada*, and the 25\(^{th}\) April, the feast of St Mark.\(^{189}\)

### 2.5 Hegemony

The commune of Zadar was thus a wealthy, urbane and vibrant port city. Trade networks and marriage alliances meant the commune was well connected with the other ports of the Dalmatian coast and a European-wide commercial web that stretched from Northern Europe to Byzantium and beyond. The reality was Zadar was too small to remain independent. Marital connections may have consolidated the material links between the elites of the Dalmatian communes but rivalry was still intense. A unified alliance was never created. Even within the communes, the factionalism was rife. In Zadar the need for a foreign count to ensure stability for the city implied that political cabals were a real threat to internal peace. So the city turned

---

\(^{186}\) Regarding the early modern history of this confraternity see Bianchi (1877), pp. 494 -5.

\(^{187}\) Stratico does not state whether it was the confraternity of the fishermen or sailors who led the procession. Stratico (1769'), fol. 46r. Both groups had their base at two churches dedicated to St Andrew. See Bianchi (1877), pp. 510-11.

\(^{188}\) ‘...ad onor dio, Santi Protetori della Provincia, della Republica Veneta...Arcivescovo... Nobili, e Popolo della Città’. Stratico (1769'), fol. 46r.

\(^{189}\) Ibid.
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to greater powers, those of Hungary and Venice. But how did these foreign administrations fit over and work with the running of the commune?

2.5.1 The Hungarians

Hungarian rule over Zadar was tempestuous and infrequent. The main concern of the Kings was stability in Hungary proper. They could only achieve this by consolidating royal power and influence against a landed, ambitious and martial baronial class. Every change of King could result in chaos both in Hungary and its allied territories. Even a clean succession was still not a guarantee of obedience among the Kings’ subjects. Therefore, it was not a Hungarian priority to form an effective territorial administration in the Dalmatian communes, regardless of their strategic import. These were peripheral concerns. So how did the Hungarians attract Zaratine allegiance? A number of tactics were deployed, including strategies such as a political presence by proxy - a theme that will be further developed in Chapters 3, 4 and 5 - as well as patronage of individuals and institutions.

Just how successful was the presence of a royal representative? Early on the Duke and Ban of Croatia and Dalmatia had a palace in Zadar and so these figures of royal authority were often in the city. This situation became less frequent during the thirteenth century because of civil disorder in Hungary and the rise of the Šubići. 

Surprisingly, the physical presence of the Hungarian King in Dalmatia, with Béla in 1242 and Louis in 1345, proved less effective because of their military inadequacies and distractions back in Hungary. The Zaratine rebellions failed, as their allegiance was not repaid with military support when it was most needed.

The return of a royal official to Zadar in the 1370s, Charles of Durazzo, was arguably a success. Charles cultivated personal friendships and connections with the

---

local nobility that resulted in ongoing Zaratine loyalty.\footnote{Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 56.} When in 1376 he overthrew Queen Joanna in Naples Zadar celebrated.\footnote{Die 10. mensis septembres venit nova (ladram, quod) dominus Carolus rex repulit et captivavit (dominium Ottonem ducem Brunsvicensem), virum dominae reginae Ioannae, et cras (die 11. dicti mensis), fuit magna festivitas in ladra. Šišić (1904), p. 4.} Problems arose when the personality of the royal representative proved more appealing to the Zaratini than the Hungarian Crown proper. Zaratine support for Charles’ coup in 1385 was an example of this.\footnote{After Charles’ Hungarian coup and coronation in December 1385 Zadar quickly accepted the change as indicated by notarial documents of January and February 1386. All of them note in the introductory dedication that the King of Hungary, Croatia and Dalmatia was Charles. Praga (1953), p. 23.} Therefore it seems that royal representatives could prove dangerous when personality and ambition dominated the role. We shall see how this was also an issue that the Venetians contended with.

Another means of securing the centre to the periphery was with visits, both by Hungarian ambassadors and members of the royal family. The Angevins used this method during the second half of the fourteenth century: King Louis came to the city twice, in 1358 and 71. The 1380s were punctuated with ambassadorial delegations and one royal visit in 1384. Although these sojourns were fleeting, the public rituals, ceremonies, celebrations and oaths that defined them were the means by which the local community became an active participant in these historical events. The coronation of Ladislaus of Naples in 1403 was a prime instance of this. The citywide festivities - the focus of which was the house of the returned exile Ludovico de Matafari - that swiftly followed the event, complemented liturgy and political ritual.\footnote{Šišić (1904), p. 34; Engel (2001), p. 208.} Thus royal presence became tied to the commune’s collective memory.

Oaths of fidelity and allegiance were also an important means of binding the territory to the Kingdom of Hungary. The royal representative might be absent but the oaths taken by the community’s representatives were formal contracts, witnessed by God and the saints. The first example was after the coronation of Maria as Queen of
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Hungary in 1382. Zadar’s count, Butcho, along with his chief of staff, Ottonellus de Discalliis, the rectors Cressio de Civallelis, Damiano de Nassi, Ludovico de Georgio as well as the noble representatives of the commune - Saladino de Saladinis, Cressio de Nassi, Cosa de Begna and Paulo de Pauli- promised perpetual fraternity, friendship and fidelity to the crown of Hungary. This was repeated four months later when the Major Council laid their hands on the Gospels and pledged homage and fidelity to the Queen. Within a year, Queen Maria returned to Zadar accompanied by her mother, Elizabeth Kotromarić, and an entourage of bans, barons and bishops. On the 24th October 1384, in an elaborate gesture of homage, the Queen was given the key to the shrine of St Simeon. Her mother, Elizabeth Kotromarić, had commissioned this elaborate silver reliquary in 1377.196 (Fig. 4.1) In fact the panel narratives of St Simeon’s silver arca, the case study for Chapter 4, depict an instances of oath taking and the dire repercussions for those who disregarded their validity (Fig. 4.27).

Oaths were an especially crucial means of providing stability as the political situation in Hungary began to unravel. On the 18th July 1384 a the Ban of Croatia and Dalmatia, Tomaso di San Giorgio, and the commune of Zadar pledged their fidelity to Elizabeth Kotromarić and her daughters. The Ban along with the rectors of Zadar - Saladino de Saladini, Francesco de Çadulin, Cosa de Begna - as well as twenty-three noble members of the Major Council took their oath over the arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus.197 Six years later, the commune swore allegiance to Sigismund and Maria,198 and followed with another oath in 1392199 and the final one in 1394.200 These oaths ceased after Sigismund’s unpopular decision to strip Zadar of Pag’s jurisdiction.201 Sigismund’s decree may have been the reason why the oaths stopped.

196 Šišić (1904), pp. 5-6 & 8-9.
198 Šišić (1904), p. 14
199 Ibid., p. 16.
200 Ibid., p. 18.
201 Ibid., pp. 21 & 28.
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Sigismund’s father-in-law, King Louis had understood the power of patronage and donations as a means by which loyalty was encouraged from individuals, institutions and even entire city communes. The connections between the Matafari family and the Angevins Charles of Durazzo and his son Ladislaus of Naples were important factors in the noble family’s success. There is speculation that Petrus was made the city’s youngest archbishop in 1376 because of Angevin intervention and support. Ludovico had captained a ship on the Genoese side against the Venetians at the Battle of Chioggia in 1379 and then in 1403 helped capture Novigrad for Ladislaus of Naples. In recompense for their loyalty, Ladislaus granted both Ludovico and Guido the titles to the islands of Korčula, Hvar and Brač as well as additional property and wealth. However, in the 1390s, Sigismund decided on a firmer stance against those who did not support his claim to the Hungarian throne. This explains his banishment of the Matafari brothers and others considered more loyal to Naples than Hungary. Sigismund was also distracted by the Hungarian barons and was unable to cultivate a nurturing stance towards Zadar and the Dalmatian communes. But the result of his forcefulness was the defection of Zaratini to Naples and ultimately, Venice.

But once the royal protagonists had departed from the commune, visits and celebrations long forgotten, what remained? By what other means could a royal presence be established by proxy? Some sort of tangible relic was necessary. The Hungarian patronage of St Mary’s convent and St Chrysogonus’ abbey provide two examples of this. The impressive bell tower of St Mary, with its dedicatory inscription, was a dominant architectural statement upon Zadar’s urban topography. This
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202 Bianchi (1877), p. 49.
reinforced the connection between the commune and the Hungarian crown. Hungarian patronage of St Chrysogonus’ abbey was slightly different. There was no direct financial support for the building proper but the arm reliquary and ongoing Hungarian sponsorship of the Benedictines meant that the abbey church became a suitable setting for events imbued with Hungarian significance. These included the baptism of Giovanna of Naples, the burial of Elizabeth Kotromarić and the coronation of Ladislaus of Naples. No other church in the city was better suited to such significant royal rituals and occasions. The building’s magnificence and strategic location next to a port gate within the city also meant that its Hungarian associations would be there for both Zaratini and foreign visitors to behold.

The key to continuity, loyalty and stability in Zadar was an effective and physically present administration supported by a military garrison. This was rarely achieved. Other strategies proved ineffective without the strong framework of administrative support and processes. The Hungarians were never able to provide these effectively. The Zaratini may have sought high levels of autonomy but the commune also demanded protection. It is no coincidence that during periods of Hungarian insecurity Zadar’s loyalty to the Crown was in doubt. By contrast, the Venetians provided a better structure of territorial management. This evolved over time and in response to the changeable circumstances of the Zaratini.

2.5.2 The Venetians

The Venetian administration of Zadar can be divided into two distinct periods: pre 1358 and post 1409. The earlier period was one in which individual personalities dominated. Counts used their position as a means of personal betterment rather than as civil servants serving the Republic. The framework of colonial administration was
created through trial and error. Usually, rebellions instigated change, but relations with the local ecclesiastical institutions were often tense and equally demanding of administrative responses. After 1409, although Venetian individuals and families still sought to improve their personal wealth and influence in the *Stato da Mar*, a more robust and coherent system of rule was in place. It was used not just in Zadar but the other territories of Dalmatia, Istria, Greek Romania and the cities of the *Terra Ferma*.

The main contrast between the Venetian and Hungarian model of territorial administration was that the Republic encouraged the adaptation of a professional body of colonial administrators. Members of the Venetian nobility always filled these posts as a means of ensuring loyalty and binding the periphery to the centre. The professional responsibilities and parameters of these positions were what changed over time. During the twelfth century the role of count in a number of Dalmatian communes and islands, such as on Rab and Osor, was often given to the sons of Doges. Without well-defined roles, however, abuses and tensions arose. Domenico II Morosini, count of Zadar during the second half of the twelfth century, was so unpopular that he was ejected from the city three times in 1155, 1171 and finally in 1180. In the first half of the thirteenth century siegnerial habits cultivated by Morosini were still apparent amongst some of the Venetian counts. A case study from 1227 gives us some insight into this behaviour.

Miller and Vedriš recounted tensions between Damianus, archbishop of St Chrysogonus, and Marino Dandolo, the Venetian count in 1227. Damianus brought a legal case against Dandolo in which the count stood accused of intimidating the
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207 Ibid., p. 261.
209 The sons of Doge Vitale II Michiel (1156-72), Nicolò and Leonardo, were counts of Rab and Osor respectively. Miller (2007), p. 65.
Benedictine monks during mass and their celebration of the Holy Offices. The abbess of St Mary recounted the catalyst for this case, an exchange with Dandolo that must have seemed extraordinary to Zaratine eyes.

[Dandolo] asked me for new honours, that I should invite and summon him to the feast of my convent. I was to receive him at the entrance with holy water, incense, crucifix, chrism and the other ecclesiastical festive apparatus. When I said no, he said, ‘Now I demand and desire the honour that this be done for me at the monastery of St Chrysogonus and all the monasteries and all the churches of Zadar that are able to do it. Our lord archbishop [the Venetian, Johannes Gardiaca] orders this to be done’.

Damianus was livid, demanding the abolition of such unorthodox rituals. In response the archbishop Gardiaca, probably working with Dandolo, forbade the local population from making donations to the monastery. Anyone caught would be excommunicated.

Miller noted that the type of ritual and honours demanded by Dandolo were remarkably similar to those in the dogal processions between Santa Maria Formosa in and San Zaccaria in Venice. In Zadar the use of intimidation as a means of coercing the clergy and monastic orders to participate in the processions and rituals was very different. There was arguably a precedent. Zadar’s 1204 submission treaty to Venice required that at Christmas and Easter the commune had to sing lauds in honour of the
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213 Smičiklas (1905), pp. 281 & 283.
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count as well as the Doge, Patriarch of Grado and archbishop. But Dandolo’s additional liturgical honours were a much greater imposition. It might have been that Dandolo was familiar with the civic rituals developing around the person of the Duke of Candia, a proxy for the Doge himself (of which more in Chapter 5), and wished to mimic them.

Whatever the reason it appears that there was no direct encouragement for Dandolo’s demands from Venice. Damianus’ ire was directed toward the person of the count rather than the institution of the Republic. The case for prosecution was presented against the individual count for failing to uphold the commune’s traditions. The bishop of Trogir, judge of these proceedings, decided in favour of Damianus. Although Dandolo’s model of the dogal procession in Venice may have been ‘a means of attaching parochial group identities to a larger civic culture dedicated to exalting the government’, it seems to have failed in the new context of Zadar (if that was in fact the intention of the count and archbishop). Instead we find a clash between a powerful local Zaratine and a foreign ruler. It appears that attempts to subjugate the local community by undermining the Benedictines - with tactics ranging from the aggressive to the ritualistic - failed.

After such an event and the uprising of 1242 - attributed to a combination of frustration regarding commercial rights and the unpopularity of the count Giovanni Michiel - new counts could only hold the post for two years. The 1243 commission of Leonardo Quirini noted this important development. Curiously it does not seem that marriage - an obvious means of binding the local community to the Venetians - was encouraged. During the thirteenth century Venetian administrators generally made

256 Whether the bishop of Trogir was a local man or a Venetian is not stated in the original document. Smičiklas (1905), pp. 282-3.
258 Ibid., pp. 79 & 83.
259 ASV, Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.
strategic alliances with members of the nobility from Croatia, Hungary and other
Slavic countries. Marriage with local Zaratini, or for that matter with any Dalmatians,
was rare.\textsuperscript{220}

The role and remit of the Venetian count continued to mature over the course
of the next century. The count had a difficult position to maintain: although he was
head of the subject territory he was also the Venetian representative. Armed with the
local statutes and advised by a deputy assistant and local counsellors, the count was
expected to oversee lawsuits, ensure good documentation of judicial and political
proceedings, maintain the export tariffs for the commune and protect the citizens from
piracy and banditry. Consultation with the commune’s councils was encouraged,\textsuperscript{221} but
policy was dictated from the metropole through a system of ducal letters and orders,
the Ducali e Terminazioni.\textsuperscript{222} Local factors demanded consideration, but the count had
to achieve Venetian policy objectives at almost all costs.

Some compromises with the local community were possible but Zadar was too
important a commercial and strategic centre for the Republic to permit high levels of
autonomy. Venetian policies of market manipulation and income generation through
punitive excise were consistent in the period prior to 1358 and again after 1409. The
main aim of the Republic was the enforcement of the staple - the demand that all
territorial goods be bought and sold through the intermediary of Venice at prices
dictated by the Republic rather than direct to market for the true value of the goods -

\textsuperscript{220} Nikolić Jakus (2004), pp. 70-1.
\textsuperscript{221} Miller (2007), pp. 94-8.
\textsuperscript{222} The original bound registers of the Ducali e Terminazioni are still in the Državni arhiv in Zadar. Some
of the first few folios have been published by Alačević but most still need further research. DAZD, Ducale i
Terminacije, Knjige 1 & 2; Josip Alačević ‘Prva knjiga, “Dukala i Odredaba” sa ogledom Opći ogled (Il
Primo Libro delle Ducali e Terminazioni: con progetto storico geografico), Arhivi u Dalmaciju, 1 / 1 (1901),
pp. 8-12; ‘Prva knjiga “Dukala i Odredaba” (Il Libro I delle Ducali e Terminazioni Venete che comincia
coll’anno 1409) Arhivi u Dalmaciju, 1 / 2 (1901), pp. 19-34; Arhivi u Dalmaciju, 1 / 3 (1901), pp. 35-42; Arhivi u
Dalmaciju II / 3 (1902), pp. 43-58; Arhivi u Dalmaciju II / 4 (1902), pp. 59-74; Arhivi u Dalmaciju, III / 1
(1903), pp. 75-90; Arhivi u Dalmaciju, III / 2 (1903), pp. 91-106.
and this drove Venetian imperial policy in Dalmatia.\footnote{223} During the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the Zaratini were only allowed to trade with other Dalmatian communes. Access to the Italian towns such as Rimini, Ravenna, Pesaro and cities further inland from Venice was completely restricted unless goods went through the lagoon city.\footnote{224} Venice also applied additional constraints on the trade of salt and Zadar’s role as a conduit between the markets of the hinterland and Italy.\footnote{225}

On top of the staple was the extra imposition of the *dazio*, particularly after 1409. The ducal letter of the 22\textsuperscript{nd} July 1422 announced a stabilising of the *dazio* on products exported anywhere except Venice, where certain products were otherwise exempt from duty. These included wax, honey, stamped leather, furs, such as marten and fox, metals like lead and tin, and foodstuffs like cheese, figs and olive oil as well as small animals.\footnote{226} Within a year it seems that the Zaratini had found a way to export and import cheese, oil and so forth from the Marches, the Abruzzi, Puglia, Senj and Rijeka without paying any excise. This loophole was closed on the 28\textsuperscript{th} July 1423.\footnote{227}

Foodstuffs did generate a lot of taxable income, but the true focus of Venetian economic policy in Zadar was salt. This was the most valuable local commodity and Venice was keen to control the market. A year after the siege of Zadar 1345-6, the Republic took over the administration of the island of Pag and all its lucrative saltpans:

The island of Pag, which together with its boundaries is totally exempt from the jurisdiction of the council of Zadar, and not yet anywhere subject to its jurisdiction. All is on the contrary. Because [of this] anyone from Pag held by

\footnote{224 ibid., pp. 62-3; Fine Jr. (1987), pp. 337-8.}
\footnote{225 Raukar (1977), p 30.}
\footnote{226 Alăcuvić (1902'), p. 57; Šime Ljubič, *Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnega Slavenstva in Mletačke Republike (1420-1424)* (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1886), 8, p. 179.}
\footnote{227 Alăcuvić (1902'), p. 70.}
the commune of Zadar, would be set free by the regular arrangement of our rule.\footnote{Quod insula Pagu cum pertinentiis suis sit in totum exempta a iurisdictione comitatus Jadre, nec in aliquo subiaceat iurisdictioni eius, set omnia, in quibus Pagenses tenebantur communi Jadre, remaneant libere in dispositione nostri domini.} The return of Pag and its salt pans to Zadar in 1358 heralded an economically vibrant period for the city unhindered by Venetian influence upon the commodity markets. The contrast with economic developments after 1409 was profound. The Venetian demands for taxes, tariffs and restrictions upon the sale of salt became ever more stringent. By 1413 the Venetian administration set the price it would be willing to pay for salt from Zadar and Pag.\footnote{The reason October was the best time for the salt harvest and thus the assessment was because it was at the end of the summer when the sun had evaporated the water in the salt pans and exposed the salt. It was also before the autumn damp could affect the harvest.} In 1414 the Venetians demanded an annual gathering of the salt harvest to be assessed by their own, specially chosen officers.\footnote{July 1413. \v{S}ime Ljubi{\v{c}}, \textit{Listine o odno{\v{s}}ajih izmedju ju{\v{z}}noga Slavenstva i Mleta{\v{c}}e Republike (1412-1420) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. {\v{Z}}upan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1882), 7, pp. 125-126. Also 25\textsuperscript{th} August 1413, pp. 128-129.} On the 8\textsuperscript{th} June 1423 locals were prohibited from selling their own salt. If caught they were charged with smuggling. If salt producers did not bring the salt to Zadar in October they would not only have it confiscated but also pay a 20-ducat fine. Direct sales to the hinterland were banned. The city's rectors would determine the quantity of salt necessary for Venice to sell it to those markets and then offer the salt producers the lowest price for it. Salt sellers could only send their remaining product \textit{per viam maris}, that is the towns of the Marches, the Abruzzi, Puglia, Senj and Rijeka. Even then sales would be subject to the \textit{dazio}.\footnote{Regarding the annual salt gathering begun in 1414 see Tomislav Raukar, 'Venezia, il sale e la struttura economica e sociale della Dalmazia nel XV e XVI secolo', in \textit{Sale e saline nell'Adriatico (secc. XV-XX)}, ed. Antonio di Vittorio, Biblioteca di studi meridionali, (Naples: Giannini Editore, 1981), p. 147.} Incentives for salt producers became so limited that production dwindled. In the long term, Venetian policy towards salt in this part of Dalmatia significantly diminished Zadar's wealth. Sales contracts of salt pans before and after

\footnote{Quod insula Pagu cum pertinentiis suis sit in totum exempta a iurisdictione comitatus Jadre, nec in aliquo subiaceat iurisdictioni eius, set omnia, in quibus Pagenses tenebantur communi Jadre, remaneant libere in dispositione nostri domini.' 6\textsuperscript{th} January 1347. Ljubi{\v{c}} (1870), p. 427.}
1409 record this decline. Between 1376 and 1406, the average price for a saltpan was approximately 29 ducats. Between 1411 and 1497, this average slipped to just over 14 ducats.\footnote{Raukar used a limited range of sales contracts upon which these averages are calculated. Fifteen sales in the earlier date range have prices between twenty and fifty-nine ducats, whereas the nine later sales, from a period spanning eighty-six years - fifty-six more than the earlier period examined - range in price between seven and thirty ducats. Raukar (1981), p. 154.}

Prior to 1358 Venetian policies of commercial retribution arguably helped instigate the Zaratine revolts of 1244, 131 and finally 1358.\footnote{Fine Jr. (1987), p. 338.} Yet the increasing demands of the dazio after 1409 did not provoke anything like the violence and visible resentment of the earlier years. A number of strategies, including better relations between the Venetians and local nobility, did much to neutralise these tensions. The most effective was the swift punishment of dissent.

Taking hostages was an important way that the Republic removed those considered the greatest threat to the Republic’s rule in Zadar.\footnote{Raukar (1977), p. 29.} This policy began in 1202 when thirty hostages from amongst the nobility were taken to Venice. The commune of Zadar had to pay for their expenses and anyone who died whilst in Venice had to be replaced.\footnote{Šime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (960 -1333) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1868), 1, pp. 21-22; Smičiklas (1905), pp. 45-7; Klačić and Petricioli (1976), pp. 82-3; Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 75.} After the uprising of the 1240s, forty hostages were taken but could be rotated every year or every other year, depending on the inclination of the Doge and his council. The fifteen most troublesome had to stay permanently in Venice for five years.\footnote{Ljubič (1868), p. 71; Klačić and Petricioli (1976), p. 190; Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 76.} Although no hostages were taken after the 1311 rebellion fifty hostages were taken following the siege of Zadar from 1345-6. This was a demographic catastrophe amongst the nobility who had already lost eighty of their number during the siege itself.\footnote{See Appendix B - List of noble hostages taken after 1345 and Nikolić Jakus (2004), p. 79.} In 1347 Johannes de Fanfogna - one of those hostages held in Venice -
left the city. On the 19th July his punishment was recorded: all his goods and chattels were confiscated and his fate was to be announced in Zadar as a warning to those who might consider defying the Venetian authorities.238

Evidence for the financial hardships associated with exile can be seen after 1409. In 1411 the Signoria discovered that a number of Zaratine nobles were allying themselves with Sigismund. The Signoria moved swiftly and twenty-nine noblemen were exiled to Venice.239 By 1412 twenty of the hostages were in such dire financial straits that they petitioned the Republic for a monthly stipend of five ducats to keep them alive.240 Ten years later, on the 12th June 1422 the Signoria informed Nicola Venier, count of Zadar, that the monthly stipend of 5 ducats for Cressio de Cressava, a Zaratine noble held as a prisoner in Venice for the past three years, would be stopped. The reason given for this cessation was that as Cressio’s son, Petro de Cressava, had been installed as abbot of St Chrysogonus - ‘which is a powerful and rich abbey’ - Petro should now pay for his father’s keep.241 Those noblemen who still supported Sigismund but had fled before the Venetians arrived in 1409 had their Zaratine properties confiscated. In the case of Philip de Georgio, his house was commandeered by the Venetian colonial administration.242

There were instances of leniency on the part of the Signoria. Special circumstances sometimes allowed for the hostages to return. This occurred with
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238 ASV, Avogaria di Comun, RASPE, Reg. 3642, fol. 27r-v.
239 O’Connell (2009), p. 44.
240 These men were: Paolo de Giorgi; Giorgio de Čadulin; Georgio de Georgi licentiatu in iure; Michiel Galetto; Johannes de Piero de Nassi; Bartolo de Soloradis; Simon de Gallelis; Francesco de Boton; Damiano de Cressio de Begna; Simon de Nassi; Nicolò de Nassi; Federico de Soppe; Simmon de Varicassi; Geronimo de Nassi; Johannes de Michia de Nassi; Marco de Civallesti; Cressio de Pomo; Damiano de Cela [sic] de Begna; Michael de Ginano and Simon de Pichario. 18th June 1412. Šime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (1409-1412) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Čupan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1878), 6, p. 269. Another example is the case of Johannes q. Michael de Nassis. On the 3rd March 1413 he was also granted leave to return to Zadar for a month due to good behaviour whilst in Venice. Ljubić (1882), p. 82. See also Raukar (1987), p. 40.
241 ‘...que est potens et divers abbacia...’ Ljubić (1886), p. 178; Alačević (1902*), p. 56.
242 Alačević (1902*), p. 46.
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Simon de Gallelis on the 24th September 1412. He was allowed to return to Zadar for one month as his wife had died, leaving behind his children, one of which was a fifteen-month old son.\footnote{Ljubić (1878), p. 280.} Returning to Cressio de Cressava, three years after his stipend was stopped his son the abbot pleaded with the Signoria for Cressio to be sent home to die with his family. Cressio was now more than seventy years old. The request was granted.\footnote{Alačević (1903\textsuperscript{a}), p. 92.} Yet overall this policy of hostage taking and the confiscation of property had a detrimental impact upon the noblemen’s ability to manage their assets in Zadar. Their capital, power and influence diminished, which meant that whe they finally returned home, the noblemen would focus on rebuilding what had been lost, rather than reverting to factionalism and plots.

The Republic did administer justice and control with a firm hand but the fifteenth century heralded a softening of some tactics as well. The counts of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries had been aloof. Now began an interdependence and hybridity as the Republic exploited the city’s internal political divisions. Relations with particular members of the nobility were cultivated in return for privileges and favours. One Zaratine who proves a useful case study for the effect of this political courtship was Guido Matafarri. As noted above, during the fourteenth century and early fifteenth centuries the Matafarri family were firm supporters of the House of Anjou. Guido was the son of Vučina, a nobleman who was sent as a hostage to Venice after 1346,\footnote{See Appendix B - List of noble hostages taken after 1345.} and nephew of Nicola Matafarri, archbishop of the city during the siege of 1345-6 who urged the local population during a rousing sermon not to succumb to the Venetian naval forces.\footnote{See Chapter 3.} As we know Guido, along with Ludovico and their brother Peterus, archbishop of Zadar, were all expelled from the city by
Sigismund in 1397. In 1403 Guido and Ludovico returned to Zadar as key members of Ladislaus of Naples’ entourage.\textsuperscript{247}

Despite all of this Guido was open to an alliance with the Venetians. As early as 7\textsuperscript{th} December 1396 the Signoria granted Guido not only Venetian citizenship but also the privileged status of \textit{nobilis vir}.\textsuperscript{248} On the 5\textsuperscript{th} September 1409, after Ladislaus had sold Dalmatia, Zadar’s representatives swore fidelity to the Doge, Michele Steno. Amongst this small cohort of Zaratine nobility - a number of whom had been supporters of the Angevin cause and had since switched their allegiance to Venice - was one Guido Matafarri.\textsuperscript{249}

On the 29\textsuperscript{th} March 1410 Guido was further thanked for his loyalty. The Republic gave him the castle of Novigrad and the village of Zelminac, which he could pass on to his legitimate male heirs.\textsuperscript{250} In addition to this property and increased political influence, marriage alliances with the Venetian nobility were also possible. This was a useful complement to the more traditional marital networks between the Dalmatian communes. In 1419, five years after Guido lodged his will,\textsuperscript{251} his daughter Chiara married Tomaso Venier, son of Nicolò who had been count of Zadar (1416-18) and grandson of Doge Antonio Venier.\textsuperscript{252} However, the Venetian government appropriated the castle of Novigrad and the village of Zelminac that had been included in her dowry to Tomaso because Chiara was not Guido’s male heir and Guido himself was long

\textsuperscript{247} O’Connell (2009), p. 64.
\textsuperscript{248} ASV, Senato, Deliberazioni, Privilegi di cittadinanza, Reg. 1, fol. 123v.
\textsuperscript{249} The other men were Paulo de Georgio, Jacopo de Raduchis, Simon Detrico, Michele de Soppe, Thomaso de Petriço, Simon de Fanfogna, Simon de Čadulin, Cressio de Civalleli and Simon Cos de Begna. Anthonius de Grisogono milites and Cressio quondam Raynerio de Varicassisi were too ill to travel. Ljubić (1878), p. 12; O’Connell (2009), p. 28.
\textsuperscript{250} The Signoria had already begun discussing Guido’s case and claim to Novigrad in 1409. Šime Ljubić, \textit{Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnega Slovenstva i Mletačke Republike (1403-1409 & Appendix 1226-1397)} (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Academia Scientiarum et Artium Slavorum Meridionalium, Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, 10 vols (Zagreb: Fr. Župan (Albrecht et Fiedler), 1875), 5, pp. 169 & 173; Ljubić (1878), p. 70; O’Connell (2009), p. 64.
\textsuperscript{251} See above.
\textsuperscript{252} In her will of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} August 1425 Chiara was still married to Tomaso, yet outlived him and later married Michele di Donato Giustinian. ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, B. 54 (de Andronico, Matteo), n. 3, fol. 1r-\textsuperscript{v}; O’Connell (2009), p. 64.
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dead.253 Nonetheless Guido was well rewarded for his loyalty with land and wealth during his lifetime. His daughter had married the grandson of a Doge and her children were assured entry into the highest echelons of Venetian society.254 Guido’s posterity and prosperity were assured.

These were the prizes for the allegiance of an individual. What could the Venetians do to attract larger swathes of the commune’s support? In 1409 the Signoria immediately granted all citizens of Zadar the status of a citizen de intus of Venice. This meant that, without having to live in Venice for the ten years usually required to reach this status, the Zaratini had access to the same trading rights.255 This was certainly appealing to the mercantile class of the city. Meanwhile the Signoria offered the Zaratine nobility the confirmation of a social serrata. This would exclude new members from joining their elite class with its associated political privileges.256 It was from the group of most loyal Zaratine elites that the Signoria choose the political and economic advisors to the Venetian count. The short-term benefits for those nobles close enough to the Venetian administration were great and lucrative. In the long term the Republic had compromised the local nobility to its own advantage; having secured their social position within the commune, Venice could quite easily take it away again.257 This had been the posthumous case with Guido de Matafarri’s holdings of Novigrad and Zelminac.

In 1411 after Venice discovered the plot of Zadar’s pro-Sigismund faction, a members of the Venetian nobility, Alvise Contarini, lobbied the Signoria for colonial

---

253 Ljubić (1886), pp. 93-4.
254 O’Connell (2009), pp. 64-5.
255 The initial gesture was made soon after the return of Zadar to Venetian rule in a ducal order in the 5th September 1409. Some confusion must have occurred as clarification was made six months later on 31st March 1410 where it was written that ‘Ad octavum capitulum, per quod petunt fieri cives Venetiarum de intus et extra; respondeatur, quod alias, quando venerunt nobiles, fecimus omnes cives Jadrenses cives Venetiarum de intus. Et videtur nobis, quod habent et possunt contentari. ’ 31st March 1410 Ljubić (1878), pp. 11-12 & 73. See also Bianchi (1888), p. 60; Lane (1973), p. 152; Mueller (1996), p. 47; O’Connell (2009), p. 28.
257 Ibid., p. 493.
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administrative positions for the Zaratine elite. Such access to equality with the
Venetian nobility and the chance for advancement, responsibility and success beyond
Zadar would have brought the Zaratini closer into the Venetian sphere, rather than
condemning them to a colonial and peripheral status. Contarini’s proposition was
rejected.258 Once Guido Matafarri’s generation - or more specifically his faction - had
gone, the Venetian Republic could dispense with compromise. The manner in which
the salt market was manipulated to its ultimate demise was an example of this. Having
exacerbated the factional fault lines in the commune, divisions ensued and Venice
finally conquered.259

This process of rapprochement accompanied by caveats and unexpected
demands can also be seen in the case of St Chrysogonus’ abbey. On the 16th December
1409 the Republic prohibited any Zaratine, or Dalmatian or Hungarian from becoming
abbot as the post was too politically charged.260 Compromise was later reached. As we
have seen, the abbot Petro de Cressava (1420-47) was the son of a Zaratine hostage,
Cressio, held by the Venetians until 1425. How could the Venetians allow the son of a
traitor to become abbot? Was the abbey turning into a local focus of pro-Hungarian
support again? In fact, the situation was more nuanced than that. Petro had been a
monk at the Benedictine monastery of San Nicolò on the Venetian Lido before he
returned to his native Zadar.261 Within the city, one of abbey’s most generous
testamentary benefactors was Thomaso quondam Johannes de Petriço, milites.

Although his father, Johannes, had been a hostage after the 1345-6 siege Thomaso was

258 Ljubić (1878), pp. 182-3; O’Connell (2009), p. 44.
259 O’Connell (2009), p. 81.
260 Ljubić (1878), p. 46; Ivan Ostojić, ‘Relation entre la Venise medievale et le monastere benedictins en
Croatie’, in Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV, ed. Agostino Pertusi, Civiltà Veneziana, II vols (Florence:
261 Eduard Perićić, ‘Samostan Svetog Križevana kroz lik i djeolovanje njegovih opata (The monastery of St
Chrysogonus through the figure and activities of its abbots)’, in 1000 godina samostana Sv. Križevana u
Zadru: Prilozi za znanstvenog skupa održanog 11 i 12 prosinca 1986 u Zadru (1000 years of the abbey of St
Chrysogonus in Zadar: the proceedings of the conference held 11-12 December 1986 in Zadar), ed. Ivo
one of the members of the Zaratine group who in 1409 swore fealty to Doge Michiel Steno on behalf of the commune. For his support the Venetian government gave Thomaso a pension of 100 ducats a year,\(^{262}\) and later a grazie or ducal permission to grow vines on a particular island.\(^{263}\) When he lodged his will in 1426, Thomaso de Petriço was a very wealthy man,\(^{264}\) a wealth secured by his affiliations with the Venetian cause.

In his will Thomaso named Petro de Cressava and Cressio de Cressava as his executors.\(^{265}\) He also left a hundred ducats not only for repairs to the abbey but also to build a beautiful dormitory. Three thousand masses for his soul were also to be celebrated at St Chrysogonus.\(^{266}\) Other religious houses benefited from Thomaso’s testamentary largesse, including the chapel of St Simeon the Prophet but the bequest to St Chrysogonus was the most generous.\(^{267}\) Judging by Thomaso’s affiliations with Venice, it was unlikely his patronage of the abbey and associations with Petro and Cressio were political ones. At the end of his will, Petriço left Johannes ‘de Cresianis’ or Cressava, consanguino meo, an oven or bakehouse situated in the confines of St Mary de Bongaudio, close to the citadel.\(^{268}\) So it appears that the ties between Thomaso de

---

\(^{262}\) 18th September 1409 ASV, Cassiere della Bola Ducale, Grazie del Maggior Consiglio, reg. 20, fol. 20r; 21st September 1409, Ljubič (1878), p. 22.

\(^{263}\) 30th August 1420 ASV, Cassiere della Bola Ducale, Grazie del Maggior Consiglio, reg. 21, fol. 32r.

\(^{264}\) 7th July 1426 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, ff. 289r-292r.

\(^{265}\) It is possible that this Cressio was the same one who was released as a hostage from Venice in 1425. However, his age then was more than seventy so it might be the case that this was either Petro’s brother or another younger member of the de Cressava clan.

\(^{266}\) ‘Item volo et ordino quod per meos commissios supradictos expendentur ducati centum aurum in repercetone dormitorij ispius monasterius ... seu pro fieri faciendo unum pulcrum dormitorium ubi domino Abbati Petro videbitur.’ DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, fol. 290r.

\(^{267}\) Bequests to the other convents, friaries, leper houses and churches are predominantly in libra rather than ducats, although Petriço requested a reliquary (trimba?) worth thirty ducats be made to house the bones or relics of the blessed Žiconis in the friary church of St Doymus on Pašman. ‘Item volo quod fiat fieri per meos commissios una Trimba valorum ducatorum Triginta auri in qua reponantur ossa seu reliquie beati Žiconis cuius Reliquie sunt in Ecclesiam sancti Doymi de piscimano...’ Petriço also commanded that 250 be left for Žiconis’ tomb, also in the church, so that ‘faciendo eis honoerum in corcis et alium necessariorum prout eis melius videbitur.’ DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, fol. 290v.

\(^{268}\) ‘Tunc dimitto ser Johannis de Cresianis consanguineo meo furnum meum positum Jadre in confirmio sanct Marcie de bongaudio vel quod est prope citadellam.’ DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11, fol. 292r.
Petriço, the Crissava family and the abbey of St Chrysogonus were personal and in nature and not political.²⁶⁹

By the 1420s the Hungarian associations with the abbey and thus the saint were diminishing. Petro and his background at San Nicolò would have introduced him to a Venetian cultural and political milieu. For the Venetians, Petro was a diplomatic solution to the awkward post of St Chrysogonus’ abbacy. Rather than installing a ‘pure’ Venetian as abbot, here was a nobleman from Zadar whose experiences in Venice and personal alliances with those members of the pro-Venetian faction in the city made him a pleasing compromise to both locals and the Signoria. Petro’s abbacy was also defined by cultural achievements and theological contributions. He attained a doctorate in canon law in 1430, wrote books for the abbey’s library, restored the Roman archway of the Porta Marina in 1434 and in 1437 he participated in the council of Ferrara.²⁷⁰ In many ways Petro was the perfect individual to ease a transition between the traditional Hungarian associations of the abbey and the new expectations of the Venetian administration.

Cressava’s abbacy was a successful compromise between Venetian and local demands upon the position of St Chrysogonus’ abbot. But soon after he elevation to abbot, a policy was drawn up that would redefine the abbey’s future and the methods of Venetian colonial administration. On the 17th June in 1423 active steps were taken to further undermine any political activity or significance associated with the abbey of St Chrysogonus. The Republic’s Secret Council of Inquisition (Secreta consilio rogatorum) decreed that only Venetians could take the position of abbot of St Chrysogonus. This was part of a coherent policy of control over ecclesiastical benefices throughout Venice’s Stato da Mar and Terra Ferma. In 1413 the Signoria revoked a rule that only

²⁶⁹ See Appendix C 2 - Zaratine Family Trees. Praga did not construct a tree for the Petriço family so the connection between them and the Cressava family is not included.
²⁷⁰ Perićić (1990), p. 104
local candidates could become bishops of Padua, Verona, Vicenza, Treviso, Ceneda, or abbot in Santa Giustina in Padua and Saint Zeno in Verona and or archbishop of Zadar. A 1423 decree confirmed that only Venetians fill these positions, in addition to which would be included the bishoprics of Šibenik, Split, Trogir and the abbacy of St Chrysogonus.

After the death of Petro de Cressava in 1447, a papal decree placed the abbey under the auspices of the Venetian cardinal, Pietro Barbo. He then gave the position of abbot to his brother, Paolo Barbo, who was accompanied and assisted by the cleric Nicolò de Nais of Perugia. Barbo became abbot in September 1448, and ushered in a decade of financial mismanagement and exploitation. The abbey went into decline. Books vanished from the library, the grammar school was closed and the buildings of the church and monastery fell into disrepair. Barbo’s installation and resultant behaviour displayed the worst aspects of the old Venetian colonial administration. This could also explain why there were virtually no testamentary bequests to the abbey during his abbacy.

In 1459 Deodatus Venier (1459-1488), a canon at the cathedral in Zadar replaced Barbo. Born in Zadar, Deodatus was related to archbishop Lorenzo Venier (1428-49) and was part of a Venetian family who soon after 1409 had married into the nobility of Zadar. Deodatus in many ways represented the new reality of the elites in fifteenth-century Zadar. He was man whose upbringing and heritage were now firmly bound in a new hybrid identity of Venetian-Zaratin. Deodatus was not an interloper like Barbo, nor was he a ‘pure’ Zaratine like Petro de Cressava (albeit one with an outward-looking attitude toward theological and academic developments on the Italian peninsula).

---

273 Perićić (1990), pp. 105-106.
275 The Venier had in the first decade of the fifteenth century married into the Matafari and Begna families. O’Connell (2009), p. 64.
Deodatus straddled both societies. His elevation to the post of abbot of St
Chrysogonus nullified its significance as a focus of anti-Venetian sentiment, or pro-
Hungarian support. He also led a new period of cultural distinction for the abbey.277
The changes that occurred in the abbey of St Chrysogonus during the fifteenth century
reflect the contemporary policies of rapprochement and tight familial networks that
bound the political elites of Zadar to Venice, a profound transformation from the
autocratic methods of the Venetian counts from earlier centuries.

*  *  *

This chapter has provided a glimpse of the range of social, political, cultural and
economic activities in which the Zaratini were engaged during the medieval period.
The particular emphasis upon the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is because most
of the surviving notarial documents in the city’s archives are from this period. What
these documents reveal is a wealthy and complex society engaged with larger regional
and European concerns. Even when faced with tremendous external pressures, the
commune was keen to define its own destiny and identity. The city’s churches and
monasteries were the material settings for impressive displays of wealth and piety,
with particular institutions enjoying affiliations with particular families or even
particular imperial powers.

This led on to an exploration of the relations between these imperial overlords
- the Árpáds, Angevins and Venetians - and the local population. How did these
differing modes of hegemony respond to the demands made upon them by their
respective metropoles and the territorial population? Due to Zadar’s briefer and more
disorderly period of Hungarian rule, this corresponding section was indeed shorter

277 Venier commissioned a number of illuminated manuscripts as well as over saw the architectural
development of the monastic complex, such as the bell tower. Perišić (1990), p. 106; Ostojić (1964), p. 50;
Raukar (1987), p. 152. The second half of the fifteenth century was a period of impressive architectural
development in the city, with architects such as Juraj Dalmatinac, Petar Brčić from Šibenik, Petar
Meštrićević of Split and Nicolò di Giovanni of Florence. For more about the bell tower, see Vežić (1990),
pp. 172 - 173.
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than that dealing with the Venetian dominion. The Republic’s administration of the Zaratini evolved over the course of centuries, becoming increasingly considered and subtle in its dealings with the commune, creating yet another facet of hybridity in an already multivalent society. Into this setting the cult of the saints should be examined as a means by which allegiances and identities were forged and consolidated.
Chapter 3

St Chrysogonus - The Fragmented Saint

Amongst the many cultural demonstrations of medieval civic identity, saint cults and their veneration were amongst the most powerful. A saint was an important locus where local senses of the sacred and divine met with the temporal realities of the day. Material and ritual manifestations of these cults were often articulations of societal need. The three cults that will come under scrutiny in the remaining chapters of this thesis - St Chrysogonus the Martyr, St Simeon the Prophet and St Mark the Evangelist - display different facets of cultic interaction between community and saint. St Chrysogonus’ relics were fragmented and portable contrasting with the monumentality and physical permanence of St Simeon’s cult whilst the ritualistic and ceremonial manifestations of St Mark’s cult proved more important than the relics themselves.

In the case of the Early Christian martyr, Chrysogonus, Zadar was host to a number of his fragmented relics. Appropriately the material culture associated with these relics was also equally varied. This chapter examines a twelfth-century arm reliquary, a number of small, portable reliquaries from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as well as a developing iconography that was present in both metalwork and painting. This diversity was due to Zadar’s location and historical context. The commune was situated between Venetian and Hungarian spheres of interest and so cultural developments and devotional practices from both metropoles merged with Zaratine traditions.
CHAPTER 3. ST CHRYSOGONUS

One example is that of Hungarian royal saint cults. Their associated relics became portable symbols of political meaning disseminated into territorial and urban spaces. This had a significant influence upon the cult of St Chrysogonus and in turn a profound impact upon the evolution of the saint's iconography. How and why did St Chrysogonus become the patron of the commune, represented by an image of martial civic identity that contrasted with the saint’s iconography throughout the Mediterranean world? By the fifteenth century Michele di Giambono in Venice depicted the saint in his most well known incarnation: the Saint Chrysogonus panel of San Trovaso. This shift and redefinition of Chrysogonus’ cult and iconography is analysed and placed within a larger framework of colonial networks and the adaptations of local identities through the powerful tool of patron saints.

3.1 Zadar’s Early Saint Cults

To begin with, it is important to examine the early arrival and development of St Chrysogonus’ cult in Zadar, well before the super powers of Hungary and Venice had such dramatic influences upon it. St Chrysogonus was part of Zadar's early communion of local saints and patrons. A hagiographic mythology coalesced around these figures, one that reflected the reviving confidence of the commune as it rebuilt itself following the collapse of Antiquity.¹ Along with Chrysogonus, Saints Anastasia, Zoilus, Irene, Agape, Chiona and later the bishop saint Donatus were protagonists in a set of intertwining narratives based upon Europe-wide traditions enhanced by local considerations. Over time these literary accretions reflected contemporary needs and events, providing insights into societal change.²

---

St Chrysogonus was an early Christian martyr, one of many killed in Aquileia by the emperor Diocletian in the third century AD. Initially the focus of his cult was in Aquileia and northern Italy, but by the fifth century veneration of the saint had proved so popular that a basilica dedicated to him was established in Rome. By now St Chrysogonus’ legend had evolved. The martyrdom of both Chrysogonus and his companion St Anastasia was told in the *Passio S. Chrysogoni et S. Anastasiae*, a popular hagiography throughout Medieval Europe. In this story Chrysogonus was a Roman scholar and the spiritual mentor of the Roman patrician lady, Anastasia. Both were taken prisoner by the pagan Emperor Diocletian and Chrysogonus was swiftly decapitated. The martyr’s body and head were thrown into the Adriatic and they drifted down from Aquileia onto a beach close to a place called ‘Al Salto’. The priest Zoilus and the sisters Agape, Irene and Chiona found the corpse. They placed the body in a wooden arca and hid it in a subterranean room, later reuniting it with Chrysogonus’ head when it also washed up on the shoreline. Soon after this, Zoilus died and Diocletian’s soldiers captured the sisters. Diocletian incarcerated them in the same prison as Anastasia before they were killed. His centurions threw Agape and Chonia onto a fire and although the sisters were killed, the flames did not consume their bodies or clothes. Anastasia gathered up their remains and buried them in a sarcophagus. Irene was thrown from the top of a mountain and again, Anastasia found her broken body and reunited it with those of her sisters. Meanwhile Diocletian failed

---

6 Vedriš (2005), p. 30
in his attempts to marry Anastasia to one of his supporters so he tried to convince her to renounce her faith. She would not and was finally burnt to death with a group of other Christians.\textsuperscript{8}

Unusually for a legend so full of early martyr saints, Zadar claimed relics from all the protagonists. The bodies of sisters Irene, Agape and Chiona were housed in a marble sarcophagus in the cathedral crypt.\textsuperscript{9} Zoilus’s remains were kept at the church of St Mary the Great and a number of altars throughout the city were dedicated to him.\textsuperscript{10} St Anastasia’s relics were placed in the cathedral and she became the commune’s earliest patron saint.\textsuperscript{11} (Fig. 3.1)

But how had her relics arrived at the cathedral? St Anastasia’s international cult developed during the fourth century, with a focus in Sirmium (modern day Sremska Mitrovica in Serbia) before it spread to Constantinople, Rome and Zadar.\textsuperscript{12}

The saint’s local translation legend told of the city’s bishop, Donatus, who in 804 was given her body as a gift from the Byzantine emperor, Nicephorus. Attempts by the Venetian Doge, Benenato, to take the relic to Venice were miraculously thwarted and Donatus returned in triumph to Zadar with the precious relic.\textsuperscript{13} It is more likely that

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., pp. 172 & 177-178.

\textsuperscript{9} However, by the nineteenth century when Bianchi wrote his ecclesiastical history of Zadar, the relics of the sister saints were missing. Their elevated stone sarcophagus still survived. Carlo Federico Bianchi, \textit{Zara Cristiana}, 2 vol. (Zadar: Tipografia Woditzka, 1877), 1, p. 118; Brunelli (1974), pp. 203 & 241.

\textsuperscript{10} Zoilus was depicted on a number of high altars throughout the city, such as at the churches of St Chrysogonus, Mary, Demetrius, Domenica and Barbara, but possibly more because of his role as one of the principal players within the narrative of Chrysogonus and Anastasia’s martyrdoms. It seems that his cult was not an especially large one within Zadar, at least in comparison to what would become of Anastasias and Chrysogonus. With the destruction of the church of St Mary the Great in 1571, Zoilus’ relics were moved to what remained of its sacristy. This space was later dedicated to St Roche. It was not until 1622 that archbishop Luca Stella called for a rejuvenation of Zoilus’ cult commissioning a new arca for the saint’s bones to be made out of cypress wood. On the 16\textsuperscript{th} December 1622 the new cofor and its holy contents were translated to the cathedral treasury and presented to representatives of the community. Brunelli (1974), pp. 203-207.

\textsuperscript{11} The cathedral’s original dedication was to St Peter the Apostle. It was probably severely damaged after the sack of Zadar in 1202 and this was the catalyst to eighty years of rebuilding and restoration. The cathedral was consecrated and rededicated to St Anastasia on the 27\textsuperscript{th} March 1285. Bianchi (1877), pp. 90 & 379; Vitaliano Brunelli, ‘Historia Ecclesiae Iadensis auctore Valerio Ponte archidiacono - La storia della chiesa di Zara dell’archid. V. Ponte’, \textit{Rivista Dalmatica, IV / I} (1907), pp. 118-19; Pavuša Vezić, ‘Luoghi di Culto della Cattedrale di Zara’, \textit{Hortus Artium Medievalium, 11 / May} (2005), p. 275.


\textsuperscript{13} Brunelli wrote that Anastasia’s body had originally been held in Sirmium until the mid fifth century, when it was brought to Constantinople. The Zaratine translation legend records that in 804 Donatus and
Zadar’s position as Byzantine theme or territorial capital, and relative proximity to Sremška Mitrovica in the Balkan hinterland, meant both cultic centres influenced the Dalmatian commune during the medieval period. What is certain is that some of the saint’s relics were in Zadar by the tenth century. The Byzantine emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus (912-959), described the elaborate chapel that held Anastasia’s sarcophagus:

The church of St. Anastasia is a basilica like the church of [St Mary]
Chalkopratia [in Constantinople], with green and white columns, and all decorated with encaustic pictures in the antique style; its floor is of a wonderful mosaic.  

Anastasia’s marble sarcophagus also emphasised the link between her and the bishop. The inscriptions on the sides of the coffer made quite clear that bishop Donatus was the donor of this precious relic. Beginning with the phrase ‘in the name of the Holy Trinity here lies the body of the blessed Saint Anastasia’ the inscriptions carry on the theme with some variations such as ‘by the grace of God the unworthy bishop Donatus made this gift to God and Saint Anastasia’ and finally ‘in the name of the Holy Trinity

---

the Doge Benenato of Venice went to Constantinople as diplomatic envoys of Charlemagne. They received the saint’s body as a gift from emperor Nicephorus. Enroute home they stopped off at number of islands and ports. In each demons were banished from the possessed or lepers healed. Clearly Anastasia’s relic was one of great sanctity and power. However, when Donatus and Benenato arrived in Zadar they then argued about who would take possession of the relic. Benenato initially won, claiming the position of dux was higher than that of a mere bishop. When he tried to sail away with the precious relics, God’s displeasure was made manifest by bad weather, fog and a storm. It was clear to Benenato that Anastasia had to remain in Zadar. The ship returned and the body of Anastasia was escorted to the church of St Peter by a procession of clergy, nuns and monks led by the bishop Donatus and followed by the Venetian Doge. Brunelli (1974), pp. 185-186; Ivo Petricioli, ‘From Early Christianity to the Baroque’, trans. by Sonja Bašić, Sonja Bičanić-Wild and William E. Yuill, in Sjaj zadarskih riznica. Sakralna umjetnost na području Zadarske nadbiskupije od IV. do XVIII. stoljeća (The Splendour of Zadar Treasures. Religious art in the archdiocese of Zadar 4th-18th centuries), (Zagreb: Musejsko-galerijski centar, 1990), p. 34. It also seems likely that the majority of the translation legend was composed around the ninth century, very soon after the events recounted although the documents used by Brunelli in his rendition of the tale were from the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. Brunelli (1974), p. 200, endnote 2; Vedriš (2005), p. 33. Recently Pavusa Vezić has suggested that Donatus might also have acquired Agape, Chiona and Irene’s relics on this same journey but offers no concrete evidence for this supposition. Vezić (2005), p. 280.


here lies the body of the Blessed Saint Anastasia, the unworthy bishop Donatius [sic] had this gift made’. Possibly because he donated Anastasia’s relics, Donatus later became a local saint. His body was placed in a sarcophagus in the church of the Holy Trinity next to the cathedral. This rotonda was rededicated to Donatus in the fifteenth century. (Fig. 3.2) The connection between the Early Christian martyr and her local benefactor was articulated in a monumental architectural form for the entire city to behold.

Certainly, the presence of St Anastasia’s relics denoted a devotional focus but the secular power and influence of the bishop within society was such that her cult also fused with the temporal sphere. One important symbol of civic identity in the medieval period was the city seal, a matrix that symbolically united the ecclesiastical and secular aspects of civil society. The oldest surviving city seal from Zadar is from 1190, almost forty years after the city was raised to the status of an archbishopric. Originally the seal was from the cathedral chapter but was soon used on secular documents, such as the charter confirming the particular treaty between Rab and Zadar in 1190. On it St Anastasia is depicted as as an Early Christian martyr, her hands held out in gesture of blessing or prayer over the city below. (Fig. 3.3) Around this image are the words ‘SIGILLVM IADER[E VR]BIS SANCTA ANASTASIA’, emphasising the unity between the saint and the commune. This seal, however, represents a turning point in the fortunes of St Anastasia as patron saint. After 1190 the cult of St Chrysogonus began to evolve into that of the commune’s patron.

---

3.1.1. The Translation of St Chrysogonus

The origins of St Chrysogonus’ relics and their veneration in Zadar are obscure. The earliest documented reference to the church of St Chrysogonus in Zadar is from 918. The prior of Zadar, Andrea, wrote his will and bequeathed the institution of St Chrysogonus (whether the church or the abbey is unspecified) a vineyard, servants, sheep and textiles.\(^{20}\) The first record of the saint’s relics in the city is from the middle of the tenth century and again provided by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. He wrote that ‘in this...city lies in the flesh... St. Chrysogonus, monk and martyr, and his holy chain’.\(^{21}\) But how had these relics arrived? These were the focus of the cult, tangible proof of a holy presence so their arrival needed a spectacular event as proof of their authenticity and thus the commune’s chosen place as a sacred site for the saint’s relics.

Chrysogonus’ local translation legend provides all of these elements and offers glimpses of contemporary reality, but it is a problematic piece of evidence. The version known to scholars today can be traced back to a fifteenth-century manuscript. In 1498 the Benedictine monk of St Chrysogonus, Zoilus quondam Johannes, transcribed and illuminated a thirteenth-century version of the *Translatio Beati Grisogoni Martyris.*\(^{22}\) In 1931 Iveković published the Latin transcription of this text,\(^{23}\) but more than two

---


\(^{22}\) Porphyrogenitus (1667), pp. 138-9. See also Rački (1877), pp. 403-404 as quoted in Granić (1990), p. 42.


\(^{23}\) Cirillo M. Iveković, *Crkva i samostan sv. Krševana u Zadru (Church and Monastery of St Chrysogonus in Zadar),* Djela Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (Zagreb: Tisak Nadbiskupske Tiskare u Zagrebu, 1931), 30, pp. 49-52. Zoilus quondam Johannes’ manuscript was then lost during the war, thought destroyed during the bombing of Zadar. In 1997, however, a manuscript with the Translatio beati Grisogoni martyris and the Passio S. Chrysogoni et S. Anastaiæ was found in London. This was bought by
decades earlier Brunelli had produced an Italian version of the *translatio*\(^{24}\). Although aware of the fifteenth-century manuscript, then in the private collection of the Fillipi family of Zadar, Brunelli instead compiled his version from two other manuscripts, one from the seventeenth century and the other from the nineteenth century. Brunelli noted that the seventeenth-century source was a transcription by Jerome de Grisogono of an ancient text in the library of St Chrysogonus’ abbey.\(^{25}\) The narrative similarities between Iveković’s transcription and Brunelli’s compiled translation suggest that maybe Brunelli’s seventeenth-century manuscript was another copy of the 1498 document. Nonetheless, it seems likely that the translation legend known today was also very familiar to a Zaratine audience of the late fifteenth century, and probably the thirteenth.

The story begins with a virtuous old woman, Dionisia, gathering herbs in the fields outside the city. As she foraged amongst the ruins of Old Zara she discovered a tomb of marble in which were enclosed the bodies of many saints.\(^{26}\) She heard a voice calling out the words:

> Oh fortunate woman, do not be afraid; bring the bishop and the Zaratini and tell them I am Chrysogonus, killed by the emperor Diocletian, and buried by the holy priest Zoilus. I was transported to this province for the love of the inhabitants of the city...\(^{27}\)

Dionisia rushed to the city and led the bishop, clergy and people to the tomb, the same site that Zoilus had buried St Chrysogonus’ body all those years before. The people

---


\(^{26}\) The seventeenth-century manuscript was mss. Nr. 2911 from the library of Zadar’s provincial gymnasium or grammar school. The other document was written in 1848 by G.A. Gurato, entitled De Sanctis titul. ac. pati. civitatis et archid. Jadrensis. Its call number was mss. Nr. 16523 in the Biblioteca Paravia, today the Znanstvena knjižnica u Zadru. Ibid., pp. 168-9; p.201, endnote 30 & p. 219, endnote 6.

\(^{27}\) ‘Jadera vetula’ in the Latin and ‘Zaravecchia’ in the Italian version. Ibid., p. 208; Iveković (1931), p. 49.

praised God for the blessing of such a sacred discovery and the bishop asked that the coffin be taken back to the city. Yet all attempts failed as the coffer was too heavy.

Then a miracle occurred. Without any effort two seven year-old boys lifted the sarcophagus and took it as far as the city gates, where they could carry it no further. The bishop declared that the saint wished to hear what donations the citizens would give, and only then might the relics be moved into the safety of the city.

At this point three brothers stepped forward; Giaderano, Michea and Ceto. Each made a promise to the saint. Giaderano declared that once the saint had allowed his relics ‘to be carried to the basilica, which has been built by us [the citizens of Zadar] in your name’ he would place the saint’s relics into an altar made of four silver panels.28 The next brother promised that on St Chrysogonus’ feast day he would decorate the saint’s church with banners and fabrics of many hues. Finally Ceto dedicated his life to a monastic calling. Only after these assurances could the two small boys move again and they took the holy body into the city and placed it in the church of St Rufina.29

Soon after this translation, three monks slipped into the church and stole Chrysogonus’ arm, taking it to the region of Marab.30 When they returned to Marab they were punished for their crime with a plague that afflicted all three monks. Two died and the third was left a leper. In addition natural disasters assailed Marab. An old man called Mirmidone realised that these calamities had begun when the monks came. He questioned the surviving monk and discovered that he still had the arm of St

---

28 ‘...si portari te sinis ad basilicam, que a nobis in tuo nomine constructa...’ Ivecović (1931), p. 50.
30 Where exactly was this ‘Marab’? The word may be a corruption of Moravia. Great Moravia was a region that in the ninth century encompassed most of central Europe including parts of modern day Germany, Austria, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, Serbia and Croatia. During this period Zaratine missionaries were active in Pannonia, a part of northern Croatia encompassed by Great Moravia. More simply, ‘Marab’ might refer to Zadar’s hinterland, an area lying just beyond the Velebit Mountains, which was part of the Kingdom of Croatia. Whatever the origins of the word the tale depicts a hostile area unloved by God and St Chrysogonus, somewhere in distinct apposition to the security and stability afforded by Zadar. Harold E. Cox and Dennis P. Hupchick, The Palgrave Concise Historical Atlas of Eastern Europe (New York: Palgrave, 2001), Map. 9; Vedriš (2005), p. 33; Vedriš (2006), p. 179.
Chrysogonus contained in a wooden box. Mirmidone took the arm and returned it to Zadar, presenting it at the altar of St Anastasia. The *translatio* tale then continues with a number of miracles that occurred when all the remains of St Chrysogonus were restored to Zadar. The contrast between these miracles and the disasters that befell Marab emphasised the legitimacy of Zadar’s claim to the relics. It also helped forge a sense of identity for the commune, a notion of civilised safety that distinguished it from the chaos that was inflicted upon the other region.

Recent Croatian philological analysis of the 1498 *translatio* noted that it was an oral tradition, not written down until centuries later. A number of the narrative elements can be traced to the ninth and tenth centuries. The use of the word ‘Marab’ to describe the world *extra muros* gives some insight into Zadar’s possible relations with central European developments of the ninth century as well its sense of identity when juxtaposed with the inhabitants of the near hinterland. Add to this Brunelli’s observation that the Greek names in the story - such as that of Dionisia - may also come from the period when the city was subject to Byzantine rule. The body part of choice for the monks’ *furta sacra*, the arm of St Chrysogonus, seems to echo the saint’s arm reliquary that the Hungarian King Coloman commissioned in the early twelfth century. This precious object shall be the subject of further discussion in this chapter.

Within the narrative of the *translatio* one later embellishment is very apparent: rather than restoring Chrysogonus’ arm to the rest of the body at St Rufina, Mirmidone presented it to the high altar of St Anastasia. Yet during the ninth and tenth centuries the cathedral was dedicated to St Peter. It was not until 1285, the year in which the cathedral was consecrated after many years of reconstruction, that its titular saint

---

35 For a full discussion, see Ančić (1998), pp. 127-38; Vedriš (2005), p. 33.
33 Iveković (1931), p. 51.
became St Anastasia. Therefore this aspect of the tale was added no earlier than the late thirteenth century. The translation legend of St Chrysogonus was not static, but evolved over time, much like the cult proper, in response the demands of a local audience.

Although the origins of the legend can be traced to the ninth century, the fifteenth-century version with all its narrative and historical accretions is what survives today. Later historians abandoned the supernatural account of events and sought more prosaic explanations for the transmission of Chrysogonus’ relics from Aquileia to Zadar. Farlati in the seventeenth century and Ferrante and Bianchi in the nineteenth suggested that in 649 AD the Patriarch of Aquileia, Peter Maximus - described in Boniface’s *Antiqua Monumenta Aquilejensis Ecclesiae* as Dalmatian - was the source of the relics, giving his ‘Zaratine friends’ the bones of Saints Chrysogonus and Zoilus. Bianchi claimed that in the same year the church in Zadar, originally dedicated to St Anthony Abbot, was reconsecrated to the new saint, Chrysogonus. But it is unclear where Bianchi found this rededication date of 649. If indeed this seventh-century donation from Grado was how the relics of Chrysogonus arrived in Zadar (and aside from the speculation of these historians there is no concrete proof of this) it would make the cult older than that of Anastasia.

3.1.2 The Relics of St Chrysogonus

The genre of *translationes* provided one way with which communities defined their own identity and memory, but to modern eyes they seem unreliable as historical

---

sources, only able to give hints of actual events. But to a medieval audience saints’ relics provided the tangible evidence of the events recounted, equally open to embellishment of meaning and relevance as time passed, reflecting the needs of a particular audience at a particular time. These ideas of medieval reception and interpretation affect all three saints studied in this thesis. But in the case of St Chrysogonus the Martyr, what exactly were the relics held by Dalmatia’s most powerful Benedictine abbey? There appear to be two distinct periods that define the cult of St Chrysogonus’ relics in Zadar. The first was from the Early Medieval period until the first decade of the twelfth century when the saint’s body was the main relic. From the twelfth century until the fifteenth, a multiplication or fragmentation of relics occurred.

Examining the literary sources first, the text of the Passio S. Chrysogoni et S. Anastasia told of the priest Zoilus reuniting Chrysogonus’ decapitated head with his body in the tomb. The divided parts became whole again. The next text is the Translatio Beati Grisogoni Martyris. The story is unclear about precisely what it was that Dionisia discovered in Old Zadar, but the Latin version of the translatio from 1498 described the Zaratini lifting a tumba and carrying it into the city. The literal translation of tumba defines it as a sepulchral mound but the fact that the object was lifted suggests that in this instance this was not the word’s meaning. It was probably a portable coffer or sarcophagus in which the whole or most of a body was carried. Certainly, there was enough left of the saint for his arm to be stolen away to Marab but whether these were later narrative additions is not known.

In the mid tenth century Constantine Porphyrigenitus provided us with the first concrete reference to the relics and records the presence of the whole body and a

---

39 Iveković dated the abbey’s change in monastic order from the monks of St Anthony Abbot to the Benedictines of Monte Cassino to about 950. Iveković (1931), p. 20; Vedriš (2005), p. 31.
40 Iveković (1931), p. 50.
contact relic of Chrysogonus’ chain. This latter object might have been the chain that bound the saint during his persecution and martyrdom, but Porphyrogenitus is the only surviving source for this particular relic. A few decades later, the abbey’s cartulary from the 19th December 986 recorded ‘... the church of the martyr St Chrysogonus, that is situated within the walls of the city, where his most sacred body lies’. During the tenth century it seems that veneration of St Chrysogonus was focussed on his entire body.

In his eighteenth-century history of Zadar, Gregorio Stratico cited a document from 997 (the document’s whereabouts today are unknown) in which Demetrio, a representative of the King of Croatia, donated a chalice, patena and two crowns to the silver chest in which lay the body of St Chrysogonus, held by the Benedictine monks since the early tenth century. The silver chest seems similar to the altar with four silver panels donated by Giaderano in Chrysogonus’ translatio myth. There may indeed have been a larger silver reliquary or arca similar to that later produced for St Simeon. However, there is no further record of the silver chest. If Stratico’s document was genuine then it indicates that the relic and associated shrine were the subject of veneration and patronage beyond Zadar, indeed attracting the attention of Croatian nobility and royalty.

The next reference to Chrysogonus’ relics appeared in 1056. A document described how the bishop Andreas anxiously sought Saint Chrysogonus’ body, ‘that by the grace of God had once been granted to the protection of the Zaratini’. Andreas

---


44 Gregorio Stratico, Memorie per la storia di Zara. Raccolte dall’avvocato Gregorio Stratico, 3 vols (Venice: Biblioteca Marciana, 1769), II, fol. 24r.
finally found the precious relic beneath the altar of the church of St Chrysogonus.

Upon hearing of the saint’s reinventio

...all the men and women, noble and commoners ran to him [Chrysogonus], praising and glorifying God; and each one of those that were strong enough, rushed to that place [and] bowed on the ground before the sacred body.

The fishermen of the community were so pleased at the relic’s discovery that they willingly pledged the abbey a quarter of their catch.\(^{43}\)

This reinventio of St Chrysogonus’ body indicates the loss of the relics at some point between 986 and 1056, but what exactly could have happened to them? Bianchi suggested that war may have been a factor. He wrote that during a Venetian siege in the eleventh century the citizens buried their holy relics and associated ecclesiastical accoutrements before the surrender, in order to protect them.\(^{44}\) The Venetians did suppress a Zaratine revolt in 1015,\(^{45}\) so it is possible that the relic was lost then. It might also be that the cult had gone into decline during the intervening years and that this discovery of the missing relics was a way of rejuvenating the cult. The reinventio seems to have precipitated patronage of an increasingly powerful and temporal sort for the

\(^{43}\) ‘Andreas venerabilis iaderensis episcopus cum anxius quereret beati C(h)risogoni martiris corpus, quod misericors deus ad tuicionem Jaderensium olim concesserat, tandem in ecclesia et sub altare ipsius martiris illud inventit. At cum audisset populus, quod beati martiris corpus esset inventum: cucurrerunt ad eum omnes viri et mulieres, nobiles et ignobles, laudantes et glorificantes deum; et ruerunt proni in terra(m) unusquisque horum, quod valebat, ante sacrum corpus offerebant. Affuerunt inter eos et piscatores, qui eciam griptores nominantur, scilicet Supana, Petulel, Podboi et college eorum ceteri, qui beato martiri sub iureiurando promiserunt, se suosque posteros unam porcionem seu piscacionis omni tempore esse daturos, adicientes et dicentes: ut qui hanc nostram offerencionem aliquo tempore subtrarea voluerit, iratum habeat trimum et unum deum et beatum martirem, et potestate loci coactus persolvat martiri hanc porcionem invitus. Que promissio a suis promissoribus usque nunc voluntarie est peracta et erit, putamus, peraganda semper.’ Kukuljevic-Sakcinski (1874), p. 116; Rački (1877), pp. 48-9. See also Granić (1990), p. 39.

\(^{44}\) Bianchi (1877), p. 299.
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abbot: that of the nobility and royalty of the medieval Kingdom of Croatia.\(^46\) One of these royal privileges even confirmed the presence of St Chrysogonus’ body in the abbey. In 1069 the King of Croatia, Petar Krešimir, confirmed the abbey’s territories and gave both the abbey and to ‘you, most blessed Chrysogonus, glorious martyr’ the island of Maun. The deed also noted that the martyr’s body lay in the same city as that of the monastery.\(^47\)

The saint’s body remained whole until the first decade of the twelfth century. At the time of King Coloman’s coronation as King of Croatia and Dalmatia at Novigrad in 1105 the King also confirmed Zadar’s privileges and relative autonomy.\(^48\) There is no recorded date of a visit to Zadar but it seems likely that Coloman’s patronage of the Benedictine convent of St Mary and abbey of St Chrysogonus began at a similar time to his confirmation of the city’s rights. The King gave the abbey an arm reliquary for its titular saint.\(^49\) Made of gold, it was decorated with filigree, precious stones and enamel figures. On the silver base were the words: ‘Rex Colomanne his Rector Amandeviae, hoc bene fecisti, retribui tibi quod voluisti’.\(^50\) This reliquary was sold during the eighteenth century and its whereabouts are now unknown.\(^51\) This object had an important role in the civic and political life of medieval Zadar and this aspect shall be explored further later in the chapter. The arm reliquary’s donation heralded a

\(^{46}\) See Chapter 2.

\(^{47}\) “...donamus tibi, beatissimo C(hrisogono), martiri glorioso...” Rački (1877), p. 73.


\(^{50}\) ‘With King Coloman these rector[s] of Amandevia, had this well made, [and] restored to you what you wanted.’ (My translation). This description of the arm reliquary comes from an inventory of St Anastasia’s treasury from 1642 and is cited in Petricioli (1987), p. 159.

\(^{51}\) It was sold in the eighteenth century to pay for repairs to the cathedral’s roof and interior. Ibid., p. 159; Ivo Petricioli, The Permanent Exhibition of Religious Art in Zadar (Zadar: Stalna Izložba Crkve Umjetnosti Zadar, 2004), p. 11.
multiplication of the relics of St Chrysogonus and a diversification of his cult that continued until the fifteenth century.

But why was the precious relic dismembered within fifty years of its reinventio of 1056? As we shall see in Chapter 4, royal patronage of a full body relic - in Zadar’s case the relic of St Simeon the Prophet - was an opportunity for an elaborate and monumental celebration of both patron and saint. Coloman was certainly aware of the power of monumental works of art and architecture as a means of promoting a patron: the bell tower of St Mary in Zadar is the best local example of this practice. But why would the King prefer a smaller, portable reliquary that required the fragmentation of St Chrysogonus? Possible reasons for this can be found beyond Zadar, specifically within Coloman’s cultural and ritual milieu of eleventh-century Hungary. What follows is the development of Hungarian royal saint cults in this period. The parallels between these cults and the multiplications of St Chrysogonus’ relics are marked yet have not been noted before in the literature about the Zaratine saint.

### 3.2 The Influence of Hungarian Royal Saint Cults

In 1083 King Ladislas, later Saint Ladislas, of Hungary oversaw the canonisation of King Stephen Árpád (1000-1038), the first Christian King of Hungary. As part of the canonisation ceremony, Ladislas also witnessed the translation of Stephen’s relics. According to Bishop Hartwic’s *Legendae Stephani* of 1112, Stephen’s canonisation began on the 15th August in 1083. Ladislas and a group of the Hungarian nobility gathered at Stephen’s tomb in Székesfehérvár. Five days later, the tomb was opened. Miraculously it was full of rose-perfumed water and balsam in which were the precious bones of the
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Christian King. The relics were removed from the casket and placed in a silver chest. This ushered in a period of miracles associated with Stephen’s relics.53

Why did Ladislas venerate his ancestor in such a manner? In his study of the formation and advancement of royal dynastic saint cults in Central Europe, Gábor Klaniczay interpreted Ladislas’ promotion of Stephen’s canonization as a means of supporting his own position on the throne. Ladislas’ elevation of Hungary’s first Christian King and founder of the Árpád dynasty to the status of a saint inferred that Ladislas was the secular inheritor of Stephen’s throne and his Christian successor. Thus the sacred and temporal natures of the Kingdom were joined in one figurehead.53

The new cult of St Stephen also offered the opportunity to spread the dynastic and sacred presence of the Árpád Kings throughout their territories. Bishop Hartvic’s *Legendae* provides an early hint of this process.

A year after St Stephen’s translation and canonisation, a case of *furta sacra* was discovered: a cleric called Mercurius had stolen St Stephen’s right arm and hidden it in a monastery in the county of Bihar, Eastern Hungary. King Ladislas at first ordered the relic to be returned to Székesfehérvár, but then decided to keep the relics of the Holy Dexter (*Szent Jobb* in Hungarian) at the cloister in Berettyóújfalu. (Fig. 3.4) A new church was built with Ladislas’ support and it became a site of pilgrimage within its own right.54 The presence of the Holy Hand in a region of the Kingdom far away from

---

55 Hartvic (1938), pp. 438-440; János M. Bak, ‘Sankt Stefans Armlreliquie im Ornat König Wenzels von Ungarn’, in *Festschrift Percy Ernst Schramm zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag von Schülern und Freunden zugeeignet* ed Peter Classen and Peter Scheibert, 2 vols (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1964), 1, p. 18; Klaniczay (2002), p. 124. The Holy Dexter has quite an itinerant history. At the start of the fourteenth century it was held in the Benedictine cloister of Szentjob (the town of Sınıob in modern Romania), close to its original site in Berettyóújfalu. During the fifteenth century the relic was in Székesfehérvár before vanishing until 1684 when it appeared in the keeping of the Dominican friary of Dubrovnik. Documents suggest it had been there since 1590. During the period between the fifteenth century and 1590 it appears that the arm was split in two, with the lower part now in the Ukrainian town
the royal capital of Székesfehérvár was an effective means of promoting by proxy the monarch’s temporal and sacred authority. Breaking up Stephen’s body into portable pieces meant that the King’s influence was felt over larger swathes of territory, creating a devolution rather than a centralisation of the crown’s sacred and secular power.

Another instance of this can be seen in 1089, soon after the death of King Zvonimir of Croatia. Ladislas swiftly claimed the throne of Croatia on the basis that his sister, Helen, was Zvonimir’s widow.55 As a means of creating a tangible Árpád presence in Croatia, Ladislas transferred Stephen’s head to Zagreb. The city then became an important focus of the saint’s cult outside Hungary.56 During the next few centuries, the cult of the Holy Dexter became more important in Hungary. During the thirteenth century the feast day of the Inventio Dextrae S. Stephani Regis was celebrated on the 30th of May, a preamble to the feasts of St Stephen’s death on the 15th August and Translation on the 20th August.57 The relic became so significant that by the early fourteenth century the Bohemian claimant to the Hungarian throne, Wenceslas (1301-5), held the Dexter during his coronation ceremony of 1304 instead of the traditional royal orb (at that time held by pro-Angevin barons).58

Within two decades of Stephen’s canonisation and translation, two peripheral relics and associated cults had been established at the behest of Ladislas: Stephen’s head in Zagreb and the Holy Dexter in Eastern Hungary. These were ostensibly a means of supporting and promoting the Hungarian royal dynasty beyond the centre of Székesfehérvár. When King Coloman - arguably as shrewd a monarch as Ladislas

---

55 See Chapter 2.
56 Ladislas had given the job of founding the bishopric of Zagreb to Jaromir Gebhard, bishop of Prague and brother of Vratislav, another one of Ladislas’ brothers-in-law. Klaniczyz describes Jaromir as ‘an expert...in the workings of royal cults’. Klaniczyz (2002), p. 148.
58 Ibid., pp. 175 & 180.
before him - launched a campaign to rule the communes of Dalmatia in 1105,\textsuperscript{59} he deployed similar tactics to his predecessor. He combined the traditional patronage of Benedictine houses expected of the Croatian Kings with the promotion of Hungarian rule in this new, peripheral territory. Coloman’s gift of a reliquary for St Chrysogonus’ arm seems to be a conscious transmission of Hungarian royal influence throughout the Kingdom’s increasing territories.

Cynthia Hahn has proposed methodologies for the interpretation of body part reliquaries within liturgical and social contexts.\textsuperscript{60} Access to these sacred objects also often defined political hierarchies. With this in mind, it is important to consider relics as a means of confirming royal status and power. The emperor Constantine set the precedent by donating royal gifts to sacred shrines. Over time, the gifts themselves had the potential to become holy and venerated objects, either due to their own miraculous capacity or the holiness bestowed upon the giver i.e. the monarch.\textsuperscript{61} The object’s costliness and beauty also reflected back onto the gift-giver and enhanced the donation’s sanctity.\textsuperscript{62} This would certainly appear to be the case with Coloman’s donations in Zadar, particularly the arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus. In addition this form of a reliquary would have a functional aspect to it, primarily enhancing the sacral gestures of benediction during the liturgy.\textsuperscript{63} In this way relics and their associated material culture provided a confirmation of temporal legitimacy, binding saint, donor and the audience of the faithful.

As Coloman was probably aware of the powerful precedents of the Árpád saint cults why did he not establish a relic of St Stephen in Zadar? Coloman’s gift of an arm reliquary appears more of a nuanced response to a local cult. This was a flattering

\textsuperscript{59} See Chapters 1 & 2.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., p. 1081.
\textsuperscript{63} Hahn (1997’), pp. 20-31.
compliment; Zadar maintained its own saint cult but one that was now imbued with references to a royal saint. This had the effect of connecting Chrysogonus’ arm reliquary not just with the person of Coloman, but with the Hungarian crown and its ongoing relations with Zadar.

3.3 Fragmentation

Coloman’s arm reliquary and intervention heralded the multiplication of St Chrysogonus’s relics. The earliest surviving document that indicates the variety of relics and reliquaries is an inventory from the fifteenth century. On the 15th January 1427 the Venetian count Alessandro Zorzi commissioned this inventory of the cathedral treasury.64 In the treasury were a number of St Chrysogonus’ relics and reliquaries.

A gilded silver box in which is the head of St Chrysogonus. Item: an arm with hand of gold with stones and pearls and with a base of silver in which is the arm of St Chrysogonus. Item: an arm with a gilded silver hand in which is a mixture of St Chrysogonus’ arm. Item: two silver feet partly gilded which it is said are the feet of Saint Chrysogonus. Item: one small box of gilded silver with a few enamels without key in which it is said are a few relics and the shirt of St Chrysogonus.65

In 1579 the Apostolic Visitation led by the bishop of Verona, Agosto Valier, confirmed that these reliquaries were still in the cathedral treasury. When he visited the abbey of St Chrysogonus he recorded a repetition of the relics and reliquaries.

The head of St Chrysogonus in a small silver casket; The arms of the aforesaid saint, the one in a gold case of Panonian craftsmanship, the other in a silver case; A small casket covered in silver with a few relics of the aforesaid saint; The feet of the said saint in a gilded silver case.

In addition to these, the ‘altar of St Chrysogonus contain[ed] the body of the saint himself in a chest.’ As the saint increased in importance for the commune pieces of the cadaver had been cut away at the behest of wealthy patrons and placed into elaborate reliquaries. Between Petar Krešimir’s donation of Maun in 1069 and the Apostolic Visitation more than five hundred years later the saint’s body is not recorded in any surviving sources. This confirms that the physical focus of Chrysogonus’ cult was no longer fixed to his body at his titular church.

The portability of so many smaller reliquaries had a number of benefits that a full body relic based in a chapel did not have. To begin with, a tomb containing the body demanded a physical permanence and space in which to house it. This immovable object and its precious relic could, depending on the popularity of the cult, attract large numbers of pilgrims who would have to be accommodated. In the case of St Simeon the Prophet his full body relic required a new chapel space in St Mary the

---


68 ‘Altar Sancti Grisogoni continent corpus ipsius sancti in arca, quam est loco mensa[m] altaris, et habet inconam honorificam Sancti Grisogoni...’. Ibid., fol. 44r.
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Great to cater for an influx of visitors. A portable reliquary rarely required such a
dramatic modification of space.

There was another difference between the churches of St Mary the Great and St
Chrysogonus. The former was a collegiate church staffed by the secular clergy and
canons, men whose main role was to lead the mass and tend to the laity. The
Benedictines of the abbey led a cloistered life, one not intended for daily interaction
with laity. A large cultic centre in their church that could attract many people might
prove a large disruption, particularly if the precious relic was housed in the high altar.
Francesco Lucchini has written about the trouble such a configuration caused the
friars who tended to the body of St Anthony of Padua at the Santo. A side chapel
could provide an answer to this difficulty, but even more appealingly, why not have a
portable reliquary? The abbey would maintain control of the larger relic but smaller
relics and reliquaries would help disseminate St Chrysogonus’ cult beyond the confines
of the abbey church and well into the city space, quite unlike a full body relic based in
a chapel. In the case of Coloman’s arm reliquary it was taken into other ecclesiastical
and public spaces, like that of the cathedral, and thus became a unifying symbol
between all of society and the Hungarian Crown. Function, practicality, sacredness and
political demands were all satisfied.

3.4 Function

During the second half of the fourteenth century, the Zaratine nobleman, Paolo di
Paoli, wrote a diary. It records the use of Coloman’s arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus,
by now a sacred object over which the commune’s secular authorities made oaths of

---

69 The chapel’s reconstruction as well as the movement of these pilgrims around the relic and within the
chapel space shall be discussed further in Chapter 4.
70 Francesco Lucchini, Objects at work: a material and cultural history of the reliquaries of St Anthony of
Padua in the Basilica del Santo, ca. 1231-1448, Ph.D thesis (University of London (Courtauld Institute of
Art), 2009), p. 53.
71 Anita Fiderer Moskowitz, Nicola Pisano’s Arca di San Domenico and its Legacy (University Park:
allegiance and sovereignty to the crown of Hungary. It was a well-established tradition throughout Europe to swear oaths over relics, particularly those of patron saints.\(^{72}\) For instance since the twelfth century in Venice the investiture of all new Doges required that after they had received the *vexillum* or banner of St Mark they would then swear an oath of loyalty above the Evangelist’s tomb.\(^{73}\) Thus the ruler’s secular and spiritual responsibilities were publicly confirmed.\(^{74}\) St Chrysogonus’ arm reliquary was not the only sacred object used for oaths in Zadar. As we shall see in Chapter 4, oaths were also sworn over the relic of St Simeon the Prophet whilst the oath-taker touched the relic’s stone tomb. (Fig. 4.27) But the arm reliquary had become imbued with a political sacredness associated with the Árpád dynasty, a sacredness further cultivated by the Angevins during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As such, it was a venerated object with the additional function of strengthening the alliance between Zadar and the Crown of Hungary.

Its significance as a symbol of the Hungarian alliance is indicated by Paulo di Paoli’s description of the 18\(^{th}\) July 1384. On this day, during a period of increasing instability and potential civil war in Hungary, Zadar pledged its allegiance to Queen Maria of Hungary, her sister Hedwig and mother Elizabeth Kotromarić. The city council made their oaths to the Queen above the arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus. The setting for this event was the church of St Barbara, the sacristy of the cathedral, rather than the abbey church of St Chrysogonus.\(^{75}\) This act of allegiance for the heir of St

---


\(^{73}\) The significance of the dogal investiture ceremony shall be the subject of further analysis in Chapter 5.

\(^{74}\) This aspect of the investiture ceremony was in place at least from the dogate of Doge Sebastiano Ziani (1172-8) and lasted until the fall of the Republic. Iain Fenlon, *The Ceremonial City. History, Memory and Myth in Renaissance Venice* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007), p. 50.

\(^{75}\) ‘Die 18. mensis iuli contracta fuit unitas inter dominum Thomam de Sancto Georgio, Dalmatiae et Chroatiae banum, et commune civitatis ladrae, semper ad fidelitatem sacrae coronae regni Ungariae et dominarum nostratum reginarum, scilicet dominae Mariae reginae Ungariae, dominae Edvigae sororis eius, ac dominae Elizabeth matris earum, quae unio fuit firmata sacramento praestito eodem die super brachio Sancti Grisogoni martyrise et alias res super altari in ecclesia Sanctae Barbarae, per ipsum dominum banum corporaliter, et per ser Saladinum de Saladinis, Franciscum de Zadulinis et Cosam de Begna, rectores ladrae, cum viginti tres nobilibus de consilio dictae civitatis ac communitatis nostrae.’
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Stephen of Hungary - that is Queen Maria - used an object given by another of her Árpád royal forebears, Coloman, to Zadar. It signified the continuity of allegiance between centre and periphery, an alliance that had been more than three centuries in the making: St Chrysogonus’ arm relic tied the past to the present.

Events in the past had also precipitated Chrysogonus’ elevation to the status of the commune’s patron saint, usurping the role from St Anastasia. Eleventh- and twelfth-century Croatian and Hungarian patronage of Zadar’s Benedictines had ushered in a new era for the abbey and saint. This contrasted dramatically with the second half of the twelfth century, a period of weak and unpopular Venetian administration defined by autocratic counts such as Domenico II Morosini and regular Zaratine uprisings in favour of Hungarian rule.76 The abbey of St Chrysogonus and its titular saint became a focus of pro-Hungarian and anti-Venetian sentiment.77 In 1175 a newly constructed abbey and church were consecrated.78 Fifteen years later, after Venetian attacks on the island of Maun, Zaratini won an important victory over the Republic’s fleet at the battle of Treni on the 14th May 1190.79 After the battle all the city’s clerics and populace gathered in the church of St Chrysogonus ‘our pious patron’ and ‘the most sacred martyr, tutor and our protector’ whereupon the commune

---


76 See Chapters 1 & 2.


79 This was the island that King Peter Krešimir IV of Croatia gave to the abbey of St Chrysogonus in 1069. Rački (1877), p. 73; Josip Lučić, ‘Povjesna dokumentacija svetokrševanskog samostana i vladivina Petra Krešimira IV (Historical documentation of St Chrysogonus’ abbey and the rule of Petar Krešimir IV)’, in 1000 godina samostana Sv. Krševana u Zadru: Prilozi sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 11 i 12 prosinca 1986 u Zadru (1000 years of the abbey of St Chrysogonus in Zadar: the proceedings of the conference held 11-12 December 1986 in Zadar), ed. Ivo Petričioli, (Zadar: Narodni List, 1990), p. 76; Perićić (1990), p. 89; Vedriš (2005), p. 36-38.
prayed, praised and gave thanks for the victory and a solemn mass was celebrated by the archbishop elect, Peter, and the suffragen bishop of Hvar, Nicolao.\footnote{\ldots patro ni nostri pie et \‘sacratissimo martiri tutori ac protectori nostro\'. Smičiklas (1904), p. 244. See also Giuseppe Praga, 'Zaratini e Veneziani nel 1090: La Battaglia de Treni', Rivista Dalmatica, VIII / 1 (1925), p. 8.}

The Venetians had suffered a convincing defeat, the abbey's claim to the gift of Maun bestowed upon it by King Petar Krešimir in 1069 was validated and Chrysogonus' position as the city's patron appeared to be assured. Additional consolidation of the abbey's privileges and territorial holdings occurred in 1196. Even after the Battle of Treni, the Venetians continued their naval attacks on islands belonging to the abbey so the abbot appealed to Pope Celestine III for papal help and protection. The abbey was granted a bull on 10\textsuperscript{th} May 1196 that confirmed the land holdings, freedom and privileges of the monastery. Along with royal Hungarian approval, the Benedictines and thus Saint Chrysogonus now had the Papacy on side.\footnote{DAZD, Spisi Samostana Sv. Krševana, Kaps. I, m. A, br. 7; Smičiklas (1904), pp. 273-6. Iveković (1931), p. 17; Peričić (1990), pp. 89-90.}

With the miraculous reinvention of 1059 as well as the victory at Treni in 1190, Chrysogonus had a proven local heritage of spiritual and political efficacy. The saint's patronage was an important one to cultivate.

By the middle of the thirteenth century outsiders were conscious of Chrysogonus' role as patron of Zadar. Archdeacon Thomas of Split noted that not only was the inherent wickedness of the Zaratini punished by the Crusader assault of 1202 but 'divine judgement was manifested against them on the day of Saint Grisogonus the saint most venerated amongst them'.\footnote{Archdeacon Thomas of Split, History of the Bishops of Salona and Split, trans. by Damir Karbić, and others, eds Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević Sokol and James Ross Sweeney (Budapest & New York: Central European University Press, 2006), p. 147.} In fact, the crusaders' final attack was on the 17\textsuperscript{th} November 1202, not the saint's feast day of the 24\textsuperscript{th}.\footnote{See Chapter 1.} Nonetheless by placing the fall of the Zaratini on such a symbolic feast day, Thomas of Split created the dramatic scene of a Christian commune truly abandoned by God; devastated by an army
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gathered together with the Pope's blessing, the city's own patron deserting them on his annual feast.

After 1202 Zadar rose up against Venetian rule four times over the course of the next two centuries - in 1242, 1311, 1345 and 1357 - on each occasion transferring its support to Hungary.\(^{84}\) The revolt of 1345 proved the bloodiest of them all, with Zadar besieged by Venetian naval forces for almost eighteen months before surrendering.\(^{85}\) St Chrysogonus and the abbey were an important focus of resistance. A contemporary Zaratine account of the siege, the *Obsidio Jadrensis*,\(^ {86}\) described the events of the saint's feast day, the 24\(^ {\text{th}}\) November 1345, three months after the start of the siege. The archbishop, Nicola de Matafarri, led a mass for the city's clergymen and citizens in the church of the 'blessed athlete Chrysogonus'.\(^ {87}\) To describe Chrysogonus as a man of vigour rather than a more submissive martyr monk (as labelled by Constantine Porphyrogenitus) is telling and shall be explored later in this chapter. After exhorting the people with sermons and blessings delivered at the top of his voice, Nicola urged the people to show a sign of their allegiance to Louis of Hungary. After crying out as one, 'Amen!' all classes of the people, clergy, noble and plebian alike, rushed to the city's largest public square, the Platha Magna. In the middle of the space, to the sound of hymns, psalms and lauds, the banner of the King of Hungary was raised.\(^ {88}\)

---

\(^{84}\) Jackson (1887), p. 114. See also Giorgio Dolfin’s Cronaca of 1458, BMV, Mss. It. VII, 794 (=8503), ff. 28r.

\(^{85}\) A Venetian version of the events of the siege also exists. The fifteenth-century Cronica Jadretina (BMV, Mss. Lat. X, 300 (=3801)) was translated from Latin into Italian and was published in Don Jacopo Morelli, *Monumenti veneziani di varia letteratura per la prima volta pubblicati nell’ingresso di sua eccellenza messer Alvisa Pisani cavaliere alla dignità di procuratore de San Marco* (Venice: Stamperia Carlo Palese, 1796).

\(^{86}\) The text of the Zaratine account was recently edited and published. Branimir Glavičić and Vladimir Vrtović, eds, *Obsidio Jadrensis*, Monumenta spectantia historiam slavorum meridionalium (Zagreb: Academia scientiarum et artium croatica, 2007).

\(^{87}\) Septimo Kalendas decimi mensis, in quo precipue ladertini solemnisse eorum pastoris festum, mirifici martiris Chrysogoni, celebrando non desistunt, dominus Nicolaus, venerabilis pater et archiepiscopus ladrensis compatriota, in ecclesia beatissimi athlete Chrysogoni, in qua totus erat apparatus clerus ac populus vniuersus eiusdem ciuitatis ad solemnia audiendi officia aduenerant, deuotam celebrabat missam.’ Ibid., p. 171.

\(^{88}\) ‘Et post Sancte evangeliá lectionis enuntiationem pulpitem ascendit multosque hortatorios prounuitiát sermones et benedicens altissima voce omnibus audiuntibus, qui ad deuotionis festum congregati fuerant, vexillum regis, quod idem rex Ludouicus in signum fidelitatis laderinis transmiserat. Expleataque benectione omnes in basilica adunati vnanimiter cum iubilatione clamauerunt dicentes: Amen. Et dum solemnia explerentur misteria, vniuersus clerus Dalmaticis decoratus vestibus laudibus
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St Chrysogonus had become a rallying symbol and influential patron that defined Zaratine identity in the face of Venetian aggression. Arguably King Coloman’s patronage of the saint and promotion of the Hungarian Crown’s cause by sacred proxy had proved successful. Over the course of two hundred and fifty years it had evolved to such an extent that saint, commune and royal power had all become intertwined.

Yet during the siege of 1345-6 Hungary was not able to provide the military support sought by the Zaratini. In December 1346 after sixteen months of siege, the commune capitulated to Venice again. It was not until 1357 that the abbot of St Chrysogonus finally escorted the Venetians from the city before the commune’s restoration to King Louis’ rule. Two years later the city council decided that each citizen had to offer a candle to St Chrysogonus in thanks for deliverance into Hungarian hands.89 This ushered in over five decades of Hungarian sovereignty and high levels of autonomy for the commune.

3.5 Iconography

1358 until 1409 was also a period of increasing political significance for St Chrysogonus’. The most dramatic manifestation of this was the development of the saint’s iconography, a shift that began once Chrysogonus’ position as Zadar’s patron was assured. As mentioned above, in the tenth century Constantine Porphyrogenitus noted that the abbey held the relics of the ‘monk and martyr Chrysogonus’,90 but by the time of the siege of Zadar in 1345 the saint was described as an ‘athlete’. In the second half of the fourteenth century the saint had become a young and vigorous

---

hymnisque et sanctorum psalmorum ductu in multorum nobilium et plebeiorum comitia cum eodem antistite in foro in medio ipsius urbis usque deuenerunt et, suspceptam, a dicto antistite totus vulgus benedictionem, in trunco eminente pasuum fere vndecim in dicto medio foro dictum vexillum inexitamibili letitia erererunt.’ Ibid., p. 171.


90 See above.
cavalryman: an iconography unique to Zadar at that time. How and why did this change come about?

An iconographic survey of representations of St Chrysogonus throughout the Mediterranean world will provide a context into which we can place Zadar’s particular representation of the saint. The sixth-century mosaic medallion at the archbishop’s chapel in Ravenna depicts a middle-aged, bearded man in classical toga. (Fig. 3.5) This was very much in keeping with other Early Christian depictions of him, such as those in the St Andrew’s chapel of Milan’s archbishop’s palace as well as in the mosaics of Sant’Appolinare Nuovo in Ravenna, where he was portrayed as a martyr dressed in a Roman toga. (Fig. 3.6) Moving to Rome, there was a change in the imagery. At San Crisogono the eighth- and ninth-century frescoes in the crypt depict a figure that Kaftal has described as a ‘youthful and beardless warrior’. In the same church a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century mosaic by the school of Cavallini continued the martial theme, and Chrysogonus is represented sporting a well-kempt beard, dressed in armour and unsheathing a sword. (Fig. 3.7) The change from classical scholar or monk to a more vigorous incarnation of the saint was well underway. In Aquileia, site of Chrysogonus’ martyrdom, the apsidal frescoes of 1031 and the crypt fresco of 1200 continued this theme but now the young knight held a pectoral cross. (Fig. 3.8)

The proximity of Aquileia to Zadar influenced the iconography of the saint within the Dalmatian commune. The late eleventh-century reliquary of Saints James and Orontius from the treasury of the parish church of St Anselm in nearby Nin, has a

---

93 The apsidal frescoes were commissioned by Patriarch Poppo (1019-1042) and depict the saints Chrysogonus, Felice, Fortunato, Largio, Dionisio, Primiceria and possibly Anastasia. The crypt frescoes depict the narratives of the Passion of Christ as well as the vita and martyrdom of the protomartyrs Ermagora and Fortunato. Chrysogonus is one of many saints depicted on the column spandrels. Dina Dalla Barba Brusin and Giovanni Lorenzoni, *L’arte del Patriarcato di Aquileia* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1968), pp. 41 & 59. See also Kaftal and Bisogni (1978), pp. 223-6.
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small medallion on which is a bust of St Chrysogonus.\textsuperscript{95} (Figg. 3.9 & 3.10) He holds a pectoral cross and gives a gesture of benediction. His cloak is attached at the neck with a large brooch and the elaborate embroidery of his sleeves peeps out from beneath the drapery. Instead of the ‘monk’ described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the costume on this figure points to that of a layman.

The Aquileian iconographic model continued in the fourteenth century. From the first half of the century there is the casket reliquary of St Quirinus from the treasury of St Mary’s convent in Zadar.\textsuperscript{96} (Fig. 3.11) On one side is Christ enthroned, flanked by the bishop Quirinus and the martyr Chrysogonus, again with a pectoral cross and repeating the gesture of benediction found in the reliquary medallion of Saints James and Orontius.

In 1326 the noblemen and then rectors of Zadar, Vito Čadulin, Vulcina Martinusius and Paulo Galsigna commissioned a more sophisticated silver gilt reliquary that contained St Chrysogonus’ shirt. (Fig. 3.12) This reliquary was mentioned in the Venetian inventory of 1427.\textsuperscript{97} The casket has a number of enamels depicting Zadar’s communion of Early Christian saints, including Anastasia, Zoilus and Chrysogonus. Although the most recent catalogue of Zadar’s reliquaries described Chrysogonus as ‘wearing the clothes of a monk and holding the martyr’s cross in his right hand’.\textsuperscript{98} Why would a monk be wearing a crown, sporting a beard and chin-length flowing hair? (Fig. 3.13) This is surely a lay martyr, more in keeping with the ‘athlete’ Chrysogonus of the \textit{Obsidione Jadrensis} of 1345. The crown is an intriguing


\textsuperscript{96} Jakšić and Tomić (2004), pp. 70.

\textsuperscript{97} On the casket is the inscription: ‘+ HOC OP(US) FVIT FACT(UM) T(EM)P(ORAM) R(E) NOBILIV(M) VIKO(RUM) VITI ÇADV(INI) VULCINE MARTINUSII & PAULI DE GALÇIGN(A) ANN(O) DO(MINI) MCCXXVI’. Ibid., pp. 73. See also Brunelli (1907), pp. 122-23; Petricioli (1990\textsuperscript{3}), p. 39 & 327; Petricioli (2004), p. 9; Marijana Kovačević, \textit{Umjetnička obrada plemenitih metala u Zadru u 14. stoljeću (The artistic working of precious metals in fourteenth-century Zadar)}, Ph.D thesis (University of Zadar, 2009), pp. 103-43.

\textsuperscript{98} ‘U središnjoj je emajlirani lik gradskog zaštitnika sv. Krševana okrenut gledatelju, u rednovičkoj odjeći s mučeničkim križem u desnici…’. Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 73. See also Kovačević (2009), pp. 1040-41.
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feature and it is tempting to connect it to the royal Hungarian pedigree of the cult’s patronage, but this would be pure conjecture.

Within sixty years of the shirt casket a dramatic change in iconography occurred. After 1358, when Hungarian rule returned, the iconography became decidedly more martial and secular in tone stepping away from the Aquileian image of the martyr saint. A fourteenth-century processional cross from Zadar’s Franciscan friary has an image of St Chrysogonus as a soldier and is an important stage in the development of his iconography. 99 (Fig. 3.14) This cross was stolen from the friary in 1974 and its whereabouts have only recently been discovered. 100 The cross itself has a number of medallions that on one side depict mendicant saints such as Francis, Clare, Anthony of Padua and Louis of Toulouse and on the other side Zadar’s own Anastasia and Chrysogonus. 101 (Figs. 3.15 & 3.16) This version of St Chrysogonus combines the type found in the mosaic of San Crisogono in Rome with the Aquileian model that has been so apparent. A beardless Chrysogonus wears chain mail armour and holds a spear and shield, upon which is a cross. This is a step away from the elegant layman on the shirt casket of 1326, but a development that reflects the commune’s increasing confidence and prosperity whilst under Angevin rule. 102

The next iconographic example is the city seal from 1385 that survives on a notarial document sent to the Venetian Signoria from Zadar. 103 (Fig. 3.17) The seal

100 Ibid. pp. 29 & 32. Donal Cooper recently found the cross in the permanent collection at the Museo Civico of Amedeo Lia in La Spezia, Italy. The cross was sold at Sotheby’s in London at a sale on the 10th April 1975, a year after the theft. The work was catalogue number 8 and was noted as ‘the property of a gentleman’. Its sale price is missing from the final price list, suggesting that a private sale was negotiated. Medieval Works of Art Catalogue, Sotheby & Co. sale Thursday 10th April 1975 (London: Sotheby’s, 1975), p. 10; Andrea Marmori and Marizia Ratti, eds, La Spezia, Museo Civico Amedeo Lia: Sculture e Oggetti d’Arte, I cataloghi del Museo Civico Amedeo Lia (Milan: Silvana Editoriale, 1999), p. 224; Email from Dr. Donal Cooper, associate professor, Department of the History of Art, University of Warwick, to Zoë Willis, 16th July 2010.
101 Jakšić and Tomić (2004), pp. 82-84.
102 Jakšić and Tomić also relate the development of the cavalryman iconography to the relative autonomy and economic prosperity afforded during the Hungarian rule of 1358-1409. Ibid., pp. 73-74.
103 ASV, Senato, Dispacci antichi di ambasciatori, rettori e altre cariche (1321-528), b. 1, n. 61
represents Chrysogonus as a fully-fledged cavalryman, no longer a static monk or martyr. His horse is in full flight as it charges, the lance ready to strike and his mantle flowing out behind him. On his flowing standard is a small cross and beneath the galloping horse are some delightful foliate details in lower relief than the cavalryman and his steed above. The 1385 commission for the seal's production survives. The notary Articutius de Rivignano wrote the contract of the seal's commission and it includes a description of the city's larger and smaller wax seals. On the large one, a combination of red and white wax depicted:

...a figure on a horse, which carries the image of a man who holds a shield with a cross upon it before his chest, and under his right arm is a lance with a penant, marked with a cross; the figure of the man has a sword at his left side and a fluttering pennant behind his shoulder. Along the edges of the wax are written the words: By this guide the Dalmatian city of Zadar prevails.\(^{104}\)

The seal on the document in the Venetian Archivio di Stato is of this larger type, as indicated by the inscription's remains around the edge although no white wax survives. The smaller city seal was similar to the larger one, again using red or vermilion wax, depicting the same equestrian image but with the words 'S[eal] of the Commune of Zadar' upon it.\(^{105}\)

---


1384 and 1385 were arguably the apex of Zaratine confidence, a secure territory allied to the Crown of Hungary and the House of Anjou. We have already seen how the Coloman’s arm reliquary was used in the confirmation of the city’s fidelity to Queen Maria in 1384 when she visited the city. The commune’s future at this point seemed assured and it was in this context that the new seal was commissioned, depicting a strong and confident cavalier. This was an amalgamation of local identity with the saint’s particular associations with the Hungarian monarchy.

This same energetic and strident iconography is found on a reliquary from the end of the fourteenth century. (Fig. 3.18) Currently housing the head of St Zoilus, this small box depicts Zadar’s panoply of early Christian saints, namely Zoilus, Agape, Chiona, Irene, Anastasia, the bishop saint Donatus and Chrysogonus. What is unexpected about this piece is that if it was originally intended for the head of St Zoilus, why is there such a compositional emphasis upon St Chrysogonus and his galloping horse? There is the artistic possibility afforded by the saint’s armour, drapery and horse in this new iconography as all create movement, spirit and interest. But it does seem curious that this saint would take pride of place on a reliquary intended for another. Recent Croatian scholarship has made no mention of this conspicuous oddity and some explanation would be useful. 106

During the medieval period the body of St Zoilus had been kept in a stone coffer in the church of St Mary the Great.107 When most of the church was destroyed in 1570 to make way for the city’s new fortifications, the relic was moved to the remaining sacristy, later rededicated to St Roche. In 1622 Archbishop Luca Stella translated Zoilus’ relic into a new coffer and it was moved to the cathedral treasury, helping reinvigorate the cult. The earliest reference to the silver-gilt head reliquary is only

107 Brunelli (1974), p. 204
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from a seventeenth-century ecclesiastical inventory of the contents of the chapel of St Roche.\textsuperscript{108} The late fourteenth-century date of the silver reliquary, with its compositional emphasis on St Chrysogonus, together with the 1622 translation of St Zoilus’ relics suggest that this object was recycled during Luca Stella’s rejuvenation of Zoilus’ cult. The reliquary’s original contents are unknown but it probably contained another relic associated with Chrysogonus rather than Zoilus.

Returning to the iconography of St Chrysogonus, a final Zaratine example under scrutiny is a fine arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus produced in the early fifteenth century. (Fig. 3.19) This one is a left arm reliquary with the palm open and the fingers stretched out. It seems likely that this was the reliquary described in the 1427 inventory as ‘an arm with a gilded silver hand in which is a mixture of St Chrysogonus’ arm’ as it does not have the pearls and precious stones noted on the other arm reliquary.\textsuperscript{109} But it is probable that King Coloman’s arm reliquary provided the model for this piece,\textsuperscript{110} and its patrons were well aware of the political significance of the earlier reliquary. Rather than commissioning a direct copy (the inventory descriptions are quite different) the fifteenth-century patrons wanted to create a complementing pair of reliquaries. Indeed, the fact that this fifteenth-century work is a left hand reliquary also suggests that Coloman’s original piece was a right hand, thus emphasising the connection with St Stephen’s Holy Dexter.

On the fifteenth-century arm reliquary are two images of Chrysogonus on enamel plaques, one with the saint galloping on his horse with hair, mantle and banner flowing behind and the second a half-length portrait with him as a bearded warrior or crusader holding a pennant and shield with a cross on both. (Figg. 3.20 & 3.21) The newer arm reliquary must have been produced soon after or during the years

\textsuperscript{108} This had been the sacristy of the collegiate church of St Mary the Great. Bianchi (1877), p. 399; Brunelli (1974), p. 205; Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 126; Kovačević (2009), p. 1050
\textsuperscript{109} See above.
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of 1401 to 1403, the period when Zadar submitted to Ladislaus of Naples that culminated in his coronation as King of Hungary, Croatia and Dalmatia in the abbey church of Saint Chrysogonus.\textsuperscript{111} The arrival of Ladislaus’ envoy, Aloysius Aldemarisco, and his entourage on the 27\textsuperscript{th} August 1402 heralded the final period of Angevin rule over Zadar. This was arguably the pinnacle of the abbey’s and thus Chrysogonus’ role as patron mediator for the commune and Hungary. Paolo de Paoli wrote that

... when lord Aloysius, envoy for the illustrious prince lord Ladislaus King of Jerusalem and Sicily, and captains of five galleys and a brigantine of the same Lord King, appeared before the port of Zadar, with a few of his associates entered Zadar and then elevated the standard of the aforementioned Lord King and the standard of the Kings of Hungary at the same time...\textsuperscript{112}

This grand party was greeted by the patricians Jacopo de Raduchis, Andrea de Grisogono, Georgio de Çadulin, Simon Detrico, Thomas de Petriço and Paolo de’ Pauli himself. The group then:

...entered through the Saint Chrysogonus gate [of the city], first and before [anything] all entered the church of St Chrysogonus of Zadar in the middle [of which] was the most reverend Lord Father Archbishop of Zadar and Lord Abbot of St Chrysogonus. [This party then] made for the street and together went to the house of Micha de Soppe... rector and examiner with a great assembly of nobility and non-nobility and then immediately elevated the


\textsuperscript{112} “...quod dominus Aloysius vicarius illius trium principis domini Ladislavi regis Hierusalem et Siciliae, ac capitaneus quinque galearum et unius brigentini eiusdem domini regis, existentium ante portum ladrar, cum paucis suorum sociorum ingredetur ladrarm et tunc elevetur vexillum praedicti domini regis et vexillum regni Ungariae simul et semel...” Šišić (1904), p. 34.
standard of the aforementioned King and Kingdom and at the time a
standard of St Chrysogonus with great solemnity and lauds; and the
following nights there were great fires through the whole city in a sign of joy
and the next day before lunch there was a solemn procession and mass in
the church of St Chrysogonus with the sermon of a minor friar and after
lunch there was a stamping of feet and dancing in the house of Ludovico de
Matafarri, in the loggia and through the streets with the women of Zadar.\textsuperscript{133}

This event was as exciting and important as that of the saint’s feast day during the
siege in 1345. King Sigismund had been unable to provide the stability and security
sought by the Zaratini and so the commune’s future was tied to its allegiance with
Ladislaus of Naples.\textsuperscript{134} Mass was led in the abbey church and again the archbishop was
closely involved. Paolo di Paoli did not record the use of St Chrysogonus’ relics at any
point although this does not preclude the absence of the portable reliquary from the
celebrations. But the emphasis seemed to be upon the image of St Chrysogonus
depicted in the city’s banners, which were flown alongside and equal to those of
Ladislaus of Naples. The juxtaposition was a powerful and politically charged one.
Such a joyous event would have created a suitable context in which to commission
another arm reliquary in homage to King Coloman’s original donation. The alliance
between the Crown and territory appeared sealed with Ladislaus’ arrival. This new,

\textsuperscript{133} ‘Quo ingrediente per portam Sancti Grisogoni, primo et ante omnia ingressus est ecclesiam Sancti
Grisogoni de Iadra in medio reverendissimorum patrum dominorum archiepiscopi iadrensis et domini
abbatis Sancti Grisogoni petivit plateam et euntibus secum usque ad domum ser Michae de Soppe
praedictis dominis, rectore et examinatoribus cum magna comitiva nobilium et ignobiliun et tunc
immediate elevata fuerunt vexilla regis et regni antedictorum una simul cum vexillo Sancti Grisogoni cum
magna solemnitate et vociferatione laudis; et nocte sequenti fuerunt ignes per totam civitatem in
signum laetitiae et crus ante prandium processio solemnis et missa in ecclesia Sancti Grisogoni cum
praedicatione unius fratis minorum et post prandium tripudia et chorea in domo ser Lodovici de
Matafaris in logia et per plateam cum dominabus iadrensiun.’ Ibid., p. 34.

\textsuperscript{134} At this time Sigismund was dealing with the mutinous dissatisfaction of the Hungarian barons as well
as the threat to his throne posed by Ladislaus. His attentions were also on developments in Bohemia and
Germany because his brother, Wenceslas, was childless and Sigismund would become heir to these
considerable territories. The small communes of Dalmatia were not such a pressing concern at this
more confident iconography of Zadar’s patron saint was yet again intertwined with a sacred dynastic heritage.

However much imagery may have tried to represent a more glorious future, the reality was quite different. Ladislaus renounced his claim to the Hungarian crown and Dalmatian communes, selling Zadar to Venice in 1409.\(^5\) After this, the cult of St Chrysogonus underwent a new stage of development, beyond Zadar and across the Adriatic. The relative ease with which image, in contrast to relics, could be transmitted was an important factor in this shift.

### 3.6 St Chrysogonus in Fifteenth-Century Venice

André Vauchez, in his collection of essays examining the role of the laity in many aspects of medieval spiritual life, touched upon the notion of exclusivity applicable to the choice of patron saints in the communes of Italy. He noted that ‘in the fourteenth century, every urban agglomeration, no matter how small, aspired to possess its own saint’.\(^6\) Zadar’s claim to Chrysogonus was not, however, exclusive. It was in competition with Venice. The Republic also possessed relics belonging to the saint. The way in which the cult developed in the context of the lagoon was quite different to the Zaratine example, but by the fifteenth century, the Venetian response to St Chrysogonus proved the defining image of the saint throughout the Adriatic region.

In Venice the saint’s relics were kept in the parish church of Saints Gervasio, Protasius and Chrysogonus, locally known as San Trovaso. (Fig. 3.22) Venetian chroniclers do not agree on precisely when San Trovaso was founded, be it 731, 931 or 944. Two of the wealthiest families in the parish, the Barbarighi and Pascarii, funded

---


its establishment as an oratory.\textsuperscript{107} St Chrysogonus at first shared his titular church with Gervasius and Protasius, early Christian martyrs from Ravenna.\textsuperscript{108} The original building was soon in a parlous state. In 1028 with support from Doge Ottone Orseolo and the noble families of the Barbarighi and Caravella, it was restored but St Chrysogonus was dropped from the new dedication.\textsuperscript{109} In 1105 fire destroyed this second structure,\textsuperscript{110} the third church was completed in 1242.\textsuperscript{121} In 1487 Marc’Antonio Sabellio recorded an atrium and, atop the chancel end or capella maggiore, a cupola. Greek workers constructed the dome and this edifice topped off a basilica with three or five naves.\textsuperscript{122} The Barbari map of 1500 does not shows this cupola but depicts an impressive basilica with a nave and two aisles influenced by Veneto-Byzantine traditions of the high medieval period.\textsuperscript{123} Sansovino claimed San Trovaso was the biggest church in Venice after the cathedral of San Pietro in Castello.\textsuperscript{124} Aside from these tantalising vignettes, the only real description of this medieval church is in the Apostolic Visitation of 1581, and this is of a more perfunctory, utilitarian nature than an aesthetic commentary on the building.\textsuperscript{125} The Visitation was the last in a very limited range of sources regarding early San Trovaso; on the 12\textsuperscript{th} September 1583 the church collapsed, destroying the parish archives, artistic patrimony and saints’ relics.\textsuperscript{126}


\textsuperscript{110} Bianchi (1979), p. 5.

\textsuperscript{111} Ibid., pp. 6 & 8.


\textsuperscript{113} Bianchi (1979), pp. 20–21.

\textsuperscript{114} ‘La qual chiesa come antica per l’apparenza sua, fu da quella in fuori di S. Pietro in Castello, la maggiore che fosse fatta suoi tempi...’ Francesco Sansovino, \textit{Venetia città nobilissima et singolare} (Venice: Presso Iacomo Sansovino, 1581), fol. 89r; Bianchi (1979), p. 28.

\textsuperscript{115} Venice, Archivio Diocesano (hereafter cited as ADV), Curia Patriarciale di Venezia, Visite Apostoliche, 1, ff. 214r - 217r.
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What were those relics? The sources are unclear. Marino Sanudo stated that the whole body was originally brought across from Zadar and then kept in San Trovaso.127 The Apostolic Visitation contradicts this describing the saint’s altar and noting that it contained ‘a venerated casket in which were placed very holy relics of many saints celebrated with portables’.128 The portability of this casket and the mixture of relics from ‘many saints’ suggest that what relics there were of St Chrysogonus were small. The fact that St Chrysogonus had not been and was not reinstated as a joint patron of the church until its reconsecration in 1657 could imply that his relics were not especially significant in size or value during the medieval period.

Nonetheless, as intimated by Sanudo’s comment, there was an element of competition between Venice and Zadar over St Chrysogonus and an awareness in Venice of his role as the Dalmatian commune’s patron saint. In the eighteenth century Flaminio Corner claimed that after the church’s collapse in 1583, a native of Zadar had, under cover of darkness, discovered one arm bone amongst the church’s ruins. The man then returned to Zadar and restored it to the titular church there.129 Corner’s tale explained to a Venetian audience how it was possible that Zadar claimed the relic, yet Venice had lost hers and thus the efficacy and support of the saint. A man from Zadar stole away a relic and saint that should have remained in Venice. This recent legend of furta sacra has proved so popular that it is still recounted as truth by some modern scholars.130 What the myth does reveal are the thematic resonances of the arm relic

128 ‘In dicto Altari in capsa honorifica repositae sunt reliquis multos sanctos celebraturs cum portatili.’ ADV, Curia Patriarcale di Venezia, Visite Apostoliche, 1, fol. 216v.
129 ‘Fu questo il sacro corpo del famoso Martire San Grisogono d’Aquileja, trasferito già in tempi remoti (come avevasi per tradizione) da Zara in Venezie, e collocato in questa Chiesa, il quale nella congiuntura funesta ricercato nascosamente di notte, e rinvenuto fra le rovine da un Cittadino di Zara abitante allora in Venezia, fu riportato a Zara, restando a qualche consolazione della grave perdita un solo osso del braccio, che tuttavia conservasi nella rinnovata Chiesa, di cui è contitolare’. Corner (1900), p. 442.
130 Ettore Merkel, ‘Il “S. Grisogono” di San Trovaso, fiore tardivo di Michele Giambono’, Quaderni della Soprintendenza ai Beni artistici e storici di Venezia, 8 (1979), p. 34.
and the fragmentary nature of St Chrysogonus’ cult; the echoes of St Stephen’s Holy
Dexter via the conduit of St Chrysogonus’ arm reliquary are found in eighteenth-
century Venice.

Although documentation about St Chrysogonus’ cult in Venice is very sparse, the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century references to his relics and a clear mythology around their destruction suggests a revival of sorts prior to Sanudo. This brings us to the fifteenth century, a period when Zadar had returned to Venetian rule. This possible revival also coincides with the production of one of the few surviving art works from the medieval church of San Trovaso, *St Chrysogonus* by Michele Giambono.  

---

**3.6.1 Michele Giambono**

This painting is an example of the International Gothic style at its best and has since established the saint’s iconography. The image may have its origins in Zadar but it was Venetian art history that defined it. Giambono himself was probably born in Treviso in the 1390s, and by the 1420s he was painting in Venice. His rise as one of the most sought-after artists of the day continued and by the 1440s he was described as ‘painter to Saint Mark’, essentially artist to the Republic as well as ‘master mosaicist’ prior to his work on the Mascoli chapel with Jacopo Bellini in 1451. So respected was Giambono that in 1453 he, together with the *intagliatore* Jacopo Moronzon as well as the goldsmiths Giovanni Testa and Antonio Sisto, went to Padua to assess the value of

---

139 The painting was originally attributed to artists such as Jacopo Bellini and Jacobello del Fiore, but stylistic analysis and comparisons within Giambono’s oeuvre during the twentieth century confirmed his authorship of the St Chrysogonus panel. In 1909 the authorship of the painting was still under discussion. Laudedeo Testi, *Storia della Pittura Veneziana* (Bergamo: Istituto Italiano d’Arti Grafiche Editore, 1909), 1, p. 414; Cristina Pesaro, ’Michele Giambono’, in *Saggi e memorie di Storia dell’arte*, (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1992), 18, p. 25.

132 Pesaro (1992), pp. 5 & 16.

Donatello’s equestrian monument of *Gattamelata*, a value disputed by Giannantonio, son of the famed mercenary.\(^{154}\)

At the peak of his professional life, between 1444 and 1450, Giambono produced the magnificent painted panel of Saint Chrysogonus on horseback for the church of San Trovaso.\(^{155}\) This is the only existing example of any iconography of St Chrysogonus in Venice, so it is impossible to say what went before. Judging by the survey of iconographic types recounted above, it seems likely that the earlier imagery of the saint in Venice would not have been out of keeping with that found in the Adriatic neighbours of Ravenna and Aquileia.

In contrast to these earlier representations, Giambono’s painting depicts the saint as a knight atop a horse, with youth, armour and flowing drapery providing ample opportunity for artistic flair to dazzle the viewer. Chrysogonus and his horse stand within a wooded landscape. The foliage, his fluttering cloak and standard are all enclosed within the boundaries of the frame and panel edge. The warhorse stands in a pose very similar to that of Donatello’s *Gattamelata*, with its right leg bent toward the hoof as if leaning on an object. The eye is drawn toward the cartellino beneath the hoof. Pesaro wrote that the words *Imago Sancti Grisogoni* are written on it, but close inspection of the painting does not reveal such an inscription.\(^{156}\) (Fig. 3.24) Beneath this is a small curved void in the paint that may have been behind an object placed in front of the panel, probably the altarpiece associated with St Chrysogonus. It has been proposed that the painting’s original purpose was either as part of a polyptych - depicting all three patron saints of the church - or as a panel above its own mensa

---


\(^{156}\) Pesaro (1992), p. 43.
dedicated solely to St Chrysogonus.\textsuperscript{37} The Apostolic Visitation of 1581 noted that the saint’s altar had ‘an attractive panel’ on it, so it was unlikely to have been an elaborate polyptych.\textsuperscript{38} The Visitation does not include any iconographic description of the painting but it seems probable that the panel was the same as the Giambono painting of St Chrysogonus.

Unfortunately the panel’s original configuration in relation to the medieval altar and its relics are a mystery. Giambono’s painting survived the collapse of the church in 1583, but the same cannot be said of the altar itself nor of any documentation associated with the work, contracts or otherwise. When San Trovaso was rebuilt, no specific altar was dedicated to Chrysogonus, probably because the relics had been destroyed. Without an altar and relics, the painting lost its liturgical and spiritual significance; nineteenth-century inventories chart its movement around the various chapels in San Trovaso, suggesting an element of perplexity about its modern role and medieval significance.\textsuperscript{39} This magnificent panel now languishes on a sidewall of the chapel of the Milledonne, ill lit and difficult to read.

Without this framework of context, function and location it has been difficult to understand the painting’s iconography within the milieu of mid fifteenth-century Venice. Scholars have puzzled over it, but the only article that has explored it in depth was published in 1979 soon after a course of restoration and the return of the painting to San Trovaso. Ettore Merkel suggested that the combination of the painting’s date of circa 1450 and a flaming monogram of Christ - the YhS or trigamma - in the centre of Chrysogonus’ shield both point to the heavy influence of Saint Bernardino of Siena (1380-1444) upon the iconography.\textsuperscript{40} In 1443 Eugene IV had issued a papal bull

\textsuperscript{37} Caputo and Perissa (1994), pp. 16 & 18; Merkel (1979), p. 35
\textsuperscript{38} ‘Altares Sancti Grisogoni habet pallam decentem.’ ADV, Curia Patriarcale di Venezia, Visite Apostoliche, 1, fol. 216v.
\textsuperscript{39} Merkel (1979), p. 34.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 35.
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allowing Bernardino to grant indulgences for a crusade against the Turks. As the
Ottomans were an increasing threat to Venice in the Mediterranean, Merkel argued
that it would have been appropriate for the Venetians to use Chrysogonus’s image as
propaganda. This would explain the transformation from a tranquil scholar into a
young crusader to fight the Turks.

If the painting was also produced in 1450, that would coincide with the
canonisation of Bernardino. Therefore, the combination of Bernardino’s trigamma
with the ‘crusader’ Chrysogonus was a metaphorical call to arms in the face of the
ever-growing Turkish threat to all things spiritual and secular within the Venetian
republic. 140 The fact that Michele Giambono was the magister mosayci of San Marco
from 1449 to 1451,141 and based in the Republic’s political centre also fitted well into this
iconographic analysis. Scholars have accepted Merkel’s interpretation ever since.

The problems with the argument begin when one examines Merkel’s trigamma
bernadiana. Bernardino used this monogram originally as a homiletic aide and a means
of provoking theological debate.142 In time it also became an object of veneration, a
means of contemplating the holy name of Christ, for which Bernardino attracted
accusations of heresy soon after the image first appeared in 1425 during a sermon he
gave in Siena.143 Bernardino was cleared of the charge and his popularity swiftly spread
throughout the Italian peninsula. In 1429 Bernardino visited Venice.144 In parallel to his
increasing renown, Bernardino’s monogram appeared more frequently, in both public
and private spaces and on both secular and ecclesiastical buildings.145 In art and
sculpture, the IhS (or YhS. The two were interchangeable) was initially associated with

---

140 Ibid., p. 35
144 Merkel (1979), p. 35.
images of Bernardino himself, but during the fifteenth century as the monogram
gained its own significance and talismanic qualities it was used in art throughout
Europe.¹⁴⁷ This would then explain why the monogram was depicted in a range of
contexts in the fifteenth century, including St Chrysogonus’ shield and on a statue in
St Clement’s chapel in the basilica of San Marco.¹⁴⁸ It was the sacred connotations of
the holy name of Christ that was important rather than simply a reference to
Bernardino himself.

Also, why choose Chrysogonus as a symbol of Venice’s physical and spiritual
strength against the Turks? Although Bernardino did discuss the Passio of Saints
Chrysogonus and Anastasia in his writings,¹⁴⁹ no explicit connection was made
between the martyr and a possible crusade against the Ottomans. One could suggest
that as St Chrysogonus died for his beliefs, he would be a suitable tool for propaganda.
But then surely the same condition and opportunity for martial transformation would
be applicable to Gervasius and Protasius? Or even better, why not St Mark, symbol of
the Republic? Merkel’s analysis seems over elaborate. If this image was meant as a
policy statement regarding grand political developments of the day, would it have
been understood by everyday Venetians who attended mass or prayed for
Chrysogonus’ intercession in one of the city’s parish churches? Possibly not.

If Bernardino and a Crusade against the Ottomans was not the iconographic
source for the Giambono painting, then what was? As we know this particular form of
Chrysogonus’ iconography developed in Zadar during the fourteenth century in
response to the commune’s sense of confidence and security under Hungarian rule.
The question is how did this particular Zaratine version of Chrysogonus cross the
Adriatic and into the iconographic repertoire of Michele Giambono? The connection

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 36.
between Zadar and the painting in San Trovaso can be found in published documents that refer to Giambono. On the 3rd September 1443 Giambono was named arbitrator together with the painter Francesco de confino sancti Juliani in a controversy between the painter Nicolò di Ser Domenico and the wood carvers Matteo and Francesco Moronzon. On 13th June 1447 Giambono commissioned Francesco Moronzon to sculpt a pala lignea or wooden panel similar to that in the church of San Pantalon.\textsuperscript{150} Finally, in 1453, Giambono along with Jacopo Moronzon and Giovanni Testa were employed by the son of the mercenary Gattamelata to assess whether the price demanded by the sculptor Donatello for his statue of the soldier was reasonable.\textsuperscript{151}

The Moronzon family were active intagliatore or woodcarvers in Zadar from 1418 to the late 1450s, producing works for the archbishops, Zaratine nobility and the Venetian counts. In 1418 the archbishop of Zadar, Luca Turriano da Fermo, commissioned Matteo, the father, to build the magnificent choir stalls for the cathedral.\textsuperscript{152} (Fig. 5.19) Four years later, the procurator of St Mary the Great, Simon de Begna, asked Matteo produce a tabernacle for sixty ducats using as a model the tabernacle at St Anastasia.\textsuperscript{153} In 1426 the Venetian archbishop, Biagio Molin, and rector of the commune, Fantin de Ca’ da Pesaro, employed Matteo to create statues of the twelve Apostles, the Virgin Mary and St John for the top of the presbytery screen in front of the cathedral’s choir, a screen very similar to that found in San Marco.\textsuperscript{154} Moronzon’s role in this grand redevelopment of St Anastasia’s chancel end shall be investigated further in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{150} Pesaro (1992), p. 16.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., p. 16; For a full transcript of the controversy and valuation of the Gattamelata statue, see Milanesi (1855), pp. 55-61.
\textsuperscript{152} Ivo Petricioli, ‘Matteo Moronzon a Zara’, Arte Veneta, XXIX (1975), p. 113; For a full transcript of the contract, see Ivo Petricioli, Umjetnička obrada drveta u Zadru u doba gotike (Wood carving of the Gothic period in Zadar) (Zagreb: 1972), p. 121. See Chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{153} Petricioli (1975), p. 113; Giuseppe Praga, Documenti per la storia dell’arte a Zara dal medioev al seicento, ed. Maria Walcher, Studi e recerche d’arte veneta in Istria e Dalmazia (Trieste: Edizioni “Italo Svevo”, 2005), p. 150.
\textsuperscript{154} Petricioli (1975), p. 113. See also Chapter 5.
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Matteo’s son, Francesco, the man Giambono commissioned to produce a pala similar to that in San Pantalon, is mentioned in three contracts in Zadar’s notarial archives: twice as a witness in 1434 and again in 1439 when he was finally described as intagliatore,\textsuperscript{155} eight years before collaborating with Giambono. Finally on the 29\textsuperscript{th} July 1458, Jacopo, who helped in the valuation of Donatello’s Gattamelata five years earlier was mentioned in the will of Carolus, an intagliatore of Zadar.\textsuperscript{156} This was a family with an enduring Zaratine connection who were known to and knew a range of individuals and institutions within its society. Even after Zadar’s return to the Venetian fold in 1409, Chrysogonus remained the city’s patron saint. It seems unlikely that this family of artists would not have been familiar with the unusual military representation of the early Christian martyr. Considering the professional connections the Moronzon had with Giambono in the 1440s and 1450s - the period when the San Trovaso panel was painted - it seems plausible that they would have been the conduit of St Chrysogonus’ iconography between Zadar and Venice.

3.6.2 Imperialism and Saints, 1211-1463.

This discussion reveals a clear line of iconographic transmission between Zadar and Venice. Professional connections and networks provided the channels of dissemination. The case of St Chrysogonus appears to be an instance of periphery influencing the centre rather than vice versa.\textsuperscript{157} Yet although it is clearer how this particular image was transmitted, the reasons why are not so apparent. What Giambono’s panel indicates is that a costly reinvention of St Chrysogonus’ cult was undertaken in mid fifteenth-century Venice. A beautiful panel produced by one of the premiere artists of the day probably accompanied a new altar. But almost all the

\textsuperscript{155} Petricioli (1972), p. 72
\textsuperscript{156} DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), fol. 106r.
documents from San Trovaso’s archive prior to the collapse in 1583 are lost so it is difficult to piece together the commission for such a spectacular new altarpiece, whom the patron may have been and so forth. It is necessary to look at a broader context in order to suggest possible reasons for the cult’s reinvention and the commission of the painting.

What this chapter has highlighted is a long tradition of communal rivalry between Venice and Zadar made apparent in the mythologies that surrounded particular saints. The ninth-century translation of St Anastasia to Zadar told of the saint’s preference for the Zaratine bishop Donatus rather than the Venetian Doge. More than a thousand years later, Corner reported a furta sacra of St Chrysogonus’ arm relic from Venice to Zadar. Both tales were for local audiences and were a subtle means by which rival claims to saints were undermined. In addition, the celebration of the feast day of St Chrysogonus on the 24th November was only instigated in Venice in 1360. This was two years after the loss of Zadar and Dalmatia to Hungary and one year after Zadar’s city council had asked all citizens to donate a candle to St Chrysogonus in thanks for their deliverance into Hungarian hands (see above). As saints were such important emblems of temporal as well as spiritual legitimacy, translation legends and feast days were a shrewd way of subverting rivals and defining political hierarchies within popular culture, an important theme throughout this thesis. But the case of Zadar and Venice was not about equality between opponents. Venice was larger, richer and after 1360 became an increasingly formidable imperial force. How did this have an impact upon the use of saint cults for political ends?

As a metropole with a progressively strong concept of its imperial identity, the Republic used strategies that exerted increasing control upon its territories and propped up its own claims to rule. Chapter 2 has already highlighted some of these

---

methods within a social and political context. Patron saints were potent symbols of civic identity and so control of these cults would be a powerful means of affirming temporal rule. The most effective exploitation of a saint cult would involve an aggressive *furta sacra* of a particular saint’s remains. The Sack of Constantinople and the Venetian acquisition of many relics from Byzantium is probably the most famous example. Such a strategy, however, was more effective for short-term gains, like sorties against an enemy or as a method of crushing violent resistance. When dealing with colonial territories there were long-term aims that had to be considered. Ongoing peace was what ensured economic success. The forceful theft of a territory’s precious relics was unlikely to help instil a sense of stability amongst the local population. Other tactics had to be used. As Venice consolidated its position in the *Stato da Mar* and *Terra Ferma* it increased its involvement in local saint cults. Candia in the thirteenth century and Padua in the fifteenth are examples of this phenomenon and emphasise the different strategies that the Republic used.

Candia is of particular significance as it is a well studied and large maritime centre of Venice’s *Stato da Mar*. There will be more comparisons between Candia and Zadar in Chapter 5. Maria Georgopolou has produced one of the most important recent pieces of scholarship on Candia. Of particular interest was her analysis of the urban topography, its manipulation and use as a tool of what she has defined as ‘state rhetoric’. The impact of the Church and the cult of the saints on medieval life also had an important part to play in the creation of a suitable ritual and artistic vocabulary. Candia’s patron saint, Titus, was a key part of this rhetoric. It was St Paul who had converted the Titus to Christianity, who later went on to become the first

---

159 Geary has redefined *furta sacra* not simply as thefts but as ‘ritual kidnappings’. As the relics were permeated with anthropomorphic qualities, the theft of a saint’s remains was as shocking as the kidnap of an important and beloved person. Geary (1990), p. xiii.


161 Ibid., p. 107.
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bishop of Crete. After centuries of Byzantine rule, Venice conquered the island in 1211. In that year Doge Pietro Ziani (1205-29) demanded that the recently subjugated Cretans sing lauds to the Doge on Christmas day, at Easter and on the feast days of St Mark and St Titus. Soon after the Venetian arrival the orthodox priests were removed from the cathedral and Catholic clergymen were installed.

The feast day of St Titus became a particularly compelling event. The Venetian participation continued a Byzantine tradition where the secular rulers of Candia were invited to participate in the liturgical proceedings. This evoked a connection between the new Venetian imperium and Byzantium, the inheritor of the Roman Empire. The active participation of the local population in the celebrations as they sang lauds gave the appearance of a people willingly subject to the Church and the Doge. This was a staged endorsement of the new political order. Finally, there was the implication that Venice would not have enjoyed this position without the support and blessing of St Titus. The fact that the Venetians had so easily taken control of Titus’ cult was construed as divine endorsement of their rule, that the saint had forsaken the local population in favour of the foreign power. This transference of approbation is a key theme in medieval translation legends of saints, so would have been part of a familiar hagiographical vocabulary for both Venetians and Cretans. In this instance Venice used it as a means of furthering imperial ambition and territorial control on a grand scale.

\footnote{Letter of St Paul to Titus, 1: 4-5 \textit{The New Jerusalem Bible} (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990), p. 1379.}
\footnote{Georgopoulou (1995), p. 484.}
\footnote{Georgopoulou (2001), p. 118.}
\footnote{Geary (1990), p. 7.}
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Another example of this Venetian propensity to undermine the efficacy of territorial saint cults can be seen in the fifteenth century, this time on the *Terra Ferma*. Ownership of the body of Luke the Evangelist was disputed between the Benedictines of Sta Giustina in Padua and the Franciscans of San Giobbe in Venice. The Paduan history was that the relic had arrived in the eighth century and had been rediscovered in the twelfth.\(^{68}\) (Fig. 3.25) Padua submitted to Venetian rule in 1405,\(^{69}\) but no question as to the cult’s authenticity was raised until the early 1460s. It was then that Doge Cristoforo Moro gave the Franciscans of San Giobbe in Venice a body, claiming it was that of St Luke the Evangelist. Once installed in San Giobbe, the relics were promoted and venerated as the real relics of the Evangelist, all with the endorsement of the Venetian government. In 1463 the Benedictines of Sta Giustina submitted a petition to Doge Moro protesting at this state of affairs.\(^{70}\) The Venetian inquiry found favour with the Venetian claim and only after the Benedictines appealed to the Papacy was the matter resolved in favour of the Paduans.\(^{71}\)

The Venetian response is understandable. It would have been unseemly that Padua, a city ruled by Venice, could claim an Evangelist’s relic, one as prominent as and equal to that of St Mark. The events of the early 1460s seem to have been an exercise in enhancing the ‘state rhetoric’ of Venice at the expense of the territorial cult of St Luke, an exercise in which even the highest level of government as well as the Franciscan order in Venice were complicit. The public revelation of the Venetian relic’s fakery had worrying implications, though, that God was on the side of the Paduan

---

\(^{68}\) The Paduan Benedictine’s tale of Luke’s translation involved a certain Beatus Urios, the guardian and a priest of the Apostoleum in Constantinople. During the height of Constantine V’s (741-775) iconoclasm, Urios fled to Padua bringing with him a sacred icon of the Madonna, the bones of St Matthew and the body of St Luke without a head. All these sacred objects were placed in the church of Sta Giustina. Barbara Kilian, *S. Giustina in Padua: Benediktinische Sakralarchitektur zwischen Tradition und Anspruch*, Europäischer Hochschulschriften, Kunstgeschichte XXVIII (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996), p. 58.


\(^{71}\) Ibid., p. 61.
Benedictines and not the Doge of Venice. In contrast to the successful exploitation of St Titus' cult in Candia, Doge Moro's attempt to undermine the authenticity of St Luke's relics in Venetian-ruled Padua was a failure.

Venetian involvement in the territorial cults of Saints Titus and Luke were condoned at the highest political levels of the Republic. In neither instance were furte sacre perpetrated but varying degrees of provocation are apparent in both. It was a fine line between establishing authority and inducing local discontent. There may be no evidence for such considered interference in the case of St Chrysogonus, but Giambono's painting could be part of a subtler process, a similar means of undermining legitimacy found in the translatio legends. Add this to the diminishment of the cult's political rituals and significance in Zadar proper after 1409 and there is some suggestion that there were political motivations to the cult's reinvention in Venice.

* * *

The cultural development of St Chrysogonus's cult was not confined to Zadar. It reflected grand disseminations of cultic rituals and imagery through Europe, often with societal and political significance. The fragmentation of the saint's relics probably resulted from the patronage of the Hungarian Crown, which created an important conduit of influence between the royal cults of Hungary and the Early Christian martyr in Zadar. The multiplication of Chrysogonus' relics enabled a more active use of them in the relationship between the commune and Hungary, helping evoke shared allegiances and histories. This alliance then brought about increased stability for Zadar and in turn an increased sense of confidence. Again, the fragmentary nature of Chrysogonus' cult made it possible for image to prove as evocative as the saint's tangible remains: the new, martial depiction of Chrysogonus did just that. Iconography had become a key component in the cult's articulation and in turn helped a new
transmission across the Adriatic. Once in Venice, the image of St Chrysogonus was absorbed into the greater context of Venetian imperial expansion and the development of a visual rhetoric that reflected it. This diversification of St Chrysogonus’ cult resulted in a fascinating dissemination. The next chapter will look at St Simeon the Prophet, a saint whose whole body relic in Zadar had quite different requirements of form and function.
Chapter 4

St Simeon the Prophet - The Permanent Saint

One of the most important examples of metalwork of fourteenth-century Zadar was the silver gilt arca of St Simeon the Prophet. (Fig. 4.1) This cult was fundamental to Zadar’s civic identity and its place as a nexus between Hungarian and Venetian ambitions. St Simeon’s whole body relic needed a permanent reliquary and chapel space to accommodate issues of function and sacredness distinct from those of the dissembled Chrysogonus. How were these requirements met and what were the greater social and political implications?

In contrast to the early medieval arrival of St Chrysogonus to Zadar, St Simeon appeared relatively late in Zadar. His local translation legend dates from the thirteenth century.1 Yet within a grander scheme of a saintly hierarchy Simeon was more important than the Early Christian martyr. Simeon was the final prophet of the Bible, who recognised the Christ Child as the Messiah. Simeon’s cry of exultation became the Nunc Dimittis of the Catholic liturgy.2 Even with such a pedigree, Simeon’s cult within

---


2 ‘Now in Jerusalem there was a man named Simeon. He was an upright and devout man... It had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not see death until he had set eyes on the Christ of the Lord. Prompted by the Spirit he came to the Temple; and when the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him what the Law required, he took him into his arms and blessed God; and he said: “Now, Master, you are letting your servant go in peace as you promised; for my eyes have seen the salvation which you have made ready in the sight of the nations; a light of revelation for the gentiles and glory for your people Israel.” Luke, 2:25-32, The New Jerusalem Bible (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1990), pp. 1208-09.
Zadar did not become a powerful and spectacular one until the second half of the fourteenth century.

This chapter will examine a number of factors that contributed to St Simeon's rise. It is helpful at this point to compare the traditions and rituals that surrounded Simeon's cult with that of Chrysogonus. Both enjoyed the political patronage of the Kings and Queens of Hungary, with Chrysogonus benefiting from the generosity of the Árpád dynasty and Simeon from the House of Anjou. Angevin patronage resulted in the arca of St Simeon, an elaborate, silver gilt casket created between 1377 and 80 by the goldsmith Francesco da Milano, habitator of Zadar. Elizabeth Kotromarić, consort of King Louis of Hungary, commissioned the piece but not simply as a random act of personal piety: St Simeon's silver shrine was the continuation of an Angevin / Árpád policy of sacred patronage and dynastic promotion in the territories affiliated with these royal houses. The shrine's place within this European-wide network shall be considered, as well as the cross-cultural influences upon the arca's elaborate iconography and thus its supranational political and sacred messages.

The cults of Saints Chrysogonus and Simeon may have shared similar styles of royal patronage but there was an important distinction between them: the relics themselves. St Chrysogonus' were dispersed across Zadar. King Coloman's arm reliquary was the most significant of the collection but there were also foot and head reliquaries and contact relics, all in addition to a body entombed in the saint's titular church. St Simeon's remains make up an entire body. No parts were removed and redistributed. The comparison with Chrysogonus stops here and so it is necessary to look further afield. Saint cults in Italy and their associated sarcophagae provide a helpful contextual framework in which to analyse the Zaratine response to St Simeon's relic.
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Church space is also a helpful way of considering configuration, function and interaction but, as noted in the Introduction, considerable parts of Zadar’s architectural heritage have been lost. The original location for St Simeon’s shrine in St Mary the Great no longer exists as most of the church was destroyed in 1571.\(^3\) (Fig. 4.2) Part of the challenge is to recreate the space in which Simeon’s shrine lay. Documentary sources reveal that, beginning in 1400, Zadar’s secular elites began building a new chapel.\(^4\) These men continued the temporal patronage begun by the Hungarian monarchs as well as accommodating the rituals and demands of the recently rejuvenated cult. This rejuvenation had implications for the cult’s development across the Adriatic after the Santa Intrada of 1409. As had been the case with St Chrysogonus, Venice also claimed a relic belonging to St Simeon the Prophet. This was kept in a titular church known as San Simeone Profeta or San Simeone Grande. What were the implications for that cult’s development and how did Venetian rule in Zadar influence the promotion of the Zaratine and Venetian claims? The devotional practices surrounding St Simeon have their origins from across Europe and reveal social and political currents that spread well beyond the city of Zadar.

4.1 The Early Cult of St Simeon the Prophet

Before examining the saint’s translation to Zadar, what were the greater European traditions surrounding St Simeon? Centres for his relics are found in both Western and Eastern Christendom. In the West, Gregory of Tours (538–94) had written about the prophet in numerous texts promoting the cause of St Denis. Various relics appeared in towns such as Palermo, Brussels and Périgueux. Charlemagne also brought the arm relics of an individual who ‘supported’ Christ from Constantinople to the Royal Chapel


at Aachen from Constantinople. Whether this ambiguous term referred to St Simeon holding the Christ child or Simon of Cyrene helping Christ during the march to Golgotha, or even a supporter of Jesus, is unclear. In the East, Simeon’s body was in Syria until the sixth century when it was translated to Constantinople between 565 and 578. It was kept in the church of St Mary, next to Hagia Sofia. The Sack of Constantinople in 1204 and the resultant flood of relics from East to West was the most likely opportunity for the prophet’s body to come to either Venice or Zadar. Indeed, in Venetian legend, Andrea Balduinus and Angelo Brusiacus brought back St Simeon’s body to the lagoon city soon after 1204.

The Zaratine legend of its relic recorded that the body arrived during the thirteenth century. The oldest source for this assertion, however, only goes back to the seventeenth century. Lorenzo Fondra noted that Simeon’s translation to Zadar was an oral legend, not a written one, in contrast to those of Saints Chrysogonus and Anastasia, which had been in written form since at least the fifteenth century. As well as the oral tradition, Fondra had found a thirteenth-century document claiming that the body of St Simeon had appeared in the city in 1213. This was soon after the return of thirteen galleys, both Zaratine and Genoese, from the Holy Land. The captain leading this flotilla was the Zaratine nobleman, Marin Çadulin. Both Gregorio Stratico in the eighteenth century and Thomas Jackson in the nineteenth confirmed

7 Ibid., p. 193.
9 See Chapter 3.
10 Fondra (1855), p. 66.
and reiterated this date of 1213, although Jackson also notes that 1273 might have been a possibility.\textsuperscript{11}

The chaos of the Crusades brought a flood of relics from East to West. It seems plausible that as Zadar was an important mercantile port on the Levantine trade route, it benefited from this relic market and probably acquired St Simeon’s body during this period. Charles Seymour has suggested that after 1204 it was the Venetian authorities that left St Simeon’s relic in Zadar as a means of pacifying the locals. This does not seem convincing.\textsuperscript{12} Only the previous year the Venetians and Crusaders had razed the city to the ground and the Republic was at odds with the Zaratini. Why give such a precious and sacred object to a defeated territory? This was an early period in the development of the Venetian imperial administration: strategies of compromise, concessions and personal allegiances between the metropole and its territories were not cultivated until much later.\textsuperscript{13} It would be more conceivable that during the thirteenth century the Zaratini acquired St Simeon’s body from professional relic dealers, Venetian or otherwise, rather than the Venetian State.\textsuperscript{14}

Whatever the true manner of the relic’s arrival in Zadar, the narrative surrounding its origins had been embellished by the time Fondra wrote down the legend. St Simeon’s translation myth tells of a nobleman (Zaratine or otherwise is not specified) returning West from the Holy Land. In his possession was the body of St Simeon but the nobleman claimed it was that of his own brother. A terrific storm appeared,\textsuperscript{15} with Fondra adding the colourful narrative device of demons, keen to sink the ship that carried the holy relic.\textsuperscript{16} The ship limped into Zadar’s port and the nobleman went to a nearby monastery. He requested the body be buried until both he

\textsuperscript{11} Stratico (1769), fol. 40r; Jackson (1887), p. 313.
\textsuperscript{13} See Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{16} Fondra (1855), p. 74.
and the cadaver could continue the journey. Disaster, however, struck. The nobleman fell ill and died. About his neck the monks found a note claiming that the buried body was that of St Simeon. Delighted to have made such a discovery the monks told no one else the secret. Miraculously the city’s three rectors all had a dream in which Simeon appeared to them and told them he was buried in the monastery. The next day the three rushed to the monastery and caught the monks exhuming the body. The monks confessed to their crime and the true identity of the corpse. Once the archbishop was informed of the events, he ordered the body be transferred to the church of St Mary the Great where it would be possible for the faithful to visit and venerate such an important relic.  

Narrative elements and embellishments within this tale portray St Simeon’s body as a supernatural and active participant in the saint’s Zaratine arrival, in much the same way as Saints Chrysogonus and Anastasia had been in their own translation tales. For example St Simeon’s intercession meant that the vessel that carried his relics survived a terrible storm created by demonic forces. His appearance in the rector’s dreams also indicates a preference for the guardianship of the secular authorities rather than that offered by the dishonest monks at the unnamed hospital.

We can never ascertain the exact details of the arrival of Simeon’s relics in Zadar nor their initial reception and elevation. What is known is that the secular and civic connections with Simeon’s relic continued in reality as well as myth. In 1632, when Simeon’s body was translated from the remains of St Mary the Great (since 1571 known as the chapel of St Roche) to the church of St Stephen, the relic’s original marble arca was opened. (Fig. 4.3) In it was a list of local nobleman from the year 1283, with at least one representative from each elite family. Whether the proximity of the family names to the relics was a means of ensuring good fortune and protection, as

---

18 Fondra (1855), pp. 69-70.
proposed by Fondra, is unclear. It might have been that these secular representatives oversaw the official celebrations surrounding Simeon’s arrival in Zadar or the translation of his body into a new arca.19 The presence of this list in conjunction with the rectors’ role in the translation legend and the choice of St Mary the Great as the site of Simeon’s shrine - rather than the traditional loci of ecclesiastical and spiritual power such as the cathedral, Benedictine monastery or a mendicant church - indicate that this was a saint’s cult over which the secular authorities held sway. In the thirteenth century the cathedral had the body of St Anastasia and was undergoing important structural changes that would make her marble arca and relic a focus within the church space. In 1285 the cathedral was reconsecrated and dedicated to her.20 This all suggests that the archbishop was concerned with the promotion of a saint and relics within his own control and in which much had been invested.

Meanwhile, the Mendicants were proving a powerful force in Christendom as promoters of new saint cults. Their preferred candidates tended to come from the ranks of their own members or the contemporary laity. Sermons were an effective means of promoting particular candidates for blessed or saintly status. St Louis of Toulouse, the subject of later discussion, was a prime example of this. 21 These sacred figures and their associated mythologies were easier to create and control than saints that came with a biblical pedigree and centuries of theological commentary. Well

organised, the Franciscans were very effective in promoting their chosen saints with preaching and the encouragement of lay patronage.

If the local secular authorities in Zadar wished to retain some control of St Simeon, it may have been desirable to avoid mendicant involvement in his cult. But the traditions and rituals that arose around St Simeon’s body were not impervious to the powerful influences of important contemporary mendicant saint cults. The only material remnant of St Simeon’s cult in Zadar - prior to the silver gilt arca of 1377-80 - is a high relief effigy of the prophet that was part of the original stone arca. This is now the frontispiece of the high altar in the church of St Simeon. (Fig. 4.3) If one considers the larger regional context for this stone sarcophagus, it might be possible to reconstruct some sense of its form and function.

The arrival of Simeon’s body in Zadar during the thirteenth century coincided with the spectacular establishment and development of mendicant saint cults. The most significant of these - St Dominic at Bologna, St Peter Martyr at Sant’Eustorgio in Milan and St Anthony of Padua - focussed upon the full bodies of the canonised friars. The tomb of St Dominic (1264-67) by Nicola Pisano (Figg. 4.4 & 4.5) was the first important departure from the tradition of recycling classical sarcophagae for saints’ relics. These sarcophagae had become a visual shorthand for sanctity.32 Pisano’s new arca, however, provided the prototype for the tombs of St Peter Martyr and St Anthony of Padua, (Figg. 4.6 & 4.7) with elaborate sarcophagae raised upon telamones or columns. The elevation of the arcas immediately created impressive, monumental objects that soared above the heads of the laity and friars.33 These were objects that stood out within the church space and highlighted their sacred status.

33 Louise Bourdua has also noted that in the case of St Anthony of Padua the elevation of the tomb was in contrast to that of St Francis, whose body was buried and thus inaccessible. St Anthony could now fulfil the demand of the faithful for greater accessibility that had hitherto been unavailable amongst Franciscans saints. Louise Bourdua, *The Franciscans and Art Patronage in Late Medieval Italy* (Cambridge:
Some of the narrative panels on the later silver shrine of St Simeon in Zadar indicate that the earlier stone arca was also elevated. (Fig. 4.26) The choice of solomonic columns for the stone coffer of St Simeon, rather than telamones or angels at this stage, suggests a closer affinity to the elevated tombs of the Veneto-Adriatic region, such as St Anthony of Padua’s tomb and that of Antenor in Padua. (Fig. 4.8) Both structures were erected during the second half of the fourteenth century.24 Therefore the original arca of St Simeon in Zadar united both mendicant and Veneto traditions of elevated tombs. What is noticeable about both the stone and silver arcas of St Simeon is that none of the regional comparisons, aside from the blessed Odorico di Pordenone in Udine, (Fig. 4.9) had an effigial component in their composition. This aspect of the Zaratine version, in conjunction with the columns raising the main sarcophagus up off the ground, has compelling resonances with the familial patronage practices of the House of Anjou, both Neapolitan and Hungarian.

4.2 Angevin Patronage: Naples and Hungary, 1280-1390

In the second half of the fourteenth century Simeon’s cult enjoyed a revival thanks to the important patronage of the Angevin crown of Hungary. In 1377 Elizabeth Kotromarić, consort of King Louis, commissioned the elaborate silver casket for the sacred Prophet.25 This was not just an act of personal devotion articulated with an ornate and expensive commission; considered in a larger European-wide framework, the silver shrine of St Simeon in Zadar was part of a grand programme of Angevin

---
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patronage in the family’s territories throughout the Mediterranean world, as well as a means of securing prestige and support in the rest of Christendom.

As seen in Chapter 3, the Hungarian House of Árpád also used the patronage of sacred sites and cults as a means of promoting their own dynastic sanctity and thus temporal ambitions. The comparison between the Holy Dexter of St Stephen and St Chrysogonus’ arm reliquary has already been made. The successful creation of cults around the holy Kings Stephen, Emeric and Ladislaus in the tenth century - as well as the promotion of St Elizabeth of Hungary and the Blessed Margaret (1242-1270) during the thirteenth - provided an appealing archetype of hereditary divinity for the royal houses throughout Europe. The Angevins of France and later Naples were swift to realise the power of such a model. Charles I of Anjou, first King of Naples and Sicily (1226-85), lobbied for the canonisation of his brother, King Louis IX of France (1215-1270). Charles created contact relics from Louis’ tunic that were displayed for public veneration in the royal abbey of Monreale near Palermo. Miracles then ensued. This context provided the opportunity for both ‘popular acclaim and clerical approval’ to flourish, the two elements identified by Vauchez as key to the successful launch of a saint’s cult. In this case, Charles I controlled both; he allowed public access to the relics and, were the cult to succeed, the abbey would benefit both spiritually and materially. It was in the abbey’s interest to support the veneration of Louis’ relics so generously granted by Charles.

King Louis IX was not canonised until 1297 but the cultivation of his sanctity was well underway. To enhance this association with more established claims of holiness Charles encouraged a number of marriages with the Árpád family. This was a powerful way of exploiting both the political and sacred capital afforded by such

27 See Chapter 5 in Ibid.
28 Ibid., p. 301.
connections. His own son, Charles II (1285-1309), married Mary of Hungary (c. 1255-1323), niece of the blessed Margaret. Their second son, Louis (1274-97), named after his saintly great uncle, was to achieve an equal, if not more exalted status. In 1296 young Louis gave up his claim to the Crown of Naples in order to follow a religious path, first joining the Franciscan order and then becoming Bishop of Toulouse. On the 19th August 1297 he died at the age of twenty-three, only a week after his great uncle’s canonisation. In 1300 Charles II and Louis’ brother, Robert the Wise (1309-43), pressed Pope Boniface VIII to canonise the young Franciscan bishop. To claim a mendicant saint in the family, the result of such illustrious Árpád and Angevin heritage of sanctity, would be an impressive coup.

As had been the case with the cult of Louis IX, the Neapolitan Angevins set about promoting the sacred nature of their latest blessed scion. This was a programme of patronage, propaganda and ritual that spread across a number of allied territories, including those subject to the Kingdom of Naples. This was all in anticipation of Louis’ canonisation, which occurred in 1317. On the 8th of November 1319, Robert the Wise oversaw the translation of Louis’ body to Marseille’s Franciscan church, forging

---


32 To begin with, Robert the Wise (1309-43) paid his Franciscan chaplain four hundred florins to compile a list of miracles associated with Louis of Toulouse, a project that coincided with the 1276 ruling by the Franciscans’ General Chapter in Padua encouraging friars to document the lives and miracles of any saintly brothers. This mendicant connection also meant that sermons became a powerful means of promoting Louis’ sacred nature, particularly in relation to his dynastic connections with the royal saints from Hungary, France and the Carolingian Empire. Robert the Wise himself wrote a number of sermons emphasising the connection between the Árpád and Angevin dynasties. More overt secular endorsements of the cult were also made. By 1306, whilst he was his father’s representative in Provence, Robert had started an annual donation of twenty-five livres to celebrate in Marseille the anniversary of Louis’ death. A confraternity dedicated to the Franciscan Angevin was already established in the city, indicating the lay acceptance of Louis’ sacred status already in existence before 1307 when an official ecclesiastical enquiry was launched to investigate his sanctity. Hoch (1995), p. 31; Vauchez (1997), pp. 117 & 227; Klanczyz (2002), pp. 305-6 & 310-11.

33 Pope John XXII (1316-1334) oversaw the canonisation. As a young priest in 1297, James Duèse of Cahors had known Louis personally when he lived in Toulouse. Once he became Bishop of Avignon, James was part of Robert the Wise’s entourage whenever the prince - later King - would visit Marseille. This connection proved advantageous when in 1316 James was elevated to the position of Pope, thanks to the support of his powerful Angevin patrons. These associations and events probably played a part in his decision to canonise Louis in 1317. Hoch (1995), p. 25; Klanczyz (2002), p. 306.
even stronger ties between the secular and spiritual identities of the House of Anjou. After this event, a three-day fair was held annually in the city to celebrate the feast of St Louis of Toulouse. This was an effective way of improving the royal saint’s popularity amongst the laity and helped disseminate his cult beyond the immediate confines of his tomb at Marseille.³⁴

Popular fairs were not the only way of promoting and spreading Louis’ cult: the translation ceremony of 1319 also created multiple body relics. These were then given to Angevin supporters from both the lay and ecclesiastical realms of society, a strategy earlier deployed by King Ladislaus in Hungary.³⁵ This tactic not only generated more loyalty for the house of Anjou but also continued the promulgation of Louis’ veneration well beyond the urban centres of Provence. This was not intended as a local cult. Louis’ brain and an arm bone went back to Naples with Robert. Members of the royal family commissioned reliquaries for them.³⁶ The brain was given to and displayed at the Franciscan church of Sta Chiara.³⁷ In either 1337 or 1338 Robert’s wife, Sancha of Aragon commissioned a reliquary for the arm bone. The Sienese goldsmith, Lando di Pietro, produced a beautiful crystal reliquary, topped by a right hand giving a gesture of benediction.³⁸ (Fig. 4.10) Sancha’s grandmother was Yolanda of Hungary, half sister of King Béla IV and St Elizabeth. As the Neapolitan Angevins were very conscious of the Árpáds’ successful promotion of their dynastic saint cults, might the choice of both an arm bone and head as relics refer to the relics of St Stephen of Hungary?³⁹

---

³⁷ The reliquary and brain were displayed for almost thirty years, until 1348 when Joanna I of Anjou, in dire need of money, sold it to the Genoese Grimaldi family for 3,300 ounces of gold. Its current location is unknown. Hoch (1995), p. 25.
³⁹ As we know, St Stephen’s head relic was sent to Zagreb at the end of the eleventh century at the behest of King, later saint, Ladislaus. To complement this, over the course of the thirteenth century the cult surrounding the Holy Dexter in the Benedictine abbey of Szentjob or Szent Jobb in Berettyóújfalu had enjoyed a revival. This culminated in 1304 with the use of the Holy Dexter during the coronation of
Within the mendicant, primarily Franciscan, churches and convents of Naples the Angevins also commissioned monumental pieces to commemorate their dynastic sanctity. Franciscan institutions within Naples had already enjoyed decades of patronage from the Angevins and their Árpád wives so these were spaces ready and willing to display objects and images commissioned by the family.\(^{40}\) Frescoes,\(^{41}\) panel paintings\(^ {42}\) and impressive family tombs were the results of such generous royal patronage.

The family tombs were especially noteworthy, combining the physical aspect of the temporal (in the guise of the royal body) and symbolic imagery of the sacred (with images of the deceased’s saintly forebears). They were designed for a large audience, both lay and ecclesiastic, and proved a successful medium that promoted images of the royal house’s own circle of familial saints. The elevated tomb of Catherine of Austria, daughter-in-law of Robert the Wise and niece by marriage to St Louis of Toulouse, depicts the Franciscan saint on the central panel of her elevated sarcophagus in San Lorenzo Maggiore. (Figg. 4.11 & 4.12) St Elizabeth of Hungary is also one of the saints on her sarcophagus.\(^ {43}\) Mary of Hungary’s effigy (1323-36) was atop a relief showing her

---

\(^{40}\) Mary of Hungary had founded the Clarissan convent of Sta Maria Domina Regina in 1293 and funded its rebuilding after an earthquake in 1297. She was also an important supporter of San Giovanni a Nido. Following his mother’s example, in 1310 Robert and Sancha of Aragon founded Sta Chiara, where St Louis’ brain was held from 1319 until 1348. The royal couple also sponsored the General Chapter of 1316, which was held for one month at San Lorenzo Maggiore, yet another Franciscan foundation. Caroline A. Bruzelius, ‘Hearing Is Believing: Clarissan Architecture, ca. 1213-1340’, *Gesta*, 31 / 2 (1992), pp. 86-7; Hoch (1995), p. 25; Klanciczy (2002), p. 304.


\(^{42}\) In 1317 Simone Martini produced the magnificent altar panel of St Louis of Toulouse, depicting Robert the Wise kneeling before his brother, the bishop and friar saint. Whether the panel was originally for the Franciscan churches of Sta Chiara or San Lorenzo Maggiore is unknown but both had chapels dedicated to Louis. Hoch (1995), pp. 28 & 29.

\(^{43}\) Ibid. p. 28; Klanciczy (2002), p. 312.
seven sons. St Louis, the dynasty’s sacred culmination, is the central figure.\(^4\) (Fig. 4.13) On the tomb of Charles of Calabria from 1332 - 33 at Sta Chiara, (Fig. 4.14) Tino di Camaino depicted Charles kneeling before the Virgin Mary. His two intercessors are his uncle, St Louis of Toulouse and his earlier holy ancestor, St Louis IX.\(^5\)

This artistic promotion of the Angevin and Árpád saints was not confined to Naples. Marseille obviously was a focus of Angevin support in both its secular and spiritual manifestations. As noted above, the Friars Minor and Dominicans were invaluable conduits for the advancement of these royal saints. In Assisi, the very centre of Franciscan spiritual and liturgical life, saints from both royal houses are depicted in the St Martin fresco cycle in the Lower Church of St Francis and a chapel dedicated to Elizabeth of Hungary was also founded.\(^6\) In the Dominican churches at Bologna and Milan - where the Order of Preachers preserved the bodies and tombs of Saints Dominic and Peter Martyr respectively - the Blessed Margaret of Hungary was also the focus of particular veneration.\(^7\) All of this not only created for the house of Anjou what Vauchez described as ‘a glorious past in order to legitimize its present situation’ but also the potential for a glorious future.\(^8\) That future and the continuing advancement of the sacred dynasty was to be found in Hungary.

The Angevin claim to the Hungarian throne after the death of the last Árpád, Andrew III, in 1300 created another channel for the transmission of dynastic saint cults. In 1301 the thirteen-year-old Charles Robert, nephew of Robert the Wise, was crowned in Esztergom and ushered in eighty years of Angevin rule.\(^9\) During the fourteenth century it was predominantly the consorts of the Angevin Kings, women

\(^7\) Klaniczay (2002), p. 337.
from the royal houses of the Balkans and Central Europe, who continued these strategies of patronage and cult promotion as a means of enhancing the dynasty’s political capital. The most influential of these women was Elizabeth Piast, daughter of Władysław I Łokietek, duke of Cracow and then King of Poland (1320-33). She became Charles Robert’s fourth wife in 1320.50 A trip to Naples in 1333 to negotiate the marriage of her son Andrew to Joanna, granddaughter of Robert the Wise, exposed the family’s Hungarian branch to the creative devotional practices surrounding the cults of St Louis of Toulouse and Saint Louis IX.

Soon after this expedition, the Angevin Hungarians followed the lead of their Neapolitan cousins. They established mendicant institutions and patronised familial saint cults in their immediate environment as a way of supporting their position as monarchs. Between 1336 and 1340, a tomb was built for the blessed Margaret at the Dominican convent Margaret Island in the Danube close to Óbuda (Buda). An unknown mason produced the arca in a Neapolitan manner, very similar to the style of Tino di Camaino’s workshop.51 Elizabeth Piast also established a large Clarissan convent in Óbuda (1343-49) that was attached to the Queen’s residence, seemingly in response to the practice instigated by Mary of Hungary when she founded the convent of Sta Maria Domina Regina in Naples.52

Elizabeth spread the importance of the dynasty’s cults well beyond the borders of Hungary and with that the temporal power of the family itself. After the death of Charles Robert in 1343 and an unstable political situation in Naples, Elizabeth set out

52 In 1358 the convent was granted a papal indulgence that allowed King Louis and the Queen Mother, Elizabeth to enter whenever they wanted. The Óbuda convent, however, no longer exists and there is no record of any commission, artistic programme or rituals that glorified the family saints there. Klaniczay (2002), p. 336.
to prop up the Hungarian claim to the Neapolitan throne. On her trip to the Italian peninsula, she visited the Dominican friaries in Bologna and Milan, which (as noted above) were important centres for the cult of the blessed Margaret of Hungary. She gave an altarpiece to the Basilica of St Nicholas in Bari and an altar cloth to St Peter's in Rome. The altar cloth was embroidered with the words *Regina Ungariae*: there could be no doubt as to the donatrix. Along with the dedicatory inscription were the figures of the Madonna, Saints Peter and Paul, the Hungarian King saints Stephen, Emeric and Ladislaus with the Angevin saints Louis IX and Louis of Toulouse as well as the blessed Margaret.

Although Elizabeth's beneficence did not achieve the anticipated support for her son Andrew, nonetheless it successfully promoted the family's saint cults on the Italian peninsula and well beyond. Pilgrims from all over Christendom came to Bari, Bologna, Milan and Rome to venerate the bodies of, respectively, Saints Nicholas, Dominic, Peter Martyr and Peter. To such an audience it would have given the Angevin and Árpád saints an increased sense of legitimacy when their images and royal donations were juxtaposed with the shrines and relics of such important saints. When these international pilgrims went home, the iconography, legitimacy and cultic qualities of the royal saints dispersed throughout Europe. To reinforce this dissemination, Elizabeth Piast travelled in 1357 to Aachen, Charlemagne's royal capital, where she established a 'Hungarian chapel' next to the cathedral. Later her son, King Louis, sent relics of the three Hungarian Kings to the chapel. After Aachen, Elizabeth travelled to Cologne to visit the shrine of the three Magi. There she also founded another chapel dedicated to the Hungarian Kings. Finally, the Queen went to visit the

---

tomb of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary in Marburg, a pilgrimage not only to honour and
evenerate a saint but also the memory of an ancestor.56

Elizabeth Piast became highly skilled at promoting the family saints as a means
of furthering dynastic ambition. The patronage of the Árpád and Angevin saints
encouraged their veneration across Europe and gave the families both divine and
temporal legitimacy. That way political power was assured.

4.2.1 Angevin patronage in Zadar, 1358-1390

Chapter 2 presented an analysis of how Hungarian Angevin rule over Zadar was
achieved by a combination of personality, presence and patronage. The latter was very
important in establishing a royal presence by proxy in the absence of the King of
Hungary or his deputy, the Count of Croatia and Dalmatia. Zadar’s strategic
significance and wealth made it a vital territory for the application of these dynastic
and cultic tactics developed by the Neapolitan and Hungarian Angevins. As we have
seen, the Mendicants were an indispensable means of transmitting the royal cults and
Zadar was no exception to this. In 1358, the Peace of Zadar was signed in the sacristy of
St Francis.57

During the period of Angevin rule in the city, the friary also received a silver
gilt processional cross, briefly mentioned in Chapter 3. It is decorated with twenty
enamel medallions. (Fig. 3.14) The central medallion depicts the Crucifixion on one
side and an Imago Pietatis on the other. The other enamels portray a number of saints,
including local figures such as Saints Chrysogonus and Anastasia.58 There are also

56 Ibid., p. 342.
57 Petricioli (1983), p. 8; Marijana Kovačević, ‘Ophodni križ - još jedan anžusiški ex voto u Zadru?
(Processional cross - another Angevin ex voto in Zadar?), Radovi Instituta za Povijest Umjetnosti, 31
Lincoln, 2009), p. 78; Marijana Kovačević, Umjetnička obrada plemenitih metala u Zadru u 14. stoljeću (The
58 The missing enamels may also have included Donatus and Zoilus. Kovačević (2007), p. 34.
images of saints associated with the Friars Minor, such as St Francis, Anthony of Padua, St Clare, St Nicholas, St Elizabeth of Hungary and St Louis of Toulouse, the latter two held in particular esteem by the Angevin dynasty. In front of St Louis is a small, kneeling donor figure in rich clothing with an uncovered head. (Fig. 3.16) In her recent article on the processional cross, Marijana Kovačević identified the donor figure as Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić on the basis that certain panels on the silver coffer of St Simeon are traditionally assumed to depict the Queen with her head uncovered. As shall be discussed later in this chapter, this royal identification of a number of female figures in the St Simeon panels is unlikely to be correct and therefore it cannot be assumed that the donor figure in the Franciscan processional cross was also Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić.

Thus there is no information about the patron behind the processional cross’ commission. Nonetheless, this object does have currency. The clever combination of mendicant saints and royal saints with the local communion of patron saints emphasised the political and spiritual connections between the Dalmatian territory and the Angevin Kings of Hungary. This is a flattering comparison; Zadar’s Early Christian saints are equal to the superstars of contemporary Christendom such as Saints Francis, Anthony of Padua and Louis of Toulouse. This in addition to the portable cross’s portability made it a powerful object that brought the images of the saints into the city’s public space or simply into the ecclesia laicorum of St Francis.

The examination of Angevin patronage networks across Europe reveals how the silver shrine of St Simeon sits in a complex framework of monumental art, political capital and genuine devotion. Yet the particulars of the strategic patronage employed by Elizabeth Kotromarić were not identical to those of the Neapolitan Angevins, nor of

---

59 This was particularly relevant to the city of Zadar as its Clarissan convent was dedicated to St Nicholas.
60 Louis I of Hungary was named after his great uncle, St Louis of Toulouse, who in turn was named after his great uncle, Saint Louis IX of France.
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her mother-in-law, Elizabeth Piast of Poland. Rather, the case of St Simeon in Zadar seems to be an evolution of the Angevin programme of dynastic promotion, tailored to the specific milieu of the commune and the personal demands of the royal patron.

For centuries Angevin and Árpád familial patronage and veneration had been focussed on cultivating the sanctity of members from their own dynasties. Although an important biblical saint, Simeon the Prophet was not one of the ‘family’ and so his promotion is unusual. Another aspect that seems anomalous to the Angevin patterns of patronage is that St Simeon’s remains were held by the collegiate church of St Mary the Great. This was not a mendicant institution, but, as we shall see, the mendicant influence was never far away. Yet in the 1350s Elizabeth Piast, Elizabeth Kotromanić’s mother-in-law, had already begun to extend her gift giving to other ecclesiastical institutions, such as the establishment of Hungarian chapels at the cathedrals in Aachen and Cologne.62 In the context of Zadar, we have an instance in 1378 when the younger Elizabeth gave 200 florins to the cathedral fabricceria in order to help pay for the restoration of an altar dedicated to St Elizabeth of Hungary.63 Therefore, the Queen’s financing of Simeon’s silver shrine at a collegiate church was not a complete anomaly.

Also, the family tombs of the Neapolitan Angevins in the early fourteenth century were an elaborate and monumental means of promoting dynastic sanctity and political propaganda. These secular arcades had carved effigies of the deceased atop caskets decorated with carved figures of both lay and sainted family members. The sarcophagae were embellished with baldacchini and placed on top of columns.

Although the majority were attached to the walls of the great Neapolitan churches, the

---

62 See above.
63 Half of this document from the 4th May 1378 has been severely water damaged. DAZD, SZB, Petrus Perećanus (1365-1392), B. 2, Fasc. 7, Istrumenti (1373-1381), fol. 18v. See also Ana Munk, ‘The Queen and Her Shrine: An Art Historical Twist on Historical Evidence Concerning the Hungarian Queen Elizabeth, née Kotromanić, Donor of the Saint Simeon Shrine’, Hortus Artium Medievalium, 10 (2004), p. 253. It is interesting to note that by the time of the Apostolic Visitation in 1579 the altar no longer existed. ASVat, Congregatio Vescovi e Regolari, Visite Apostoliche, n. 80, ff. 34v-35v.
tomb of Catherine of Austria from 1323 is free standing and has solomonic columns, a configuration that is very similar to that of the stone arca of St Simeon depicted on the silver shrine in Zadar. (Figgs. 4.11 & 4.26) This as well as the effigial aspect of the St Simeon stone arca would have provided a visual cue of the great Angevin tombs, a typology that had spread to Hungary through the conduit of Queen Elizabeth Piast.

To the Hungarian Angevins, St Simeon’s stone arca would have been a familiar example of what Hahn has described as a ‘visual rhetoric of sanctity’, but in this instance one that was quite particular to their dynasty and its whole imperial identity. A part of this identity, certainly within the context of Zadar, was the besting of Hungary’s regional enemy and Zadar’s former imperial ruler, the Republic of Venice. That city also claimed the body of St Simeon. Might Elizabeth Kotromarić’s patronage have also been a means of undermining the Venetian claim and thus its authenticity? The patron’s original intention can never be really known but what does exist are the documents associated with the arca’s commission.

4.3 Function and Form: The Shrine of St Simeon 1380-1570

On the 5th July 1377, five Zaratine noblemen - Francesco and Paulo de Giorgio, Mapheo de Matafari, Grisogono de Civalleliis and Francesco de Çadulin - on behalf of Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić commissioned the goldsmith Francesco di Antonio of Sesto near Milan ‘to produce a silver arca in which the said holy body [of St Simeon] would be placed and conserved...’. Francesco had to base his work upon a drawing of the planned arca, which included a scene of the Presentation at the Temple, as well as

---

64 Kovačević (2009), p. 117.
66 The documents of the notary Petrus Perecanus (1365-1392) were severely water damaged during the course of the twentieth century so only part of the original contracts are legible today. Nonetheless, what remains of the contract can be found at DAZD, SZB, Petrus Perecanus (1365-1392), B. 2, Fasc. 6, Instrumenti (1373-1381), fol. 13v-14r. The contract was recently transcribed and published in its entirety in Marijana Kovačević’s recent doctoral thesis. Kovačević (2009), pp. 1365-69. This has been reproduced in Appendix D- The Commission of St Simeon’s Silver Arca.
67 ‘...fabricandi arcam unam argenteam in qua dictum corpus sanctum reponetur et conseruetur...’ See Appendix D- The Commission of St Simeon’s Silver Arca.
other figures. He would receive 1,000 marks of silver with which to create the arca,
given to him in instalments of fifty marks. The fee would be one gold florin per mark
of silver used and there would be an additional two hundred florins for his work.68 On
the 29th July 1379 the commission was still not complete and so Francesco had to hire
an assistant, Mihovil quondam Damjan, to help finish the work.69

The arca as it exists today is a sarcophagus with a trapezoidal lid that contains
the relic of St Simeon. (Fig. 4.1) The main body of the pine coffer is covered on all sides
with a silver gilt cover made up of square narrative panels divided up by spiral-fluted
columns topped by angels’ heads.70 On one side of the lid is an effigy of the bearded
prophet, sporting a halo and clothed in a richly decorated tunic and cloak, the latter
closed at the chest by an ornate brooch. (Fig. 4.15) On the other side of the lid are
three further narrative panels. (Fig. 4.16) The section of the sarcophagus under the
effigy today opens up to expose the body behind a glass panel. (Fig. 4.17) On the back
of this door are further narrative panels and the interior of the arca also has silver gilt
figures in relief. Today’s construction, however, is not true to the original. Although all
the external panels and those on the back of the opening door are the work of
Francesco da Milano, those on the interior are a later addition from 1497 by Tomaso di
Martino of Zadar.71

After this first documented intervention the arca remained at St Mary the
Great until its demolition in 1570. The casket was moved to the bell tower of the
Benedictine convent of St Mary. For the next sixty years it remained there and when it
was brought out in 1630 the silver gilt was so damaged by damp and the sea air that it

68 Francesco da Milano received his two hundred florins on the 13th August of that same year. DAZD, SZB,
Petrus Perecanus (1365-1392), B. 2, Fasc. 6, Instrumenti (1373-1381), ff. 27v-28r. See also Appendix D- The
Commission of St Simeon’s Silver Arca.
71 Petricioli (1983), p. 12; Nikola Jakšić and Radoslav Tomić, Umjetnička baština zadarske nadbiskupije:
was black.\textsuperscript{72} Constantino Piazzalunga of Venice and Benedetto Libani of Zadar undertook a more comprehensive restoration in that same year. These goldsmiths added the panel partitions of solomonic columns with angel heads. Since Lorenzo Fondra in the seventeenth century scholars have written that Libani and Piazzalunga also shortened the casket by 4 inches and made it slimmer by a further 3 inches.\textsuperscript{73}

In fact, a restoration undertaken in the 1980s - the results of which were not published until 2009 - indicated that there had been no such intervention: the pine coffer and thus its silver gilt layer were the same length and width today as they had been in 1380.\textsuperscript{74} The restoration also revealed that the pine coffer did have a hinged opening but it was originally on the back lid of the arca and not the front façade.\textsuperscript{75} The glass panes that are seen today when the façade is opened were a nineteenth-century addition that replaced four older crystal panels. These were inserted so that pilgrims could see the relic during its annual exposition on the saint’s feast day of the 8\textsuperscript{th} October.\textsuperscript{76} As we shall see, whilst the 1377 contract stipulated that the arca was meant to contain the relic, this was not originally the case. The 1494 account of Pietro Casola, Milanese deacon and pilgrim (of which more below), noted that the body was not in the silver arca. There is no documentary evidence from 1497 to indicate that the relic was moved into the silver reliquary after the first restoration. It might conceivably have been as late as the official translation of the relics in 1632 to the church of St Stephen, today the church of St Simeon,\textsuperscript{77} before the body was placed within the coffer.

\textsuperscript{74} Kovačević (2009), p. 1073.
\textsuperscript{75} Ibid., p. 1074.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., p. 1071.
Although the coffer has not been shortened, the closure of the arca’s original opening and the insertion of the new, hinged façade does have implications for the narrative sequencing of the silver gilt panels as we see them today. Quite simply, they are incoherent and puzzling, probably rearranged after one of the earlier restorations. This may contribute in some part to the debates about the stories behind elements of the iconography. As shall be discussed below, compositional elements within some of the scenes may lead to a better reconsideration of the sequencing.

4.3.1 The Silver Reliquary of St Simeon

This problematic sequencing issue demands that the analysis of the arca’s accepted iconography will follow the order of panels that exists today. To begin with, the central panel of the front façade depicts the Presentation at the Temple, with a clear reference to the model by Giotto of 1305 from the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua. (Fig. 4.18) Moving clockwise around the arca, the scene to the left represents the local legend of the saint’s discovery in Zadar: the city’s three rectors discuss their shared dream, whilst the monks dig up the body of the saint buried in the cemetery of their hospital. (Fig. 4.19) Continuing around to the end of the arca is a higher-level triangular compartment. (Fig. 4.20) It contains the coat of arms, helmet and crown in which the Angevin lilies are combined with the bands of the Hungarian crown. This gives a fitting emphasis to the pan-Christendom network of royal patronage of which this silver gilt reliquary is firmly a part. Beneath the panel is another scene from the translation myth of St Simeon, illustrating the moment when the ship that carried his
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body from the Holy Land was struck by a storm, which ultimately drove the crew and thus the relic into the port at Zadar.\(^82\) None of the figures on the ship have their hands clasped in prayer, which emphasises their ignorance of the saint’s physical presence. The arms of some of the men are thrown up in shock and draw the viewers’ eyes either up to the satanic source of the storm - a demon keen to sink and destroy the relics - or the saviour of the ship and its sailors, St Simeon himself.

At this point a brief comparison between this panel and a rather important iconographic model is necessary as a means of underlining the cultural currents between the Italian peninsula and the Dalmatian coast. As the goldsmith Francesco came from Milan, he would have been familiar with the shrine of St Peter Martyr at the church of Sant’Eustorgio. (Fig. 4.6) Giovanni di Balduccio of Pisa produced the tomb for the saint’s body in 1339, creating a historiated sarcophagus with carved narrative panels on the sides depicting scenes from the saint’s life. These panels are divided by sculptures of the doctors of the church. On top of the sarcophagus is a trapezoidal cover with a tabernacle housing the Madonna, Child and Saints Peter Martyr and Dominic. Triangular panels on the cover also have profile portraits of kneeling donors, both lay and ecclesiastic such as the King and Queen of Cyprus, the Dominican Cardinal Matteo Orsini, the Dominican archbishop Giovanni Visconti and his nephew, Azzone Visconti, signore of Milan. The whole sarcophagus is raised up on eight columns covered with sculptured Virtues.\(^83\)

This prototype of a sacred yet contemporary interpretation of a saint’s shrine had an influence on the design of St Simeon’s silver arca in Zadar. The most obvious instance is in the ship scenes on both chests. The Shipwreck (Fig. 4.21) of the Milanese arca depicts sailors off the coast of Genoa, who were threatened by a storm. They

prayed to Peter Martyr for his intercession and were saved.\textsuperscript{84} The panel shows a galley tossed about by the energetic waves beneath. A sailor on the stern clasps his hands in prayer and gazes upward, whereupon St Peter Martyr himself, larger than life, appears out of the sky. His right hand is held in a gesture of benediction and his left clasps the ship’s mast that is dangerously out of balance. The sailors below scurry about, either in fear or frantically trying to save the ship. This panel is on the front of the stone arca, whereas the Zaratie version is at the end of the silver gilt coffer.

Forty years on from Balduccio’s \textit{Shipwreck}, Francesco da Milano took the model and enhanced it. The ship is on the same axis as that in Milan, the sailor at the stern and the intercessory saint are still in their correct locations but the Zaratie scene contains more drama and props. The waves are even larger but now caskets and barrels thrown overboard from the ship are in the water. The ship is a double-masted galley and the prosperity of the sailors is more apparent by the clothes that they wear and the merchandise that they are handling. Adding further to the miraculous nature of the event, a demon is depicted in the top left corner, appearing to shake the billowing sail. St Simeon’s arm, also in a gesture of benediction like that of St Peter Martyr, is outstretched towards the demonic figure, almost as if the viewer is witnessing the moment before an exorcism. Francesco da Milano’s dramatic local interpretation of the \textit{Shipwreck} scene brought with it the additional prestige and enhancement associated with a major mendicant pilgrimage site. The shipwreck scene thus amplified the status of the precious relics, its royal patroness and the local community.

Returning to the iconographic discussion, on the back of the arca is a panel split into two scenes. (Fig. 4.22) On the right is the smaller scene that makes reference to the interior of the church of St Mary. A young boy kneels beneath the arca praying

for the saint’s intercession. This same boy is found again on the left, his arms gesturing towards the object of his prayers. The larger scene on the left is a bedroom or the interior of a hospice with curtains as a backdrop. In a bed, either dead or sleeping, is an old man. Behind him stand two women, one young with an uncovered head and one old with her head covered. Both seem distressed. At the top of the bed stands St Simeon, resting his hand on the old man’s head giving either a gesture of benediction or comfort.

This scene has been interpreted as the 1353 death of the Ban of Bosnia, Stjepan Kotromarić, father of Elizabeth Kotromarić.\footnote{Stjepan had been a vassal of Ban Mladen II Šubić and in 1318 was given the title of Ban of Bosnia. Although loyal to Mladen, even after his downfall in 1322, Stjepan remained Ban when Charles Robert demanded that the position report directly to the King of Hungary, rather than remain as a vassal of the Ban of Croatia. During Stjepan’s banship the mines of Bosnia became an important economic driver in the region and Stjepan was keen to encourage trade routes and deals with potential exporters, primarily the Ragusans or Dubrovčani. The fact that his daughter was able to marry Charles Robert’s son, Louis, gives some indication of the power, wealth and influence Stjepan enjoyed at the Angevin court of Hungary. Fine Jr. (1987), pp. 211-12 & 283.} The younger woman and the youth praying to St Simeon have been identified respectively as Elizabeth and Tvrtko, nephew of Stjepan and King of Bosnia since 1377. Fondra wrote that the image depicted the death of the old Ban, surrounded by his wife, daughter and nephew but did not name the Ban in question. In 1903 Luka Jelić first suggested that it was Stjepan Kotromarić and this interpretation has since gained currency amongst many Croatian art historians.\footnote{Fondra (1855), p. 119; L. Jelić, Sveti Šimun Bogoprimac: Pučke pisme na uspomenu devetnaeste stogodišnjice smrti Svetoga Šimuna Proroka, čije se moći u Zadru časte (St Simeon God’s Cleric: Popular writings in commemoration of the nineteenth centenary of St Simeon the Prophet’s death, whose relics are in Zadar) (Zadar: 1903), as noted in Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 110; Kovačević (2009), pp. 1088-90.} Ivo Petricioli suggested that although Ban Stjepan was accused of participating in the Bogomil heresy rife in Bosnia, this scene was a means by which Elizabeth could confirm his Catholicism and ensure salvation for his soul.\footnote{Petricioli (1983), p. 18. Regarding the mendicant response to the Cathar and Bogomil heresies, see C.H. Lawrence, The Friars: The Impact of the Early Mendicant Movement on Western Society, ed. David Bates, The Medieval World (Harlow & New York: Longman Publishing, 1994), p. 4.} As Jakšić and Tomić commented however, if it was believed that Ban Stjepan was a heretic, why
depict him as a Christian?\textsuperscript{88} Ana Munk went further and construed the purported young figure of Tvrtko as a symbol of Elizabeth’s hopes to unite Bosnia and Hungary as had been her father’s ambition. In this manner the silver shrine becomes a symbol of unification between the regional ambitions of the Kotromarić and Angevin dynasties.\textsuperscript{89}

But what relevance would such a symbol have to the people of Zadar? An emphasis upon the connections between the Angevin Hungarian crown and the local populace would make more sense. Also there is virtually nothing in this scene that supports the interpretation that this is the death of Ban Stjepan Kotromarić: no crowns, no heraldry, in short nothing that identifies the protagonists of this panel as anything other than characters from a local myth that supports the sanctity of St Simeon’s relics.\textsuperscript{90} As we shall see, other scenes are explicit in their use of visual cues that define the main participants as ‘Angevin’ and ‘royal’, thus giving those images an additional imperial and political cast.

Next to the Ban Stjepan scene is a dedicatory panel. (Fig. 4.23) On it are the words

Simeon the Just, who in his arms held Jesus, born of the Virgin, lies peacefully in this chest, which was offered with gentle pledges by the Queen of Hungary, the mighty, glorious and exalted Elizabeth the younger, in the year 1380.\textsuperscript{91}

Vauchez noted that ‘the act of the donor was also a piece of propaganda; what better way to show one’s gratitude to a saint than to make his or her name and power

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{88} Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 110. \\
\textsuperscript{89} Munk (2004), pp. 258-59. \\
\textsuperscript{90} Vidas (2008), pp. 162-3. \\
\end{flushright}
known?'. That was certainly the case for Elizabeth. If the cult of St Simeon already enjoyed popular approval then the Queen’s favour gave it additional legitimacy. This dedicatory panel and the juxtaposed donatrix portrait scene emphasise this. (Fig. 4.24) In the donatrix panel Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić, identified by her crown, hands the arca of St Simeon to the Prophet himself. Underneath the coffer are her three daughters, Catherine (1370-78), Mary (1371-95) and Hedwig (1373-1399). All wear crowns and kneel in prayer and supplication. This panel is an intimate and charmingly feminine scene: a mother with her three daughters. Poignantly, one had already died yet here she is, commemorated, alive and equal to her two sisters.

Yet the presentation of a royal gift to the saint is set in a fictive space, with a floral motif providing an unearthly backdrop to the events that are unfolding. All the other panels on the shrine are quite definite in the reference to a time and place with the use of contemporary costume, domestic or ecclesiastical interiors or sea- and cityscapes. For the viewer - a pilgrim or local supplicant - this gives the miracles a context and plausibility: they could happen today and in contemporary Zadar. But the scene of a Queen giving the prophet such a rich gift emphasises the sacred nature of both the Angevin Queen and the saint, giving veracity to the relics themselves. And so the silver gilt arca visually fulfils a number of elements necessary to confirm the sacred nature of the relic, such as its applicability to everyday life and its unique status as the beneficiary of royal patronage. Elizabeth would have benefited from the personal connections forged between herself and the saint with the donation of such a magnificent reliquary but the Zaratini would also have enjoyed the added benefit of

---

92 Ibid., p. 142.
royal and, by inference, divine recognition of their sacred relic.\textsuperscript{97} This royal connection may have helped the shrine in Zadar receive a papal indulgence by the end of the century.\textsuperscript{98}

The back of the arca’s lid also has three panels on it; the narratives for all of them are contested.\textsuperscript{99} On the far right is a scene with five tonsured clerics standing around the body of St Simeon in the arca. The saint’s arms hang loose, his mouth is open and a shroud has been draped on him from the chest down. This is not the dignified effigy with crossed arms that can be seen elsewhere. One of the clerics is also holding the leg of the saint, possibly trying to pull it off and so we may have captured a moment of *furta sacra*. Certainly this was Jelić’s interpretation in calling this scene the *Theft of the Holy Leg*.\textsuperscript{100} (Fig. 4.25) The grimace on the thief’s face and the fact that he is biting his own hand indicate some sort of attack of madness in punishment for desecrating the holy relic.

The central panel on the lid appears to set the scene within the church of St Mary the Great. (Fig. 4.26) A woman on the left reaches out or maybe urges forward a young man on bended knee who prays to St Simeon. On the left of the panel is an unusual depiction of a craftsman, with hammer and chisel in hand, creating the columns for the arca and attaching them to the sarcophagus. Recent Croatian scholarship has suggested that this panel depicts the creation of the silver coffer by Francesco da Milano.\textsuperscript{101} This seems unlikely, fitting as it is for the scene of the maker to be sited above the dedicatory panel and signature of the goldsmith. In the seventeenth century Lorenzo Fondra quoted a document of 1455, in which an old man of Zadar, Novachus quondam Miclo, remembered that in 1380 silver angels had originally held

\textsuperscript{97} Regarding the development of the ‘sacral nature of temporal (imperial, royal and princely) authority’ associated with the Hungarian monarchy see Klaniczay (2002), p. 115.

\textsuperscript{98} See below.


\textsuperscript{100} Fondra (1855), p. 119; Jakšić and Tomić (2004), pp. 112-114; Kovačević (2009), pp. 1094-5.

the silver arca.\textsuperscript{102} None of the silver gilt representations of St Simeon's arca depict these angelic supports. The craftsman represented on this panel appears to be a stonemason finishing off the capital of a solomonic column with his hammer and chisel. These are not the tools of a goldsmith. This is not an image of Francesco da Milano building the new, silver arca of 1380 but an image of the original, elevated stone arca and its construction.

The panel on the left contains two scenes that create a continuous narrative read from left to right. (Fig. 4.27) A group of richly dressed noblemen gather around the arca of St Simeon. One has his hand clasped together in prayer and another reaches out to touch the effigy. A tonsured priest watches or maybe witnesses this. On the left, the same nobleman who touched the arca collapses outside either a bell tower or stylised reference to a church exterior. This may be a warning to those who desecrate the holy relics by perjury.\textsuperscript{103} Certainly, within the context of Zadar the arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus was a sacred object over which the Zararini made oaths of allegiance to the Hungarian crown.\textsuperscript{104} Relics were important elements in the rituals of oath taking that were commonplace throughout medieval Europe.\textsuperscript{105} It is appropriate that such a significant mode of societal cohesion was depicted on the arca, as well as the consequences should an oath be taken lightly.

On the side of the arca, beneath another intricate panel with the Hungarian escutcheon and Angevin lilies, is a scene identified as Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić stealing the finger of St Simeon. (Fig. 4.28) Well-dressed men crowd the church

\textsuperscript{102} ‘Novachus de Milco quondam Micli civis Jdrae, annorum 88, prout asseruit, monitus, juratus, et diligent examinatus super praedictus, cum sacramento dixit... quod de anno 1380, vel circa, dum tempore serenissima regina Ungariae venit Jadram, pro accipiendo corpus sancti Simeonis cum arca argentea, nobiles Jdrae acceperunt quattor angelos argentos, qui erant sub arca ipsa, ubi vel penes quam nunc est corpus sancti Simeonis, et illos reposuerunt in camera suae Procuratiae.’ This examined testimony was from Zadar’s Camera de Procuratori and was written on the 12th April 1455. Fondra (1855), p. 123. See also Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 97; Kovačević (2009), p. 1069.
\textsuperscript{105} Geary (1990), p. 4; Klaniczay (2002), p. 146
interior and create an opportunity for Francesco da Milano to show off his skills with the depiction of drapery, feathers and embroidered textiles. These might even be portraits of prominent Zaratini whose identities have since been forgotten. On the left is a woman with a bare head who has opened the arca of St Simeon and reaches in towards the hand of the body. A very similar profile of a woman (possibly the same one if this is an instance of continuous narrative) peers out from between the shoulders of the two central male figures, her head turned toward the exit of the church. Fondra gave the first account of the narrative, followed by Bianchi and then translated into English by Thomas Jackson.106 The story provides the catalyst for the silver arca’s creation:

The younger Queen [Elizabeth Kotromarić], so says the legend, was so desirous of possessing a piece of the relic that she broke off a finger and hid it in her bosom, but she instantly lost her senses and only recovered them on restitution of her theft. The finger miraculously attached itself to the body, and the bosom of the Queen which had begun to mortify and breed worms was no less miraculously healed.107

Another version of the legend tells of Elizabeth stealing a finger from the relic as she hoped to have a son. But she could not physically leave the church until she returned the finger to the body.108 Like the scene supposedly depicting the death of Ban Stjepan Kotromarić, it seems unlikely that this was the original tale intended for the panel. Again, an absence of crowns and heraldry suggests that this was a local event, the main protagonist of which over time elided with the figure of Queen Elizabeth.109 New meaning was given to the panel as the original story was forgotten. What still exists in

---

106 Fondra (1855), pp. 97-99; Bianchi (1877), p. 49.
107 Jackson (1887), p. 314.
the narrative is the warning to the viewer of how relics could react if treated badly. Punishment was meted out to those who did not show the respect and faith that was necessary.\textsuperscript{110}

Moving to the front of the arca again, the panel on the right depicts the arrival of King Louis of Hungary into Zadar in 1357. (Fig. 4.29) On the right is the city’s port, full of ships and sailors, their heads all facing the King who is the central figure of the composition. The commune’s nobility and archbishop greet the King outside the fortified city walls, many kneeling before him.\textsuperscript{111} Above this activity is the arca of St Simeon. A number of Louis’ royal coats of arms can be seen on the city walls throughout the panel and the \textit{fleur de lis} on his crown also emphasise his Angevin heritage.

This scene memorialises the Zaratine connection to the Angevin cause. Above it all the relic of St Simeon gives protection to both the new territory and the King himself. The two groups are united by the divine intercession offered by the saint. This is probably the most important panel on the shrine for highlighting the political and imperial rhetoric deployed by the Angevins. If one considers how both this panel and that with Queen Elizabeth and her princess daughters have so many elements that emphasise their royal status and sacred connection to Simeon, it seems odd that further opportunities to do this would be missed. If indeed the \textit{Ban Stjepan} and \textit{Queen Elizabeth steals the finger of St Simeon} panels were narratives of events from the life of the royal family, then why would symbols of that regal status, so carefully cultivated by the Angevin dynasty, be omitted?

The scenes on the interior side of the front flap illustrate other local miracles associated with the holy relic. The panel on the left incorporates two aspects of one

\textsuperscript{110} Geary (1990), p. 21.
\textsuperscript{111} The archbishop depicted is Nicola Matafari (1333-67) whose nephew, Petrus, was archbishop (1376-1398) in 1380 when the shrine was completed. Bianchi (1877), pp. 47-51; Kovačević (2009), pp. 1081-3.
tale divided by a column. It starts with the exorcism of a young man possessed by a
demon and is followed by his prayers of thanks made beneath the arca of St Simeon.\footnote{Fondra (1855), p. 120; Kovačević (2009), pp. 1096-7.} (Fig. 4.30) The central panel depicts three parts of the one miracle. (Fig. 4.31) The first is the rescue of a drowning child and the next part tells of his recovery once his mother placed his body atop the arca of St Simeon.\footnote{Fondra (1855), pp. 103-4; Kovačević (2009), p. 1098.} The kneeling figure beneath the arca wears the same short tunic and medallion girdle as the drowning child and the prone body atop the arca so would be, like the formerly possessed man in the first scene, praying in thanks.

The final scene on the right is more complex. (Fig. 4.32) Fondra recounted a legend of a cleric unconvinced by the authenticity of St Simeon’s relics. Simeon appeared to him in a dream, a threatening figure wielding a sword who forcefully chastised the cleric for his terrible doubts. The cleric then returned to the pulpit proclaiming the sanctity of the relics.\footnote{Fondra (1855), p. 104.} This version does not explain why the cleric has an icon behind him of the Madonna and Child and a Man of Sorrows, nor why the cleric reaches up to touch the Christ Child. Jakšić and Tomić suggest that the scene may depict the conversion of a Bogumil heretic, but the details of the original narrative have been forgotten.\footnote{Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 115; Kovačević (2009), pp. 1098-9.}

What is striking about this panel are its compositional similarities to the Ban Stjepan scene. It is a mirror image with the same decorations upon the curtains, bed covers and wooden bed base. The Cleric panel is also split into two, with two thirds of the space for the bedroom and the final third depicting a church interior, in this instance containing a pulpit and icon instead of the shrine of St Simeon. A small thurible hanging on a chain provides a partition between the scenes instead of a solomonic column. The mood of this tale is much darker than that of the Ban Stjepan
image. Here a wrathful Simeon may strike the young cleric. In contrast the other panel illustrates a peaceful older man facing death or illness not only with the saint’s support but in the caring presence of the women and young man. The themes in the panels provide contrast too: youth with age; ecclesiastical with lay; aggression with tranquillity; friendless with loved. These are all telling juxtapositions for the faithful that emphasised the fruits of an ideal model of Christian behaviour. It seems likely that these panels were conceived of as a contrasting pair and therefore positioned as such.\(^\text{16}\) As noted above, the sequence of the panels has undergone a major shift. The more recent positioning of the Ban Stjepan scene, juxtaposed with the dedicatory panel and the donatrix portrait of Queen Elizabeth and her daughters, appears to have imbued the image with political nuances that were unlikely to have ever been intended.

What seems more likely is that the legends recounted in the secondary literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries only go back as far as the seventeenth century and are not medieval. Fondra was the earliest source and what he narrated were contemporary responses to the restored and probably reconfigured narrative panels. The arca had been hidden in the bell tower of the convent of St Mary from 1570 until 1630, emerging blackened from the humidity. Two generations of Zaratini had not seen the arca. This would have been enough time for people to forget some of the narratives associated with the panels, particularly if the legends were oral traditions rather than written accounts. With the revelation of the cleaned arca in its new site at St Stephen’s church the local population created novel narratives that fitted their own contemporary understanding of the commune’s history.

It is doubtful that the original sequence of the panels shall ever be known, but the themes and compositions of the narrative panels could provide a clue of what a

\(^{16}\) Marina Vidas has also commented upon this likelihood. Vidas (2008), p. 164.
medieval viewer would have seen. Aside from the ‘Royal’ panels, the Presentation at the Temple and the Dream of the Rectors, the scenes depicting miracles associated with the relic of the prophet alternate between tales of punishment and those of well-being:17 the comparison between the Heretical / Doubtful cleric and Ban Stjepan Kotromarić panels makes this clear. Therefore a possible reconstruction may have one side of the arca full of the ‘Royal’ panels, the other with the Presentation at the Temple flanked by the two bedroom scenes because in these the positive and negative experiences of the relic are made visible. (Fig. 4.33) The Presentation might also have been the central panel to the two figurative ‘Royal’ panels thus bringing further visual associations between the royal patrons and the sacred, biblical relics of St Simeon. The dedicatory panel may have been placed between the two bedroom scenes, and brought an Angevin presence into the local narrative, a presence in word rather than in image. (Fig. 3.34)

The remaining six panels might have been on either side of the flap that opened to gain access to the arca. Different narratives would have had different significance depending on whether the arca was open or shut, almost providing a visual commentary on the precious contents of the silver coffer. (Fig. 4.35) The three ‘Miraculous’ panels - The Exorcism, The Rescue from Drowning and the Construction of the Original Arca - all have a similar divisions of the compositional space created with architectural elements of the solomonic columns and arches. Aesthetically, it would be pleasing to have all three together thereby emphasising their uplifting message of hope. The ‘Sinners’ side could have The Perjuror and The Theft of St Simeon’s Foot flanking the Rectors’ dream. In the latter panel the rectors are about to discover the monks’ crime of burying the relic for their own benefit instead of offering it up for the good of the commune. The scenes at the end of the arca create a contrast between the

---
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 miracle of St Simeon saving the ship and the ambiguous furta sacra. Again, hope is juxtaposed with punishment. Marina Vidas’ hypothesis on the didactic nature of these panels, as a way of showing the faithful how to ask for the saint’s intercession and how to respond once it was received, seems very plausible particularly with one of these proposed sequences.\textsuperscript{108}

 There were also the local narratives that would have appealed to the faithful and given the shrine even more contemporary resonance and relevance. Panels depicting the discovery of the body by the rectors, the recognition of the relic, the creation of the stone arca, the miracles associated with his body and so forth, not only helped to forge the connection between the community and its newly rejuvenated saint cult, but also had a practical element to it as well; aside from the reference in the gospel of Luke, virtually nothing is known of Simeon.\textsuperscript{109} Viewers would ‘know’ more about the saint in the city’s care. The local legends as well as the ex voto scenes of Elizabeth Kotromarić with her daughters and the triumphant arrival of King Louis of Hungary into Zadar are what gave the saint’s relics relevance and meaning to the community and the shrine's royal patrons.

4.3.2 Space and Interaction

 The contribution of the silver arca to the cult of St Simeon would have necessitated a significant reconfiguration of the space and interaction with the saint’s relics. Before discussing the reconstructed chapel space, issues of function and material need to be considered. St Simeon’s arca clearly fits into the the typology of elevated sarcophagae. Scholars such as Italo Sordi, Anita Moskowitz, Joanna Cannon and André Vauchez, Donal Cooper, Michele Tomasi and Francesco Lucchini have examined how saint

\textsuperscript{108} Vidas (2008), p. 155.
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tombs and shrines aided devotional practice in a number of Italian case studies.\textsuperscript{120} Shrines and chapels that incorporated elevated arcae created a setting where many senses were stimulated. To begin with, elevating the tomb produced a visually arresting monument where the body of the saint seemed to rise up above the heads of the faithful, situated somewhere between Heaven and Earth. The focus of veneration was clear to all.\textsuperscript{121}

The raising of an arca also made accommodated the practical needs of supplicants, for them to touch and pass around or under the sacred bodies as a way of increasing the relic’s miraculous efficacy. An image from the Pala Feriale of 1345 depicts pilgrims passing beneath the tomb of St Mark the Evangelist.\textsuperscript{122} (fig. 5.11) Today in Milan, devotees walk under the arca of St Peter Martyr, touching the underside of the sarcophagus with their hands or heads or maybe a handkerchief that transforms into a sacred souvenir.\textsuperscript{123} (Fig. 4.36) This means of creating a personal contact relic by touching an object against a relic or reliquary took many forms such as pouring water over the tomb and then catching it as it dripped down, now sanctified.\textsuperscript{124} In the case of the fourteenth-century tombs belonging to the blessed Margherita of Cortona and the blessed Egidio of Assisi, expensive wax tapers or chains made of precious metal were wrapped around the sarcophagus and then offered to the saint as votive gifts.\textsuperscript{125}


\textsuperscript{121} Vidas (2008), p. 152.

\textsuperscript{122} As shall be discussed in Chapter 5, the tomb of St Mark in Venice was not accessible to the general public in the manner depicted on the Pala Feriale. Tomasi has written that the image of the elevated tomb was visual shorthand for a saint’s tomb, thus immediately recognisable as such to the fourteenth-century viewer. The fact that such a sepulchre did not exist for St Mark was neither here nor there. It was the image of sanctity - reinforced by accepted devotional practices of pilgrims and the faithful - that gave the cult its legitimacy. Tomasi (2008\textsuperscript{1}), p. 124.


\textsuperscript{124} Vauchez (1997), p. 430.

\textsuperscript{125} Cannon and Vauchez (1999), pp. 58-60; Cooper (2001), p. 241
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But what of the interaction between the massed faithful and the stone arca of St Simeon? Some of the silver shrine’s panels provide a glimpse of the practices surrounding the relics and the stone arca. The panels on the inside of the front door - visible only when the relic is exposed on the saint’s feast day - depict a number of miracles associated with the relic. Two of the scenes show a young man kneeling in prayer sub sepulcro gazing up at the arca. In one of these scenes a woman lays her dead son atop the tomb. The boy arises well and is cured. Simeon’s effigy is shown on the side of the coffer, thereby identifying the arca and associating the miracle with the blessed Prophet’s intervention. (Figg. 4.30 & 4.31) These panels suggest that soon after the recognition of Simeon’s body, the stone arca was lifted up onto solomonic columns. This provided greater access around the sarcophagus itself.

Devotional practice and interaction with the shrine took other forms. Evidence for this can be found in Zadar’s notarial archives. On the 31st October 1385 Mara de Mance of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), wife of Cressio de Rayniero de Varicassis, lodged her last will and testament. In it she demanded that

Item: it is required and wished for that at the arca of St Simeon the Just of Zadar be made one silver finger and one [fine] silver chain circled around the arca of the said holy body to the total value of two gold ducats.\(^{126}\)

The mention of ‘one silver finger’ suggests an ex voto object, either a three-dimensional sculpture or a small silver plaque upon which was stamped the image of a finger. This would be a small gesture of thanks to the saint, whose intercession had cured an affliction of the finger, possibly arthritis or a broken bone. It seems doubtful that the ‘silver finger’ in this will of 1385 is a reference to Elizabeth Kotromarić stealing

\(^{126}\) Item reliquit et voluit fieri ad arcam sancti Simoenis iusti de Jada unum digitum argenteum et unum filum argenterum circa arcam dicti corpus sancti valoris in totum duceorum duorum aurii’. DAZD, SZB, Articutius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), ff. 21v-23r.
the finger of St Simeon:127 as argued above, that legend was probably a seventeenth-century invention.

Mara de Mance’s request for a silver chain is a particularly interesting aspect of her will. As we have seen in the cases of the blessed Margherita of Cortona and Egidio of Assisi, to wrap such expensive metal strands or wax tapers was another ex voto gesture, one with thaumaturgical powers associated with the sacred object’s encirclement.128 Within the context of Zadar and the surrounding district, such a tradition of wrapping tapers or metal chains around sacred sites was also used in times of war as a means of intensifying an exhortation to heaven for divine protection. In 1394 just before the Zaratini attacked Pag town, the citizens of Pag encircled their collegiate cathedral of St Mary with ‘a girdle of virgin wax’.129 Clearly, this was a practice considered to have impressive powers, applicable not just to personal requests for intercession but also to the desperate demands of an entire community.

Returning to Mara de Mance, it seems probable that the intention was to wrap the silver chain around St Simeon’s shrine. If the city’s elite were commissioning silver chains for such an activity then one could assume, ex silencio, that supplicants also used cheaper wax tapers. These particular devotional objects and practices emphasise the site and permanence of the relic as this encircling would not be done on a portable reliquary. They could be carried but full body relics demanded that the devotee move around the static reliquary. Mara’s bequest also stresses the connection between the relic, the individual and the community. In the case of the Pagani, they were quite literally tied to the physical presence of the church in their hour of need. As for Margherita of Cortona, hers was also a more local cult. Of the many beneficiaries of

her miracles, the furthest travelled only came from 50km away.\textsuperscript{130} It seems that although Mara was originally from Dubrovnik her marriage into the Varicassis family had bound her tightly into Zadar’s communal veneration of St Simeon.

The next question is, what precisely would these chains have encircled? Mara’s will was written five years after the completion of Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić’s silver gilt shrine so the assumption is that the chain would be wrapped around this object as surely that would be where St Simeon’s body was. But Mara’s will only mentions the word ‘arca’ and does not specify the silver reliquary. This adds an element of ambiguity to Mara’s request.

As discussed above, touch was a key aspect in the rituals and expressions of veneration surrounding these sacred tombs. But stone or marble are much more durable mediums than silver gilt. Thousands of even the lightest touch of a hand or handkerchief - never mind the more demonstrative instances of interplay between the faithful and the holy tombs - would create a build-up of dirt that would have to be cleaned. In this instance a stone object is much easier to maintain than a work of metal. The silver shrine has already suffered the ill effects of maritime humidity at least once in its history, whereas stone, if not exposed directly to the sea air, survives much better. The sculptural elements of stone would also endure more than the low reliefs of the metal arca: many hands touching the silver gilt would soon wear out the details of narrative scenes. The gold leaf of the metal arca might also be a temptation for pilgrims, a contact relic that not only had spiritual but actual monetary worth. Taking all this into consideration it seems likely that Mara de Mance’s silver chain was wrapped around the original stone arca of St Simeon.

Having investigated the variety of devotional practices associated with St Simeon’s shrine, the next element that had an impact on the saint’s veneration was

\textsuperscript{130} Cannon and Vauchez (1999), p. 29. See p. 56 for a map showing where beneficiaries of Margherita’s miracles came from.
space. A permanent relic needs a permanent architectural shrine. The original late fourteenth-century chapel that held the relic no longer exists but it was likely to have been a side chapel off the aisles of St Mary the Great.\textsuperscript{139} The first recorded development of a chapel space began soon after the completion of the silver gilt arca. On the 26\textsuperscript{th} July 1384 representatives of Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić - Grisogono de Civalleli\textsuperscript{132} and Bartolus de Ciprianis - commissioned the blacksmith Venturino quondam Pacis de Cesana to produce an iron grille that had a door fitted within. A similar grate from St Chrysogonus would be its model. Venturino would fit the new grille in front of the chapel of St Simeon.\textsuperscript{133} The grille ensured security but this restriction of access to the sacred space would have additionally given it an exclusivity that enhanced the sacral nature of the relic and its material accoutrements within the chapel.\textsuperscript{134} The holy relics, silver shrine and valuable ex voto gifts like Mara’s silver chain and finger image were protected and their spiritual efficacy improved. This early side chapel was soon replaced by a much grander building. There was an opportunity to modify the space for St Simeon’s double arca shrine and make the project an articulation of civic pride in architectural and spiritual form. The fifteenth-century chapel of St Simeon no longer exists but fortunately it has been possible to propose a reconstruction based upon surviving notarial documents and the 1494 description of the chapel by the Milanese pilgrim, Pietro Casola.\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{139} Bianchi wrote that a chapel was built in 1368 off the north aisle of the church although Petricioli later disputed this. Bianchi (1877), p. 391; Petricioli (1984), p. 178.

\textsuperscript{132} Less than two months later Grisogono, also known as Cressio, would lodge one of the largest inventories of this period. DAZD, ZB, Raymundus de Modii (1384-1388), B. 1, Fasc. 3, Br. 2, ff. ir-2ov and transcribed in full in Jakov Stipišić, Inventar dobara zadarskog patricija Grizogona de Civalleli iz 1384. godine (The 1384 inventory of Grisogono de Civallelis, Zaratine nobleman)’, Žbornik Historijskog zavoda Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, 8 (1977), pp. 385-406.

\textsuperscript{133} ‘...ser Venturinus promisit ... de faciendo cum suo ferro et suis propriis expensis unum rete ferreum cum porta in ecclesia Sancte Marie presbiterorum ante capellam Sancti Simeonis ad eam formam et secundum opus retis ferrei facti et quod est in ecclesia Sancti Grisogoni de Jadora...’ Giuseppe Praga, Documenti per la storia dell’arte a Zara dal medioevo al settecento, ed. Maria Walcher, Studi e recerche d’arte veneta in Istria e Dalmazia (Trieste: Edizioni “Italo Svevo”, 2005), p. 81.

\textsuperscript{134} Hahn (1997), p. 1093.

\textsuperscript{135} For the English translation see Pietro Casola, Canon Pietro Casola’s Pilgrimage to Jerusalem in the Year 1494, trans. by M. Margaret Newett, ed. Margaret M. Newett (Manchester: University Press, 1907), pp. 165-
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What was the catalyst for this new chapel? It was begun sixteen years after the completion of the silver shrine so there was no Angevin involvement in the chapel’s establishment. On the 8th of October 1396 a papal indulgence ‘just [like that which] is in the church of St Mark in Venice on the day of the Ascension of the Lord’ was granted to the church of St Mary the Great ‘where the holy body of St Simeon the Just lies’. 136 The archbishop of Zadar, Petrus Mataferrri, had successfully procured this privilege from the Papal Curia. 137 This papal recognition, in which the significance (or arguably veracity) of St Simeon’s body in Zadar was emphasised by the comparison with St Mark in Venice, would have been an important consideration for the cult’s promotion. In addition Zadar was an important port on the maritime pilgrim route between the Italian Peninsula and the Holy Land; not only would this indulgence attract increased local interest but also international support for the cult. It would be necessary to build a space large and grand enough to accommodate the influx of pilgrims who would visit the shrine.

In late May 1397 the stones necessary to start the project had been gathered and Paolo di Paoli laid the first block on the 8th June. 138 On the 29th April 1398 Cressio de Varicassis, Damiano de Nassis and Andrea de Grisogono commissioned the stonemason and sculptor Paolo quondam Vanusio de Salmoena to continue the

137 ‘...quam indulgentiam impetravit reverendissimus pater et dominus Petrus de Matafariis archiepiscopus ladrae...’ Ibid., p. 22.
138 ‘Die lunae 28. dicti mensis madii... de nostro mandato inceperunt portari lapides et calx, pro fabricatione capella Sancti Simeonis iusti, et die veneris 8. mensis iunii proxime venturi, incepit laborari fundamentum pro ipsa capella amplianda, cuius fundamenti primum lapidem ego Paulus cum episcopali benedictione posui.’ Ibid., p. 24. In the seventeenth century, Fondra quoted from a letter written in 1404 from the rectors of Zadar to Pope Innocent VII defending the indulgence granted by his predecessor, as not only had miracles associated with the body occurred but it was also necessary to help in the fight against the heresy prevalent in the Kingdom of Bosnia at this time. Fondra (1855), p. 80.
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project.\textsuperscript{139} Paolo was given eight months to source and prepare masonry from the island quarries in the district.\textsuperscript{140} Within two years another committee investigated Paolo’s progress. On the 8\textsuperscript{th} April 1400 Cressio de Varicassis, Blasius de Soppe and Simon Detrico, \textit{milites} procurator of the fabric of the St Mary the Great and St Simeon’s chapel,\textsuperscript{141} demanded that Paolo complete his work on the chapel within three years, according to the drawing of the intended plan. The chapel’s façade would be forty-five feet high with an additional fifteen feet atop this.\textsuperscript{142} Petricioli has suggested that the extra fifteen feet was an attic level atop the façade of the main structure.\textsuperscript{143} Inside, eight cross vaults in the ceiling would support a cupola, which included latticework in its construction, probably to illuminate the chapel space from above.\textsuperscript{144}

By May 1401 Paolo of Salona was no longer involved in the project.\textsuperscript{145} The patrician committee members met to employ a new stonemason, Nucio of Fermo, repeating their building specifications.\textsuperscript{146} This was to prove a drawn-out and inauspicious professional relationship. On the 27\textsuperscript{th} November 1405 Simon Detrico and

\textsuperscript{139} Paolo de Sulmona was already well established in Zadar and its districts, having produced a number of prestigious monumental pieces prior to his engagement on the St Simeon project in 1398. For instance in 1386 he carved the tomb for the archbishop Nicola de Matafari. This monument was destroyed when the cathedral was restored in 1782. The original contract for the tomb was transcribed and published in Praga (2005), p. 79. In 1389 Paulo worked at the churches of St Chrysogonus and St Michael the Archangel, particularly on the gothic portal of the latter where he created the relief of St Michael spearing the demon. In 1392 Paolo was employed to work on the façade of the church of St Mary in Pag old town. Brunelli (1974), p. 424; Nada Klaic and Ivo Petricioli, \textit{Pro\'slu\'ost Zadra II; Zadar u srednjem vijeku do 1409 (Former Zadar II: Zadar in the Middle Ages to 1409)} (Zadar: Narodni List, 1976), pp. 517-19; Petricioli (1984), p. 178-79; Petricioli (1990\textsuperscript{a}), p. 37.

\textsuperscript{140} Praga (2005), pp. 120-130.

\textsuperscript{141} For many years prior to the commission of the silver arca, the Council of Zadar had chosen two men from amongst the city’s nobility to become procurators of the arca of St Simeon. This later evolved into a general procuratorie della fabriccerie or procurator of the church fabric or estates. These men were in charge of maintaining the shrine associated with the body of St Simeon. They would receive a proportion of the income from legacies and donations. The position was for five years and Queen Elizabeth confirmed this privilege in 1383. Fondra (1855), pp. 144-45.

\textsuperscript{142} ‘...facere frontalia dicte capelle circumcirca alta incipiendo a terrae usque ad sumnum erorum pedibus quadraginta quinque videlicket iuxta portam exteriorem dicte capelle incipiendo mensurari et desuper ipsis frontalisbus elevere... dicte capelle aliis pedibus quindecim...’ Praga (2005), p. 167.

\textsuperscript{143} Petricioli (1984), p. 182.

\textsuperscript{144} ‘... et debeat facere voltam dicte capelle a parte intrinseca in octo crusieriis cum trullo super ipsis crusieriis et facere cancellos necessaries in dicto trullo...’ Praga (2005), p. 167.

\textsuperscript{145} Indeed, Paolo not only vanished from the St Simeon chapel project but from the archives in their totality. Although he may have left Zadar, it seems strange that having signed this contract no other documentation exists that makes comment about any ensuing indignation or demand for recompense. What is more likely is that he passed away. Brunelli (1974), p. 424; Petricioli (1984), p. 180.

\textsuperscript{146} Praga (2005), p. 170.
Mica de Soppe complained to the commune’s rectors about Nucio’s slow work.\footnote{Ibid., p. 199.} A new contract was written three days later demanding that Nucio finish the work within two years.\footnote{Ibid., p. 200.} On the same day Nucio hired a stonemason, Giorgio di Marco of Ljuba, to produce within a year some architectural ornamentation for the chapel at a cost of 120 ducats. Giorgio had to create the basement of the chapel; two stone columns without capitals and above these a tabernacle with a cupola;\footnote{In his 1984 article on the late medieval chapel of St Simeon, Petricioli proposed that the two columns were part of the chapel’s main structure. However, the original contract with Giorgio could also suggest that the columns were not meant as larger supports for the whole building. To begin with, they are to be carved without capitals. The next line of the contract, ‘item facere promisit tabernaculum quod esse debet super columnnis predictis cum trullo’ has been interpreted as the columns supporting the cupula (trullo). Petricioli (1984), p. 182. However tabernacles were often created as instances of micro ecclesiastical architecture. Might a tabernacle instead be the object with the cupola? ‘Georgius lapicida filius quondam Marci de Liuba promisit ... facere eadem pro opera dicte capelle [St Simeon’s] opera et laboreria infrascripta: primo bassamentum dicte capelle videlicet duarum colomnarum lapidearum usque ad sumnum earum ab immo incipiendo in hoc capiti non incluso nec comprehenso, et exceptis figuris et figurarum intaleis ad quas faciendas idem Georgius... teneatur; item facere promisit tabernaculum quod esse debet super columnnis predictis cum trullo prout spectat et pertinet ad dictum opus secundum dessignamentum super hoc factum; item facere promisit foileamen cum cornisius prout apparat in dicto dessignamento; item facere promisit unum trulum super ciburgo sive ciburio prout pertinet et spectat ad dictum dessignamentum; item basses et tabernaculum super ymagine Annuntiationis Virginis Marie prout dessignatum est in dicto dessignamento, item arcum super ymagine Sancti Simeonis iuxta dessignamentum predictum; item unum tabernaculum super arcu dei patris prout pertinet ad dictum dessignamentum...’ Brunelli (1974), p. 425; Praça (2005), p. 201.} foliate wreaths; another cupola above the ciborium; a base and canopied recess for an image of the Annunciation; an arch above the image of St Simeon and finally another canopied recess above the arch of God the Father. All of these elements were according to the drawn plan.\footnote{The day after hiring Giorgio, Nucio commissioned another stonemason, Peter quondam Radmilo Pozdančič from Šibenik, to produce the following: carved statues of the twelve apostles (each three and a half feet high); two figures flanked by two angels each four foot high; an image of the Annunciation with an angel; an image of God the Father giving a gesture of benediction and surrounded by angels holding a curtain. These latter two were part of the architectural tabernacle or canopied recesses that Giorgio was working on. Peter also had to create an angel with a sword in its hand, a...}
crowned Madonna with Child with two angels and finally two figures at the base of the columns. All these scenes were to be three feet high and were according to the architectural drawings for the chapel. Peter had one year in which to complete the project and would be paid 150 ducats.152

Within a year Peter had fled to Šibenik without completing the job.153 By the end of 1406 Nucio had hired another assistant but work was still slow.154 In December 1408 the committee hired another stonemason, Andrea quondam Giorgio of Dubrovnik, to help with the project. Almost nine years after Nucio was hired, the chapel was still incomplete and on the 10th January 1410 he signed yet another contract. Two more documents from the 8th February and 8th March of the same year emphasised how slowly Nucio was progressing.154 In November 1411 work continued on the chapel and, it seems, the church of St Mary the Great itself: Simon de Martinussio, a local nobleman, left £100 to the building of both structures.155 Two years later Georgio son of Miroslav, merçarius, also left a bequest of £20 for the chapel’s construction.156

Nucio and the chapel disappear from the archival records until 19th June 1432.157 On that day Simon Detrico commissioned Magister Vidullus quondam Johannis prothomagister de Jadre 'to make and build and cover the chapel of St Simeon the Just in six crossed vaults of good white stone'.158 The request for the six cross vaults to 'cover' the chapel suggests that the building either did not have a roof or what was

---

153 In fact on the 17th August 1406 Simon Detrico and his committee members sent Jacob of Šibenik, a goldsmith living in Zadar, back to his hometown in order to find the errant Peter. Jacob would be paid £100 if he succeeded in finding Peter and bringing him back to Zadar by Michelmas. It was not recorded whether Jacob achieved his mission. Petricioli (1984), p. 180-81; Praga (2005), p. 203.
155 Ibid., pp. 204.
156 19th November 1411. DAZD, SZB, Articulius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 80, fol. 1r-v.
157 26th March 1413. DAZD, SZB, Articulius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 82, fol. 1r-v.
158 Nucio remained in Zadar until 1413 during which time he appears to have set up a business exporting stone from Zadar and its district to Fermo. Petricioli (1984), p. 181.
159 ...facere et fabricare et coperire capellam Sancti Simeonis Justi in voltam sex cruseriis de lapide albo bene... Praga (2005), p. 162.
there needed strengthening. It appears that the whole church complex of St Mary the Great was undergoing structural changes during the first half of the century. The same Magister Vidullus had begun a campanile in 1423,¹⁵⁹ and the contract of 1432 also required him to cover it in white stone.¹⁶⁰ It does not seem that the developments were completed. In 1441 the church needed repairs on its roof and gospel lectern,¹⁶¹ and in 1444 Vidullus was still hiring boatmen to bring stone for the campanile.¹⁶² In the middle of the century a large crack had formed in the façade of St Simeon’s chapel that demanded immediate attention.¹⁶³ By 1460 the chapel and the façade of St Mary the Great were still incomplete. In his will of that year, the wealthy cives Gregor Morganić requested that £50 be provided either for the completion of the façade or the chapel of St Simeon, should work begin on the latter before the former.¹⁶⁴

We can never know for certain what St Simeon’s chapel looked like or even if it was completed. The intention, however, was an impressive project, conceived of as a whole from its inception; a domed chapel with a ciborium and possible stone tabernacle with its own cupola in miniature, not withstanding the sculptures of the Madonna, God the Father, angels, and St Simeon himself within canopied niches. But where was St Simeon’s arca in all of this? None of the original contracts or notarial documents mention its position within the chapel. The first record of the chapel and reliquary’s configuration is from 1494. In that year the Milanese Canon, Pietro Casola,

¹⁵⁹ ²⁸th March 1423 was the date of the original contract. A document confirming the completion of the campanile’s foundations was submitted on the 11th June 1425. Ibid., pp. 151 & 154.
¹⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 162.
¹⁶¹ Ibid., p. 227.
¹⁶² Ibid., p. 231.
¹⁶⁴ 'Item voluit et ordinavit quod quandocumque frontale sancte Marie ceperit de novo construi et fabricari et constructum fuerit usque ad medietatem vel saltum usque ad tertiam partem, tunc dari voluit de bonis suis in auxilium operis frontalis libras quingentas denarioorum parvorum, pro anima sua et suorum. Aut si capella sancti Simeonis fabricaretur prius quam dictam frontale, quod in opus ipsius capelle, dicte quingente libre expendi debeant, et si ipse testator hoc legatum in vita sua fecerit, quod hereditas sua plus dare non teneatur.' Will of Gregorio Merganich ²⁸th April 1460 contained in DAZD, SZB, Nicolas Benedicti (1433-1469), B. 2 (Testamenta Registrata), fol. 1/4, is transcribed in Roman Jelić, 'Grgr Mrganic', Radovi Instituta JAZU u Zadru, 6-7 (1960), p. 503. Regarding its mention of St Simeon’s chapel see Brunelli (1974), p. 425.
visited Zadar en route to the Holy Land and came to the church of St Mary the Great to see the body of the prophet. His account of the chapel of St Simeon has profound implications for the space and interaction surrounding the holy relic.

I went with the other pilgrims according to arrangement to the Church of Saint Simeon, where after Vespers were sung the body of Saint Simeon was shown - a very remarkable relic - certainly the most beautiful I ever saw, either at Rome or elsewhere. The body is perfectly preserved, there is nothing in the world lacking, either in the face or in the hands or in the feet. The mouth is open and in the upper jaw there are no teeth... I went several times to see the relic because there was a great crowd of pilgrims and also of people belonging to the city and country around who came there because it was a holiday. And the more I looked the more it seemed to me a stupendous thing, most of all when I remembered the time of his death which could not be less than one thousand four hundred and ninety-three years ago. The body was very carefully guarded; the Governors of the city - the Venetians as I said - keep the keys. The church is very beautiful... High above the place where the said most holy relic is kept is an [arca], all of silver-gilt, on which the presentation of Christ in the Temple is sculptured. In the middle of the said [arca] there is an inscription in Latin which records how a Queen of Hungary caused it to be made.165

---

165 'Andai con li altri peregrini, però che cossì era ordinato, ad una giesia de Santo Symeone, unde, cantato lo vespero, fu mostrato lo corpo de santo Symeone, reliquia dignissima e la più bella che mai vedesse, né in Roma né altro. Nam se fe vede tutto integro non li manca cosa del mondo, non in el volto, non in le mane, non in li pedì; tene la boca aperta e di sopra non li sono denti...lo replicai el vederlo piú volte, però che gli era una grande furia de peregrini e anche de quili de la citade e de contato chi concurrevano perché era dì de festa. E quanto piú el guardava, tanto piú me pariva cosa stupenda, eo maxime che me ricordava el tempo de la sua morte, che non poteva esser manco de MCCC’LXXX’III anni. Fu tenuto con grande guardia. Li rectori de de dicta citade, como ho dicto Veneziani, tengono le chiave. La giezìa è asai bella... In el loco unde è dicta sanctissima reliquia, egli una arca, di sopra al loco, unde è in alto; è tuta de argento, inaurata, unde gli è sculipa la presentatione de Cristo in el templo, et in mezo de dicta arca el titulo in latino, como una regina de Ungaria l’haveva facto fare.’ Casola (2001), pp. 119-21. English translation from Casola (1907), pp. 166-167.
CHAPTER 4. ST SIMEON THE PROPHET

By 1494 Simeon was a saint who attracted large groups of the faithful, both pilgrims and locals. How the silver shrine was arranged in response to their veneration is fascinating. According to Casola’s description, St Simeon’s body could be exposed but was not contained within the silver shrine. Today the early marble effigy and arca that held Simeon’s body is the mensa of the high altar in St Simeon’s church. (Fig. 4.37) The fact that it survived and was recycled into such a significant piece of liturgical furniture suggests the community understood the coffer’s importance. Might it not be the case that the marble arca was still in use when Casola came to Zadar?

As discussed above, stone is a much harder wearing medium than wood covered in silver gilt and could withstand the touch of many pilgrims. The exposure of the body, though, raises questions about accessibility and visibility. It was a feast day when Casola visited Zadar so the lid may have been removed for the pilgrims to see the relic. Even today, the body is exposed for eight days beginning on the evening before the saint’s feast day on the 8th October. If, however, the original marble arca was still on its columns then it would not have been possible to see the relic inside. Might it have been the case that the stone sarcophagus was flat on the ground so that visitors could see the body when it was exposed? This would mean that on other occasions the effigy would have acted as a proxy for the actual relic.

If the body was indeed contained within the marble arca then another element of Casola’s account needs consideration: how do we interpret the keys held by the Venetians? Looking back to 1384 and the earlier chapel we can consider Venturino of Cesena’s commission for the metal grille with a door inside. This provided visual permeability of the saint’s chapel and allowed the pilgrims to stretch out through the grille and into the sacred space but the grille would also have restricted access to the shrine. Casola does not record any sort of grating in his description but the original

---

See above.
contract from 1400 between the chapel committee and Paolo de Sulmona mentions an exterior door on the chapel. Such an opening would make sense. Visitors who came to St Mary the Great specifically and solely to venerate the relics of St Simeon could easily enter the chapel. This would have prevented disruption of the day-to-day activities within the main church as the crowds would have been directed straight to the shrine from the main street without cluttering up the interior of the church. This exterior door, and any interior ones that provided access between St Mary the Great and the chapel, would have been locked up when the chapel was not in use. The Venetians held the keys that secured both the chapel and its precious relic. When the chapel was open the presence of Venetian guards emphasised the high value of both the relic and its costly silver reliquary.

Therefore, if by 1494 the marble sarcophagus still contained the holy relic, Casola’s description states that the silver shrine was placed high above it. This suggests an extraordinary configuration. It appears that St Simeon’s body was never formally translated into the Hungarian silver arca yet the reliquary was still an important part of the shrine and the pilgrim’s experience. If the stone arca had been taken off its columns and lowered on to the ground, it would have lost the impressive visibility associated with the tombs of Saints Peter Martyr and Dominic. In Zadar, the silver shrine provided the visual drama within the sacred space. Elevated above the sacred body and the heads of the faithful, it was a glorious object whose expense and quality not only pointed to the temporal riches of its patrons but also the spiritual wealth and beauty in Heaven above. The effigy on both the silver arca and marble

---

167. ... iuxta portam exteriorem dicte capelle incipiendic mensurari...’ Praga (2005), p. 167.
168. The challenge of improving crowd flow and ensuring the boundaries between ecclesiastical, sacred and lay spaces within churches, particularly those popular amongst pilgrims, was ongoing throughout the medieval period. The examples of the tomb of the blessed Margaret of Cortona and St Anthony of Padua highlight this. Cannon and Vauchez (1999), p. 53; Lucchini (2009), p. 53.
169. See above and Vidas (2008), pp. 149-50.
shrine connected the two objects and created a breathtaking contrast between the practicalities of the stone container and the aesthetically astonishing silver gilt.

How was the silver shrine elevated so high above the body of St Simeon? Casola is not clear on this point. As we know from Fondra, an interview with an aged Novachus quondam Miclo in 1455 revealed that silver angels had held the shrine up in 1380. Why would the old man be questioned about his memories of the original chapel? As the new St Simeon’s chapel was still under construction in 1455, it may have been that Novachus’ memories of the angels were incorporated into the chapel space.\(^\text{177}\) For a pilgrim this must have been a spectacular sight; their first glance of the sacred space would have involved silver angels lifting up St Simeon’s silver effigy in glory towards the heavens, the ciborium a proxy for the celestial firmament and the whole chapel lit by the light of candles and natural daylight pouring in through the grille under the building’s cupola. The image of the Presentation at the Temple on the front of the silver arca would give a biblical narrative that explained the relics below it, providing visual proof of the veracity of the body’s sanctity.

Therefore we can consider the silver arca of St Simeon as a complement to the marble coffer; a beautiful ornament that offers an impressive visual substitute for the faithfuls’ usual sensory demand for touch.\(^\text{178}\) It seems likely that access to the body proper was saved for a select few - other than on feast days - and that the silver shrine, positioned on angels above the marble sarcophagus, would have been the visible manifestation of the prophet’s presence for the general public. Today the silver shrine in the modern church of St Simeon is placed in an arrangement very similar to that

---

\(^{177}\) The bronze angels that today lift the silver shrine were cast from cannons confiscated during the War of Candia (1645-69). Jakšić and Tomić (2004), p. 99. It is interesting to note that Fondra’s Istoría dell insigne reliquia di San Simeone Profeta was written in 1685, soon after the cessation of hostilities. It seems probable that the discovery of this document encouraged the commissioners of the bronze angels to try and closely reproduce the original setting for the silver shrine.

\(^{178}\) Although Hahn discussed the use of icons at early Christian shrines as visual substitutes for the tombs and relics themselves, nonetheless, the use of the effigy on the St Simeon arca in conjunction with the gold leaf would surely have presented as spectacular a sense of the divine and sacred as the gold backdrop of an icon. Hahn (1997), p. 1092.
described by Casola. The effigy from the original marble arca is now the frontispiece of the high altar. Behind this seventeenth-century bronze angels lift up the silver shrine. (Fig. 4.37) The contrast between the two effigies of Simeon is striking, with two effigies depicting two versions of the saint; his terrestrial self on the marble arca and his divine state on the silver gilt reliquary. The stone arca on the ground provides a visual stepping-stone up to the heavenly level of the lustrous metal sarcophagus.

There is one important distinction between St Simeon and almost all the other saints mentioned in this thesis. His body remained whole whilst others were pulled apart and divided into many relics. A local example of this practice was that of St Chrysogonus. Following that saint’s reinvention in 1056, the number of his relics both within and without the Benedictine monastery multiplied over the course of the next five hundred years. St Stephen of Hungary’s head was sent to Zagreb soon after the translation of his body at Székesfehérvár in 1083. In the case of St Peter Martyr, the Dominicans who oversaw his translation in 1254 separated his head from the rest of his body, placing the head in an elaborate reliquary that is still used today on the saint’s feast day. In 1319 Robert of Anjou took back to Naples with him the brain and arm of his brother Louis of Toulouse following the translation of the young friar saint. Although St Simeon is a biblical saint and not one of the multitude of new saints created during the Middle Ages, his body did appear in Zadar during the

---


174 See Chapter 3.


thirteenth century when such practices were well-established within the local context as well as a European one. The tale of Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić stealing a finger from the body, only to have her body suffer terrible gangrene until she returned it,\textsuperscript{78} is an interesting example. It suggests that such attempts to dissect and dismember the body were not encouraged. The myth provided a warning to those who would consider such a thing.\textsuperscript{79}

In contrast to St Chrysogonus’s cult, St Simeon’s in Zadar was not one that was disseminated into the public space through the use of relics and smaller reliquaries.\textsuperscript{80} The wholeness of the body, the theatricality of the shrine’s configuration and the fixed nature of the marble arca point to a cult that could be controlled. The fact that it was Zadar’s external rulers who received keys giving privileged access to the body - firstly Maria of Hungary in the 1380s\textsuperscript{81} and then the Venetians in the fifteenth century - suggest this was probably the case. Within the immediate Zaratine context, it was important to maintain the monumentality and permanence of the relics so that the grand communal enterprise of the chapel itself could go ahead.

As noted in Chapters 1 & 2, Sigismund’s political instability in Hungary during the 1390s and 1400s could not give Zadar the protection it desired. The commune’s attempt to submit to Venetian rule in 1401 was rebuffed and the following year Zadar swore allegiance to the Angevins again, this time to King Ladislaus from the Neapolitan side of the family.\textsuperscript{82} Throughout this period the chapel project was instigated and overseen by members of the nobility and funded by the general public.

\textsuperscript{78} Although I have argued that this myth was probably a seventeenth-century narrative created in response to the newly restored panels, echoes of an earlier story may still exist. I believe it unlikely that the main protagonist in this panel was originally Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić, but that does not negate the origins of the rest of the tale.
\textsuperscript{79} Geary (1990), p. 21.
\textsuperscript{81} See Chapter 1.
Wills from the period of 1400 to 1413 make generous bequests specifically for the chapel’s construction ranging in value from the income of country properties, to as much as fifty gold ducats. The chapel that contained both the relic of St Simeon and the magnificent silver gilt arca was a civic venture, complementing the Angevin shrine.

There is no evidence from testaments nor inventories that the cults of St Chrysogonus nor Simeon pervaded the domestic sphere. Any cultic objects such as private contact relics of handkerchiefs and holy water were not recorded. Yet the diminution of Angevin or Hungarian power over Zadar provided an opportunity for the collective support of a public monument. Elizabeth Kotromarić’s silver shrine may emphasise the familial and personal connections between the saint and patron but its local narratives, exceptional beauty and quality would reflect very well upon the citizens of Zadar.

4.4 The Cult of St Simeon in Venice

What happened to this civic pride in the cult after 1409? Contrary to Petricioli’s claim that this ‘new [Venetian] power obviously paralysed [Zadar’s] prosperity’ and by extension the chapel project, it appears that early on the Venetians were happy to support the venture. On the 10th January 1410 Leonardo Mocenigo and Fantinus Michiel gave Andrea de Cesamis and Micaeli de Soppe, ‘procurators of the church and arca of St Simeon’ the authority to pursue their claim against Nucio of Fermo, demanding that he complete his work on the chapel. Casola’s description of the chapel eighty years later recorded Venetian guards overseeing the shrine. The inference is that the Venetian administrators were keen to monitor the cult. What

---

183 Will of Damiano quondam Macoli de Cipriano, 13th April 1304. DAZID, SZB, Articuicius de Rivignano (1384-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 2, Testamenti aperti (1384-1416), Br. 47, ff. 1r-2v.
184 Will of Gaspare, son of Filippo de Matafarri, 21st September 1405 DAZID, SZB, Articuicius de Rivignano (1383-1416), B. 5, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1385-1413), fol. 1r-7v.
makes this stance somewhat unexpected is the fact that, like Chrysogonus, Venice also claimed the whole body of St Simeon.

The collegiate church of San Simeone de Profeta or Grande in Venice is located on the western periphery of the city far from the Republic’s political and commercial centres. It was founded in 967 by the noble families of Ghisa, Aolda and Briosa,\footnote{Petro Iustiniani, ‘Venetiarium historia vulgo Petro Iustiniano Iustiniani filio adiudicata’, in Monumenti storici pubblicati della Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Venezie, eds Fanny Bennato and Roberto Cessi (Venice: Deputazione di Storia Patria per le Venezie, 1964), p. 142; Corner (1749), p. 386; Cappelletti (1860), p. 23; Annamaria Pozzan, ed., Archivi storici della chiesa veneziana. Inventari [di] parrocchie di San Simeone Profeta ovvero San Simeone Grande, (Venice: Archivio storico del patriarcato di Venezia, 2001), p. 127.} (Fig. 4.38) The small parish church was affiliated to the Bishop of Olivolo, later bishop of Castello and his cathedral of St Peter.\footnote{Pozzan (2001), p. 128; Silvio Tramontin, ‘Dall’episcopato castellano al patriarcato veneziano’, in La chiesa di Venezia tra medioevo ed età moderna, ed. Giovanni Vian, Contributi alla storia della chiesa di Venezia, (Venice: Edizioni studio cattolico veneziano, 1989), p. 63.} As noted above, the saint’s body was brought to Venice and the titular church after the Sack of Constantinople in 1204. But the relic’s original location within the thirteenth-century church space of San Simeone, as well as its earliest arca or grand reliquary have long since been forgotten and lost. Fortunately some elements do remain that give an indication of the relic’s treatment. A number of similarities between the cults in Venice and Zadar are also revealed.

The tomb of St Simeon the Prophet that exists today is in the chapel to the left of the high altar, tucked into the right wall and secondary to the chapel’s altar. (Fig. 4.39) It was probably not the intended location for such a precious relic in a small parish church. The tomb today is constructed out of a marble effigy of the saint 210 cm long by 52 cm wide, with beard, closed eyes and head turned to the right and lying on a cushion with the hands crossed just below chest height. This effigy sits atop a stone sarcophagus 46cm high by 179 cm long and 46cm deep. On the front of the arca is an inscription with the words: ‘Here lay the body of the blessed prophet Symeon [for] 114
years’. Behind and above the tomb is a stone tablet 42cm high by 180 cm long upon which is a long inscription recounting how on the 4th February 1318 (1317 more Veneto), a hundred and fourteen years after having arrived from Constantinople, the body of St Simeon was translated into a new area. Overseeing this translation were the Bishop of Castello - Giacomo Albertini - as well as the bishops of Caorle, Jesolo and Torcello along with the church’s priest, Bartolomeus Ravachaul. At the bottom of the panel is an additional note:

Celavit Marcus opus hoc insigne Romanus. Laudibus non parcus est sua digna manus

The first part translates as ‘By this sign Marcus Romanus hid (celavit) the work’ and the second part roughly translates as ‘abundant is the praise for his worthy hand’. Although there is this curious use of the word ‘hid’ and the ambiguity of the word opus or ‘work’, scholarly emphasis has been upon the praising of Marcus Romanus’ worthy hand. The juxtaposition of this inscription with the exquisite quality of the marble effigy has, since the late nineteenth century, resulted in scholars

---

191 ‘IN CHRISTI NOMINE AMEN ANNO INCARNATIONIS MCCCVII MENSE FEBRUIII DIE III INDICTIONE PRIMA TRANSLATIO CORPORIS / SANCTI SYMEONIS PROPHETE FACTA FUIT DE QUADAM ARCHA IN HOC ALTARE POSITA IN QUO CXIII ANNIS / STETERAT UT IN TRANSLATIONE DE CONSTANTINOPOLI MCCIII HUC FACTA ET SCRIPTURIS AUTENTI / CIS PLENIUS CONTINETUS IN HOC EXCELLENTISSIMUM SESPRÆM PER VENERABILEM PETREM DOMINUM / IACOBUM DEI GRATIA EPISCOPUM CASTELLANUM CUM QUIBUSDAM ALIS CONVICINIS EPISCOPIS PROCU / RANTE CUM DEI AUXILIO BARTHOLOMEO RAVACHAULO EIUDEM ECCLESIE PLEBANO SINE ALIQUA ECCLESIE / PECUNIA PROPTER QUOD SUPPLICAT IDEM PLEBANUS HUIUS ECCLESIE CAPITULO AC UNIVERSO CONVICI / NIO UT PER CHRISTI MISERICODIAM IN SUIS SACRIFICIS ET ORATIONIBUS SEMPER SIT IN EORUM MEMORIA / VISITET QUILIBET LIBENTER HEC PRECIOSE CORPORA QUIA EX INDE XL DIES DIEBUS SINGULIS RELAXANTUR DEINIOUNCTA SIBI PENITENTIA A DOMINO PATRIARCHA DE ALEXANDRIA DE ORDINARIII LICENCIA / CELAVIT MARIUS OPUS HOC INSIGNE ROMANUS LAUDIBUS NON PARCUS EST SUA DIGNA MANUS.’ Wolters (1976), p. 152.
193 This is my own translation.
attributing the work to Marco Romano. It is considered to be the only signed copy by this mysterious early fourteenth-century master.194

There are problems with this attribution. As indicated by the measurements of the tomb’s various components the effigy is too long for the sarcophagus below by twenty centimetres. The quality of the sculptured St Simeon is so excellent it seems incredible to consider that a sculptor would choose not to match effigy with arca. The style of the effigy is also problematic. If it was indeed made in 1317 it was unlike anything occurring in contemporary Venice. Although Wolfgang Wolters gave some credence to the proposal that this was the work of a Sienese or Pisan sculptor, if one were to ignore the dated inscription behind the effigy and derive a date upon stylistic grounds, the work could be considered late trecento or early quattrocento.195 There are additional problems with the current configuration and attribution. The plaque itself records that the relics that were in ‘that arca’ were moved into ‘this altar’.196 In the apostolic visitation of 1581 the entry regarding San Simeon recorded:

The relics of St Simeon the Prophet are contained in the high altar in a stone arca covered with an iron grating fortified around with the proof ‘Here is the body of St Simeon the Prophet’ incised in oak.197

The question is: where would the effigy be if the arca was the mensa? The answer can be found in Giovanni Stringa’s edition of Francesco Sansovino’s Venetia città nobilissima et singolare of 1604. It described:

196 See footnote 191.
[The holy body] of the aforementioned St Simeon, that lies in a sepulchre of marble sited under the high altar, with the figure of the holy one stretched out below the tomb.\textsuperscript{198}

It is probable that during the late sixteenth century the beautiful effigy was on the front of the high altar, a configuration that was described in Zadar by Pietro Casola in 1494, and indeed what can be seen in today's church of St Simeon in that city. But what of the smaller arca and translation inscription in Venice? It was only during renovations in the eighteenth century that the sarcophagus and inscription were found buried beneath the floor of the church. Judging by the dimensions of the larger dedicatory panel, it seems likely that this was originally attached to the side of the sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{199} A new baroque altarpiece in 1765 replaced the medieval altar and so the effigy and sarcophagus had to be moved. Quite when this occurred is unclear. Cappelletti in 1860 recorded that the arca was moved to the left hand chapel in the eighteenth century, whilst Wolters noted that Selvatico in 1847, Zanotto in 1863 and Perkins in 1868 wrote that the effigy was still attached to the back of the baroque altarpiece. It was not until Boni in 1888 that the effigy and arca were placed in their current location and configuration.\textsuperscript{200} From this it is apparent that the ensemble of dated inscription, sarcophagus and marble effigy is a nineteenth-century ideal. The inscription and sarcophagus that survive today were created as separate elements from the effigy. It is incorrect to connect the fourteenth-century inscription and its 'Marco Romano' with the marble effigy of St Simeon.

The original configuration of the tomb during the medieval period is difficult to reconstruct. As was the case with the shrine of St Simeon in Zadar and other Italian saint tombs in the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century, there was a trend of placing

\textsuperscript{198} [Il corpo Santo] di S. Simeone predetto, che giace in un sepolcro di marmo posto sopra l’altar maggiore, con la figura di esso santo distesa sopra il sepolcro.’ Sansovino and Stringa (1604), p. 163.
such sarcophagi upon columns. The arca in San Simeone today is now firmly fixed to the ground so it is impossible to see any indication that could confirm this supposition. By the sixteenth century the relics of St Simeon were in the high altar and the effigy was on the front of the mensa, providing a wonderful reminder to the worshipping laity of the origins of their Nunc Dimittis. The similarity to Zadar’s arrangement is marked and suggests that the sculptor of the Venetian effigy was aware of the Dalmatian precedent. This may be because both cities claimed a full body relic of the prophet rather than just small parts. The tomb and effigy archetype would fit very well with the size and nature of the relic.

Stylistically, the Zaratine stone version was completed earlier than the Venetian one. (Fig. 4.3) It is a high relief work with a slightly awkward construction of the hands, feet and head in relation to the rest of the composition. Yet the fine lines of the drapery, the curls of the beard and delicate halo around the saint’s head all have a wonderful finesse. The angel popping out of the void behind the effigy gives a sense of depth that would otherwise be lacking and brings the viewers’ attention to the saint’s face. On the silver shrine, the saint’s head is flat and faces up. The halo is still present and the same brooch at the chest gathers in the drapery and causes it to flow out and across the body. The angel is absent but if the silver angels of Fondra’s source did indeed exist then there would be no need for them upon the shrine itself. The Venetian version develops the image of St Simeon further, giving one pause for thought; is the figure dead or simply sleeping? This tension is enhanced by the naturalism of the Venetian effigy, the drapery creating a sense of the body beneath the folds, the crossed hands with the veins of an old man, the brow furrowed slightly as if dreaming and the beard and hair on the head all the more realistic. There is no need for a halo or angels here as this visual type is well understood by viewers. All three

---

versions of St Simeon lay their heads upon the same sort of cushion, a small square one with corner tassels.

A possible chronology for the effigies based on stylistic grounds would place the Zaratine stone one first, followed by the silver shrine and then the Venetian marble effigy. As we know, the silver shrine was completed in 1380 so the Venetian effigy would have been produced in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. It is probable that the Zaratine models set the iconographic precedent for the Venetian one. If the Venetian effigy was made in the early fifteenth century, this would coincide with increased Venetian access to Zadar after decades of restrictions. It would have been easy for the model of the sleeping St Simeon to cross the Adriatic. There is also the possibility that the cult in Venice underwent some sort of rejuvenation after 1409, as a method of undermining the established cult in the new Dalmatian territory that had been so blessed by the patronage of the Angevins. The glorious marble effigy at San Simeone Profeta would have been a part of that new promotion, in a similar manner to Giambono’s St Chrysogonus altar panel.

Why did the cult in Zadar continue, whilst the relics in Venice did not undergo further recorded promotion and change? The plaque from 1317 in San Simeone Profeta noted that the patriarch of Alexandria had granted all pilgrims to the Venetian shrine an indulgence of forty days.202 By contrast Zadar’s St Simeon had received a more recent papal indulgence, which made the Dalmatian shrine a more appealing centre for pilgrims.203 The Venetian panel also highlights another reason why the cult in Venice was not promoted. The parish church of San Simeone Profeta was allied to the Bishop of Castello. The bishop’s presence at the 1317 translation of the saint’s relic further emphasised this connection. But there were difficulties and ecclesiastical rivalries to contend with in Venice. Since 1155 the Patriarch of Grado had laid claim to

---

202 Ibid., p. 152.
203 See above.
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a number of dioceses in Dalmatia, including Zadar. This made the patriarchate a useful tool of imperial expansion along the Adriatic coastline.204 From 1178 the Patriarch had been resident next to San Silvestro in the heart of the Rialto district. This arrival strained relations with the bishop of Castello, whose jurisdiction was often undermined by Venetian government policy.205

These tensions between the Signoria and the bishop of Castello may explain why there was no direct government sponsorship of St Simeon’s cult in Venice. By contrast the Signoria demanded and enjoyed excellent relations with the patriarch of Grado and, after 1409, the administration of Zadar. This would have meant a more effective management of the cult in Dalmatia. Add to this the peripheral location of San Simeone Profeta in Venice; any foreign visitors would have had to make a special trip to see the relic. In Zadar the church of St Mary the Great was close to the port therefore easily accessible to merchants, sailors and pilgrims. The local economy would have benefited greatly from the influx of visitors and the Venetians would then have enjoyed greater taxes from the commune.

By the middle of the century, a symbolic compromise was reached between the Venetian authorities and the commune of Zadar. A ducal order of the 9th August 1455 noted that the Doge gave the body to ‘that most faithful commune’, and confirmed that the four keys to the arca of St Simeon stay in the care of those usually in charge. These individuals were the archbishop, the count, the priests and procurators of St Mary the Great.206 What is fascinating is that the Doge and Venetian Republic had at some stage claimed ownership of the relics of St Simeon in Zadar, before symbolically returning it to the commune in this ducale. The keys were divided between the city’s

206 Fondras (1855), p. 130. Gregorio Stratico noted that this privilege was confirmed two years later, on the 8th September 1457. Stratico (1769), fol. 26v.
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local and Venetian representatives. This image of a shared guardianship over the sacred relics was arguably reiterated in coinage of 1470 when St Simeon was depicted on the obverse of coins minted in Zadar with St Mark on the reverse.207 Yet the presence of the Venetian guards in Casola’s description of St Simeon’s forty years later, and their control of the keys, suggests that the balance of power and control over the relics had shifted. Casola presents an evocative scene, a summation of the regional political reality in Zadar evoked by the authority and ownership of St Simeon’s relics. The Venetian guards flank both the body of the prophet and the silver shrine, watching for possible threats to the sacred and temporal capital manifest in both. The Republic had no need to encourage the saint’s cult in Venice. Not only did it control the precious relics of a territorial conquest, Zadar, but it also stood triumphant over the silver gilt arca, a symbol of past Angevin and Hungarian control now firmly expelled from the region.

*   *   *   *

At first glance the medieval cults surrounding the relics of St Simeon the Prophet and St Chrysogonus in Zadar appear quite similar. Both enjoyed Hungarian royal patronage and were part of pan-European networks of patronage and political promotion for the political and spiritual good of the Árpád and Angevin dynasties. The local citizens of Zadar were happy to receive the material benefits of this largesse and responded with either oaths of fealty in the case of St Chrysogonus’ arm or collective financial support in the instance of St Simeon’s chapel. The commune's identity became bound up with the Hungarian crown and, in the case of St Simeon’s silver shrine, the local narrative associated with the saint became inextricably tied to Angevin regional ambitions. Yet the nature of St Simeon’s relics - a whole body - led to a different sort of interaction.

between the faithful and their sacred intercessors. Functional considerations associated with devotional practice and the shrine’s placement defined the experience. By using Italian precedents not only were these practical needs answered but an additional sacred pedigree was bestowed upon the Zaratine cult of St Simeon.

Zadar’s success as an important centre of veneration for the relics of St Simeon may have influenced Venetian policy after 1409. In much the same way that Venetian social and administrative responses to the territory were becoming more nuanced, so too were Venetian responses to the cult. Another aspect to consider was the transmission of iconographic and structural models from Zadar to Venice and Venice’s own local cult of St Simeon the Prophet. How this occurred is unknown. But it seems that the cultic imagery in the territory had proved so potent and associative with the Prophet saint that the Venetian church used this vocabulary as a means of legitimising its own claim to the relics. What both the cults of St Chrysogonus and Simeon the Prophet have are the physical relics and glittering material remains of lively saint cults. Meanings and narratives could evolve upon these objects in response to the demands of a particular audience at a particular time. The other saint cult that had the greatest impact upon Zadar was that of St Mark the Evangelist, the state patron of the Republic of Venice. As shall be seen in Chapter 5, this was a cult for which the material was secondary to meaning.
Chapter 5

St Mark the Evangelist - The Absent Saint

The final chapter concerns a cult of the state, more specifically the cult of St Mark the Evangelist, patron saint of Venice. Instead of cultural transmission from periphery to metropole, St Mark exemplifies the standard trope of the metropolitan model generating new configurations and interpretations in the periphery. The presence of St Mark’s cult in Zadar was arguably an imposition from outside rather than a local response to a trend from the centre. This chapter will examine the development of the cult of St Mark, first within the context of Venice proper (a topic much visited in recent years), then its export out into the well-studied colonial context of Candia in Crete before its arrival in Zadar proper. Much of what evolves in Venice has direct implications for Zadar. It is necessary to go into some depth regarding the Venetian conditions surrounding St Mark before analysing the Zaratine cult.

This will involve a review of the civic cult’s growth, its interaction with and responses to the Republic’s maturing identity. Grand rituals, architectural settings and liturgical manifestations all increased in significance, often to the detriment of St Mark’s tangible relics. In contrast to St Simeon and St Chrysogonus, St Mark’s relics became increasingly absent. This was a very different sort of cult and the Republic used its ephemeral and material accretions to construct a coherent communal memory and identity, one in which sacred and secular narratives were intertwined. Could Venice translate such an intricate model into a colonial framework? In Candia we shall...
see how the prototype from the metropole was placed with relative ease upon the urban fabric and native liturgical customs, creating a simulacra of Venice itself.

The transmission to Zadar, however, shows a less coherent strategy. There is a distinction between the development of the cult of St Mark before 1358 and then after 1409, a period when Venetian imperial confidence and state rhetoric was at its peak. The articulation of St Mark’s cult in the earlier period was conventional, with the establishment of a church dedicated to the saint, the encouragement of a confraternity and a rare example of a relic. During the fifteenth century the emphasis was upon the iconography of the lion of St Mark and the dissemination of cultic imagery on coins. Venetian rule also demanded mass participation in processions and liturgical rituals on feast days associated with the Evangelist and these were a means of propagating the cult and binding practices in both Venice and Zadar. What was highly unusual was the very ambitious setting in which the finale of these rituals occurred: the cathedral of St Anastasia.

Chapter 1 explored the tensions surrounding the position of Zadar’s archbishop. The authority associated with the post’s nomination was fiercely contested between Zaratini and Venetians. After the Venetians returned in 1409 the Augustinian archbishop, Luca Turriano of Fermo, remained in his seat for another eleven years.1 Following his death, the archbishops of the fifteenth century were all Venetian patricians: Biagio Molin (1420-8), Lorenzo Venier (1428-49) and Maffeo Vallaresso (1450-95).2 Modifications to the cathedral’s choir precinct between 1418 and 1451 suggest a conscious imitation of the same space within San Marco, a site where the Republic’s secular and spiritual power was concentrated. Yet this was not simply a case of imposing a charged prototype upon the cathedral fabric, rather it became a nuanced

---

2 Between Venier and Vallaresso, Polidoro Foscarì had been given the position of archbishop but died before he left for Zadar. Ibid., pp. 53-6
response to the increasing hybridisation of Zadar’s elites, a response that reflected Venetian policy in the commune after 1409. The cult of St Mark was no exception to this evolution.

5.1 Venice and the Cult of St Mark

First, it is necessary to examine the development of St Mark’s cult within the Venetian context as this influenced the cult in Zadar. How and why did the Republic choose the Evangelist as its patron? In his chronicle of 783-6, the Lombard Peter the Deacon of Aquileia wrote that St Peter had sent Mark and his supporter, one Ermagora, to the region around Aquileia to evangelise the locals. Their mission was so successful that once Mark established the church there, he left Ermagora behind as its first bishop while he continued his missionary activities in Alexandria. It was there that Mark was martyred for his evangelising. 3 Aquileia’s foundation was of such a high pedigree that it emphasised the regional importance of the patriarchy, almost en par with that of Rome. 4

St Mark’s translation from Alexandria to Venice is a well studied legend. The earliest surviving text is from the tenth century but it had been an established myth for at least a hundred years. 5 The thirteenth-century Legenda Aurea by Jacopo de Voragine consolidated a number of earlier traditions and myths about the Evangelist. 6 The tale recounted the travels of the merchants Buono da Malamocco and Rustico da Torcello who arrived in Alexandria in the year 827. The two merchants stole the body of St Mark - slipping it past the Saracens by covering the sacred relic in pork - and returned

---

5 Ibid., p. 92.
6 The Legenda was written before 1267 although the earliest surviving manuscript was written in 1281 and today is in Paris. Uwe Ludwig, "L’evangelario di Civiale e il vangelo di San Marco per la storia di una reliquia Marciana", in San Marco: aspetti storici e agiografici. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi Venezia, 26-29 aprile 1994, ed. Antonio Niero. (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 1996), p. 194.
to Venice. The Doge, Giustiniano Partecipazio, received the precious relic with great

ceremony before installing it in the Ducal Palace. Many miracles then followed that
proved the relic's veracity and justified the *furta sacra* from Alexandria.

St Mark's rise to the role of the Republic's patron was not immediate. The
*translatio*’s origins may be from the ninth century but, like St Chrysogonus in Zadar,
Mark was one amongst a pantheon of early patron saints: the Byzantine warrior saint
Theodore, St Nicholas of Bari and Ermagora the first bishop of Aquileia. Indeed,
according to Giovanni Diacono’s account of Doge Pietro II Orseolo’s naval campaign
down the Dalmatian coast of 1000 AD, the banner of St Ermagora was unfurled before
the flotilla set sail. Over time the Evangelist proved a more appealing option to the
fledgling Republic. In addition to the relic’s miraculous powers and the divine
protection it could afford Venice, St Mark was also an ‘Italian’ saint - in that his
apostolic mission sent him to evangelise the peninsula - rather than a Byzantine one.
This emphasised Venice's increasing independence from Constantinople. The
Evangelist’s translation legend records that the Doge himself received the Evangelist’s
relic before placing it in the heart of the city’s political centre, the Ducal Palace. This
location stressed the political connotations of such an important sacred acquisition.
This was not like Zadar, where bishops appear as the heroes in the translation tales of
Saints Anastasia and Chrysogonus. In the case of the bishop saint Donatus, he even
proved the political equal and spiritual superior of the Venetian Doge. In Venice, this

---

7 For the full transcription of the *translatio*, see Nelson McCleary, ‘Note storiche ed archeologiche sul testo
della *Translatio Sancti Marci*, Memorie storiche forognuesi, XXVII-XXIX (1931-33), pp. 235-64; Muir
(1981), p. 81; De Voragine in the *Legenda Aurea* puts the date for the translation as early as 468 AD. de
9 Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice. A study in diplomatic and cultural relations* (Cambridge:
10 Geary (1990), p. 91; Wipertus Rudt De Collenberg, ‘L’emblema del leone marciano’, in *San Marco: aspetti
storici e agiografici. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi Venezia, 26-29 aprile 1994*, ed. Antonio Niero,
188-9.
12 Geary (1990), p. 91.
narrative model was subverted and the commune’s political leader held the reigns of power, both temporal and sacred.

5.1.1 Liturgy and Spectacle: the Basilica of San Marco

In his will of 829 Doge Giustiniano Partecipazio asked his wife to build a suitable church for the relics of St Mark. They were placed in this church - the first basilica of San Marco - by 836.13 The basilica was established next to the ducal palace on land belonging to the Benedictine convent of San Zaccaria and this first structure lasted until 967 when it was burnt down during riots in the city.14 Where the body was kept in this original building is unknown but during the communal instability the precious relic was lost.15 Pietro I Orseolo began the second basilica in the late tenth century by and it was finished by Pietro II Orseolo.16 A third and final structure started during the reign of Domenico Contarini in 1063 and was finally completed in 1094 when Vitale Falier (1084-96) was Doge.17 (Fig. 5.1) The basilica was an architectural reference to Emperor Justinian’s (527-65) Apostoleion in Constantinople. The decision to imitate the repository of the largest collection of relics in Byzantium - and thus a symbol of God’s favour for the Eastern Empire - was not a coincidence. The second half of the eleventh century was a time when Venice was consolidating its influence and political might in the Adriatic region, a time when its own narratives of imperial identity and

---

15 Whilst the relics were probably lost in the fires of 967, Otto Demus had another hypothesis to explain their disappearance. He suggested that the only people privy to the exact location of the relics were the Doge himself and the primicerius, the highest-ranking cleric of San Marco. This was a sensible way of preventing others from perpetrating a furta sacra as monumental as that of 828. But what this did mean was that if one or other or both of these men were prevented in passing on the secret, then knowledge of the relics’ location would be lost. Demus (1960), p. 12.
the strong associations with St Mark were growing. What better choice of architectural vocabulary than one so suffused with both imperial and saintly connotations?

San Marco developed into a suitable backdrop for rituals and liturgical events that emphasised the Republic’s political structure and confidence. Part of this reflected Venice’s increasing imperial ambitions and these were displayed in the sacred spaces of the Evangelist’s basilica. The presbytery precinct in the east end of the basilica was dedicated to Christ and St Mark and was the focus of liturgical events, but peripheral areas in the east end also became imbued with temporal and spiritual significance.\(^{18}\) A private entrance between the ducal palace and the basilica in the church’s southeast corner meant that the Doge’s particular space within the basilica became associated with the chapel of St Clement, a dedication in existence since the eleventh century. (Fig. 5.2) During the twelfth century, the Doge’s throne was constructed in the chapel, its ground-level status mimicking that of the emperor’s throne in the Miratorion area of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.\(^{19}\)

The twelfth-century mosaics of St Clement’s chapel also presented a narrative of St Mark’s divine intercession, uniting the Republic’s civic and ecclesiastical identities. In the *Reception of St Mark’s Relics*, a group of clerics gather around the central figure of the patriarch of Grado. The clerics represent the dioceses that came under his jurisdiction. One of these was Zadar (since 1155 the archbishopric had become part of Grado’s see) and another was the bishop of Olivolo-Castello.\(^{20}\) (Fig. 5.3) To complement this image of the Republic’s ecclesiastical influence is a mosaic of the Doge flanked by five patricians, a symbol of temporal power and an image that had its origins in imperial Rome. The Evangelist oversees the whole proceedings.\(^{21}\) This was an

\(^{18}\) Demus (1960), p. 43.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., pp. 47-9.
\(^{21}\) Fenlon (2007), p. 27.
appropriate backdrop to the Doge when he sat in the chapel, illustrating his responsibilities and the grand traditions of his imperial claims all blessed by the sacred presence of St Mark.

At the same time that the dogal throne and mosaics of St Clement’s chapel were installed, development of the chapel of St Peter on the other side of the presbytery was also underway. Since the middle of the twelfth century, the patriarch of Grado had been granted a throne in the St Peter’s chapel.23 The chapel's mosaics portray the legend of Pope Pelagius II’s privilege. (Fig. 5.4) The forged privilege or letter had been in existence since the tenth century but the myth tells of Patriarch Helia of Grado asking Pope Pelagius II (579-90) for recognition and support of his see as successor to Aquileia.23 Pelagius confirmed Grado’s jurisdiction over Venice, Istria and Dalmatia.24 The St Peter’s chapel mosaic depicts Pelagius’s response twice. The first is a golden inscription above the Pope, stating ‘May it be Venice, Istria and the people of the Dalmatia’.25 On the tablet in his hand the following words are inscribed:

Revered brother, because we cannot contradict your legitimate applications, through our serene privileges we confirm the city of Grado as metropolitan [seat] of all Venice, Istria and Dalmatia.26

This magnificent backdrop confirmed the Patriarch’s rights and privileges as the ecclesiastical arm of the Republic. The Patriarch was seated opposite the Doge in San Marco creating an image of equality between Church and State, an image that did not illustrate the actuality of Venetian realpolitik but was a malleable element contributing to the Republic’s developing myth. An integral part of myth and imperial

23 Demus (1960), p. 43.
identity at this time was the emphasis on Dalmatia and Istria, but not the Terra Ferma. This was probably because of Venice’s mercantile and naval ambitions, ambitions that needed Grado’s ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Dalmatia, and thus Zadar, as a tool of regional Venetian dominion.

During the thirteenth century the veneration of saint and state became increasingly elaborate. After 1204 Venice had realised its ambition to become the new imperial force in the Adriatic and Mediterranean. Byzantium had fallen. The flood of spolia, relics and the impressive programme of mosaics in San Marco all contributed to the monumentality and prestige of the basilica as the locus of Venetian state and imperial identity.²⁷ Further changes were made in the area of the basilica most closely associated with the Doge. After the Sack of Constantinople a Late Antique ciborium was erected over the high altar, at a similar period to the installation of the Pala d’Oro.²⁸ (Fig. 5.5) In the middle of the thirteenth century an iconostasis was constructed, a screen decorated with icons that sealed off the chancel end of San Marco from the eyes of those in the nave.²⁹ It was also the boundary between the sacred space of the chancel - which stood atop the crypt in which St Mark’s body was supposedly kept - and the public space of the nave.³⁰ Yet the Doge as actor in this liturgical and civic theatre was still displayed to the people, the configuration of church furniture and sculpture emphasising his role as intercessor between St Mark and the people of the Republic.
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During the first half of the thirteenth century a double pulpit for the gospels (the *pulpito lectionem*) was constructed at the north end of the iconostasis and on the nave side. At the south end of the iconostasis an impressive *pulpitum magnum*, known locally and referred to hereafter as the *bigonzo*, was also built. (Fig. 5.6) It was made from slabs of red porphyry and elevated atop columns, simulating another favoured seating arrangement of the Byzantine emperors, also on the iconostasis in the southern exedra of Hagia Sophia. From here the Doge presented himself to the public after his investiture ceremony as well as attend daily masses, perched between the space of the laity in the west end of the basilica and his ducal realm in the east, legitimised by the presence of St Mark. He returned to the throne in the chapel of St Clement on special feast days when processions would pass through the choir or the Doge was expected to participate in the liturgy.  

By the second half of the thirteenth century, in addition to the physical changes in the presbytery area of San Marco, there were three celebrations for the Evangelist in the ducal chapel's liturgical calendar. The traditional feast day of the 25th April was shared with the Roman calendar. The other two feasts were particular to the Republic, a ritualised means of forging a collective memory of the Evangelist arriving, with God's support, at his final resting place in Venice. Myths became fact through solemn commemoration and repetition. These were the memorial of the body's

---

3 Deborah Howard noted that although rituals and liturgy were ephemeral events, their predictability in conjunction with the collective experience of them gave a sense of stability. However, memory is a fickle thing with different participants remembering different aspects of events. Small and considered changes to the rituals could be made that accommodated particular changes in policy or identity, changes that were quickly absorbed into tradition, its rituals and thus the continuity of the notion of political stability. Deborah Howard, 'Ritual Space in Renaissance Venice', *SCROOPE Cambridge Architectural Journal* 5 (1993/4), p. 4.
translation on the 31st January and the anniversary of the relic’s reinvention or *apparitio* on the 25th June.\(^{34}\)

The feast of the *apparitio* highlights the problems with the absence of St Mark’s relics and how shrewdly this hurdle was overcome. As noted above, the relics vanished around the time of the fire in 967. Yet during the dogate of Raniero Zen (1253-60) a legendary reinvention was created, dating the miraculous rediscovery of the Evangelist’s body to the consecration of the third basilica in 1094.\(^{35}\) The legend recorded that prior to the consecration all of Venice fasted for three days. On the fourth day, the 25th June, a solemn procession passed a column in San Marco. The column opened up and to revealed the saint’s body inside.\(^{36}\) The relic was displayed until the 8th of October, when the basilica was finally consecrated and the body was enclosed in the crypt.\(^{37}\) At the same time that this reinvention was written, Zeno also instigated a feast day on the 25th June to celebrate the *apparitio*.\(^{38}\) This feast also had a spectacular setting, one that incorporated props as well as a backdrop. As the relics were not on display, it was necessary to have some physical proof of the saint’s miraculous presence. The column from which St Mark was supposed to have reappeared, the *pilastro del miracolo*, was identified as one in the north west corner of

---


\(^{38}\) Muir (1981), p. 86. The late eleventh and thirteenth centuries were also periods when Zadar was subject to Venetian rule. As discussed in Chapter 3, the *reinventio* of St Chrysogonus occurred in 1056, a documented event where the body of the missing martyr was miraculously found in the abbey church’s high altar. The resonances between this discovery and that of St Mark are notable. Might it be the case that the documented reinvention of the province influenced that associated with the metropole’s patron saint? The date of 1056 was only forty years prior to the legendary rediscovery of St Mark and the rededication of his titular basilica.
St Clement’s chapel, between the porphyry *bigonzo* and the dogal throne in the chapel.\textsuperscript{39} This was next to Doge Zen’s monumental installation of mosaics on the west wall in basilica’s south transept, which presented a spectacular visual narrative of the *apparitio*.\textsuperscript{40} (Fig. 5.7) The mosaic gave the historical explanation on the preciousness of the holy column as well as the significance of the feast day’s celebration.

This entire configuration created a powerful backdrop for other important liturgical events, such as the presentation of a new Doge to the people. Iain Fenlon has written that:

This area of the basilica, where the Doge sat and from where he could participate in religious rituals as the ‘verus gubernator et patronus ecclesiae Sancti Marci’ (‘the governor and protector of the church of St Mark’) was common both to Mark (as the site of the *apparitio*) and to the sacral and intercessionary duties of the principal guardian of his relics, the Doge.\textsuperscript{41}

This area of San Marco may have been amongst the most charged sites within the city, combining so effectively the sacred and temporal in liturgy, mosaic and the saint’s holy *praesentia*. The potency of the site was not confined to the basilica. In a similar manner to the portability of St Chrysogonus’ arm reliquary, public processions brought the veneration of saint and state into the urban and thus civic space. The processions involved members of the city’s largest and most powerful lay confraternities (or *Scuole Grandi*) and representatives of the ecclesiastical authorities who made donations of candles to the Doge. It is important to note that this gift of candles was to the Doge, and not directly to St Mark.\textsuperscript{42} After this ritual donation, relics from the treasury at San

\textsuperscript{40} Demus (1984\textsuperscript{b}), pp. 27-32.
\textsuperscript{41} Fenlon (2007), p. 3.
\textsuperscript{42} On a saint’s feast day candles were offered to the church in which the patron saint’s relics lay. This suggests it was the ecclesiastical authorities that were the recipients, not the lay rulers. In Venice, the Doge appears to represent a merging between the roles of lay and ecclesiastical head of state thus subverting the usual practice. André Vauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and
Marco were exposed and solemnly processed around the city. In this manner all members of society, both lay and ecclesiastic, were involved in the continuation of a powerful narrative that defined the Republic. It seems likely that in Zadar in 1227, count Dandolo was referring to these grand ceremonies when he demanded gestures of submission and extraordinary liturgical rituals from the commune’s Benedictines and churches. The similarities to the ceremonies in Venice are striking.

These processions began in the piazza of San Marco before spreading out into the city proper. Development of the piazza and piazzetta (Fig. 5.8) as the dramatic fulcrum of civic movement and ritual began in the twelfth century and the spaces were finally paved over by 1266. At 9500 m² this was the largest open space in a city anywhere in medieval Italy. Arguably using the great forums of Rome and Constantinople as its model, Venice redefined the urban topography as a celebration of the Republic’s political and spiritual confidence. The spectacular juxtaposition of the basilica with the Doge’s palace was a backdrop to the processions, ceremonies, victories, dogal coronations and the arrival of foreign dignitaries that all contributed to the glorification and veneration of the Republic’s patron saint. This was a space in which Venice began to forge a ritualised sense of its growing imperial identity and a model of metropole to which its territorial dominions could look. This shall explored further later in this chapter.

Venice’s confidence continued until the mid-fourteenth century. The Falier plot of 1355 and the crushing humiliation of the Peace of Zadar in 1358 ushered in what

---

44 See Chapter 2.
46 Schultz (1992), pp. 145-6
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Lane has described as ‘two decades of doubt’.\(^{49}\) Although Venice was almost destroyed by the Genoese, this was a period when the concept of ducale and thus the Republic’s power was again re-imagined through the figure of St Mark. It was during the dogate of Giovanni Dolfin (1356-61) that St Mark’s lion - one of the four symbols of the Evangelists along with the ox of St Luke, the eagle of St John and the angel of St Matthew - became intrinsically bound up with the Republic as a political entity. Not only did the more aggressive and threatening image of the lion adorn the banners of the Republic but also the city’s coinage; the silver soldino of Dolfin’s reign was the first to have the Doge on one side of the coin and St Mark’s lion in moleca on the other.\(^{50}\) (Fig. 5.9)

The development of a powerful visual shorthand for St Mark is contemporaneous with the iconographic change of St Chrysogonus. As the confidence of both Venice and Zadar increased, so did the martial tone of the imagery associated with their respective patron saints. Even if Venice was a weakened political force during the 1350s, 60s and 70s, St Mark’s lion was a potent symbol of divinely sanctioned strength that summarised the identity that the Republic wished to reclaim.

And indeed, over the course of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century, as the Republic took over cities and islands throughout the Veneto, Adriatic and Aegean, it did just that. The symbol of the Evangelist was assimilated into the identity of an imperial Venice. Praise of St Mark amongst the newly annexed people was arguably praise for the Republic itself.

The cult of St Mark and its management continued to respond to the Republic’s changing political needs and the development of the basilica reflected that. In 1387 a new decorative programme for San Marco’s east end was begun with the

---

installation of a new organ. This grand programme would have dramatic implications for the Zadar’s cathedral of St Anastasia during the fifteenth century. In 1388 two tabernacles were placed in the presbytery of San Marco. In 1393, the thirteenth-century iconostasis was taken down, its plutei cannibalised and recycled in the rood screen of Santa Maria Assunta in Torcello. San Marco’s new marble presbytery screen was much larger in its ambition, made up of three parts with a central section for the chancel and two smaller side screens for the chapels of St Peter and St Clement. The brothers Jacobello and Pierpaolo dalle Masegna made a low railing with taller columns on top that supported an architrave. On top of this were statues of saints and apostles. (Fig. 5.10)

The two side screens had groups of female saints, those of the Mary Magdalene, Cecilia, Helen and Margaret in front of the chapel of St Peter and Christina, Clara, Catherine and Agnes for the chapel of St Clement. On the central screen the brothers were paid 1780 ducats to carve, amongst other things, fourteen figures and columns. A year after this commission Jacopo di Marco Benato of Venice produced a monumental cross. It was constructed of wood and covered in copper gilt, decorated with silver gilt figures and depicted the symbols of the evangelists at the end of each arm. This cross was placed in the centre of the screen’s architrave. The image of the crucified Christ looked out over the nave, but on the back of the crucifix - witnessing the events within the choir space proper - was St Mark in episcopal vestments. The Doctors of the Church were represented in each arm of the cross. Flanking the crucifix were the fourteen statues of the Virgin Mary, St Mark and the Apostles. Beginning from the left of the cross to the north end of the screen were the

51 The architectural development was not just confined to the interior of San Marco. In 1400 a new balcony was commissioned for the south façade of the ducal palace that over looked the Mola, the stretch of water between the Ducal Palace and San Giorgio Maggiore. Modesti (2006), pp. 190-1.
54 Ibid., p. 122.
Madonna, Saint Peter, James the Great, Andrew, Thaddeus, Philip and Mattia. To the right of the cross until the screen’s south end were St John, the Evangelist Mark, Saints Matthew, Bartholomew, James the Less, Simon and Thomas.56

This magnificent intervention - the most significant until Sansovino’s redevelopment of the 1520s and 30s 57 - gave more visibility to the proceedings within the chancel space. The citizens of the Republic could witness the rituals and liturgy that defined the cult of their patron saint. The chancel was a collection of architectural and artistic accretions, each reflecting the confidence of a particular moment in the history of the Republic and St Mark’s role within that moment.

5.1.2 Liminality: The Relics of St Mark

During this entire period the relics of the Evangelist became increasingly liminal in the basilica’s architectural arrangement. Aside from the ninth-century translatio and legendary thirteenth-century apparitio of Mark’s body, little is recorded about this important relic. Where was the saint’s tomb? The Pala Feriale of 1345 included a representation of St Mark’s tomb, depicting it as an elevated marble sarcophagus with a ciborium. (Fig. 5.11) But it is unlikely any such object existed. As discussed in Chapter 4, since the early fourteenth century these elevated tombs had become a visual ‘type’ in the Veneto region associated with sanctity, a sepulchre worthy of a saint’s body.58 Like the pilastro del miracolo and mosaics of the apparitio, this scene on the Pala d’Oro gave validation to the cult, creating the visual and physical accretions expected of a major saint’s cultic centre. Except there was no monumental tomb, no means by which the faithful could access the tangible remains of the Evangelist.

56 Ibid., p. 185.
In contrast to many of the saints mentioned in this thesis, St Mark's cult was not intended for pilgrimage. The Evangelist’s body was kept in San Marco, a church that was, for all its grandeur and beauty, the private chapel of the Doges. The basilica was not a public ecclesiastical building like St Peter’s in Rome, the Santo in Padua or St Simeon’s chapel in Zadar. The Doge was the chosen one who had access to St Mark, and with this privilege came the responsibility of the Republic. During the investiture ceremony, which mainly occurred in the closed presbytery space behind the iconostasis, the Doge was presented with the *vexillum* or banner of the commune. This was handed to him over the high altar and above the crypt, the location that the *apparitio* legend claimed was the Evangelist’s final resting place. The ceremonial gesture was interpreted as Christ granting the Doge power through the intercession of St Mark. From the reign of Enrico Dandolo (1192-1205), the Republic’s coins depicted St Mark giving the *vexillum* to the Doge. This image emphasised the special relationship between the Republic’s leaders, both temporal and spiritual. (Fig. 5.12) Coins also brought the imagery of the exclusive (at least until the 1390s) investiture ceremony into the public realm and ensured the people’s acceptance of the Doge’s divinely sanctioned authority.

Ultimately this inhibited any public devotional practice associated with St Mark in Venice: the faithful’s need for touch and an immediate visual identification of the Evangelist’s relic and tomb was not met. The sacred body may have been the starting point for the mythical narratives that shaped the Republic’s spiritual destiny so the tangible remains of the Evangelist became less important. Urban theatre and the spectacle of civic ritual and veneration were what defined the cult, a cult of the commune more so than it was a one of sanctity and the saint. Arguably this absence of

---

CHAPTER 5. ST MARK THE EVANGELIST

St Mark’s body and the vocabulary of ceremony made the cult’s transmission beyond Venice and into the Stato da Mar much easier.

5.2 Urban Space in Thirteenth-Century Candia

It is necessary to present some discussion of the greater colonial context for St Mark’s cult. New rulers had to convince the newly conquered of the narratives and justifications for change. Rituals and events helped in this creation of new histories and joint futures. The ceremonial, architectural and ephemeral aspects of the cult had proved so effective in forging a strong sense of civic identity and pride in Venice proper that attempts were made to export it to the newer territories of the Stato da Mar. Before looking at the Zaratine reception of St Mark it is worth considering a contemporaneous experiment in colonial administration and development as a basis for comparison. Was there a coherent and uniform promotion of St Mark’s cult in the territories of the Stato da Mar? Amongst Venice’s Aegean the city of Candia in Crete was as important a trading hub and strategic port as Zadar on the Adriatic. Candia has of late been one of the most researched territories of Venice’s maritime empire because of a wealth of notarial archives rescued from the city before its final fall to the Ottomans in 1669.  

In contrast to Zadar, there were fewer rebellions in Candia but there were different divisions and tensions between the Venetians and local populace. The Candians spoke Greek and were Orthodox Christians and thus, as Maria Georgopoulou
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has described, 'linguistically, ethnically and ecclesiastically distinct' from the Venetians. The Cretans' Orthodoxy posed theological and political threats to the Venetian administration: the association between Byzantium and Orthodoxy was too pronounced and had the potential to become a rallying point for dissent and rebellion. In 1211 Jacopo Tiepolo, the former podestà of Constantinople and future Doge of Venice (1229-49), conquered Candia and was rewarded with the title first Duke of Crete. Whilst colonial duke and later Venetian Doge, Tiepolo began fusing St Mark’s cult with Candia’s traditions and institutions to the benefit of Venice’s imperial identity. The challenge was reconciling local identities, both sacred and secular, with this new external ideal.

To begin with the Republic counteracted the threat posed by the Orthodox Church. It was strictly controlled and the Venetians demanded communal participation in Catholic rites as a way of creating stability for both the foreign rulers and local population. Chapter 3 has already examined the manipulation of the St Titus’ cult as an example of this. In addition to St Titus’ expropriation was St Mark’s introduction to the Cretan liturgical calendar. Having lost their own patron to Venice, the local populace of Candia had to honour the Republic’s patron saint and thus play a part in the promulgation of Venice’s developing identity as an imperial power helped by the Evangelist. Beyond the lauds and rituals of St Mark’s feast day were further, more permanent reminders of his presence and strong ties to the Republic.

The first mention of an ecclesiastical space in Candia dedicated to the Evangelist - and indeed any Latin ecclesiastical space - was a ducal chapel in 1228. But Pope Gregory IX only gave permission for the Venetians to build a titular church for St

---

Mark in 1239.65 This was constructed close to the Duke’s palace and the cathedral of St Titus, although the original thirteenth-century church of St Mark no longer exists.66 Nonetheless it would have created an extraordinary topographical imitation of the space around San Marco and the Dogal Palace in Venice itself, as both the Candi versions overlooked the territory’s main market place.67 (Fig. 5.13) This became the city’s spiritual and temporal focus as well as the seat of Venetian power.68 From there the influence from the metropole spread with new Western gothic churches dotting the skyline, in contrast to the more discrete Orthodox structures, and Venetian-style campi or squares opening up the city space in front of the churches.69

All of this provided a backdrop rich in the metropole’s topographical symbolism. In this urban theatre processions and civic rituals were acted out and joined the various spaces of Candia. A weekly example was the exposition of the miraculous icon of the Virgin Mesopanditissa. It was processed through the city, an event in which the Greek clergy were obliged to participate along with the Latin churchmen. Another example from the fourteenth century was the elaborate procession on the Feast of Corpus Christi. The Ducal Palace was festooned with decorations and the city’s confraternities prepared large floral displays, possibly mobile-like floats. Afterwards, the Latin archbishop would lead the Duke, magistrates, Greek clergy and the confraternities from the cathedral of St Titus to the church of St

---

66 Ibid., p. 56.
68 The Duke was responsible for the chapel’s upkeep. After an earthquake in 1303 the structure was damaged but the Duke was unable to raise the money necessary to restore it. Finally on the 13th February 1336 the Venetian Senate sent 1000 ducats to repair the building, saying that ‘the bad condition of the church of St Mark was harmful to the honour of the Republic and did not satisfy the devotional needs of the people.’ ASV, Senato Misti, Liber XVII, fol. 46 r as translated in Georgopoulou (2001), p. 124.
Mark. The procession then went to every square in the city, which would mean all the campi in front of the other Latin churches.\textsuperscript{70} Ephemeral rituals and processions helped cement the ideal of a unified Candia, one where the civic and ecclesiastical authorities, the local population and the foreign rulers were all joined together. The visit to both the churches of St Titus and St Mark followed by the movement out into the other city squares helped diffuse this ideal. This incorporated the permanence of the city’s topography into a grand statement of Venetian imperial identity and its connection with St Mark.

5.3 The Cult of St Mark in Zadar, 1202-1358

Did this model of colonial participation in St Mark’s cult, a model that involved both urban remodelling as well as ritual, translate to Zadar? Certainly, the commune had more in common with Venice. The Zaratini’s religion, language and civic identity were closer to the metropole than was the case with the Greek orthodox population in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{71} Might it have been easier to promote St Mark in Zadar? Yet, as seen in Chapters 1 & 2, relations between Venice and Zadar were not always smooth. St Mark’s presence had the potential to increase antagonism between the two sides. To begin with, after the crushing destruction of Zadar in 1202 the Zaratini agreed to submit to Venice in 1204. In contrast to the Cretan submission of 1211, there was no mention of St Mark in the documentation that survives. But the liturgical demand was that every year at Christmas and Easter the clerics of Zadar’s major churches had to sing laudes to the Doge, patriarch of Grado, the archbishop (at this point a Venetian) and the Venetian count.\textsuperscript{72} Constantinople had only fallen a


\textsuperscript{71} Suzanne Mariko Miller, Venice in the east Adriatic: Experiences and experiments in colonial rule in Dalmatia and Istria (c. 1150–1358), Ph.D thesis (Stanford University, 2007), p. 1.

\textsuperscript{72} Tade Smičiklas, Diplomički Zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije, Codex Diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae (1201-1235), ed. Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, 12 vols (Zagreb: Tisak Dioničke Tiskare, 1905), 3, p. 45.
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matter of months before the Zaratine submission; the evolution of Venice’s perception of itself as a new imperial force, one increasingly bound to its patron saint, was only just beginning. By 1211 there was a much stronger sense of this identity, particularly as Crete was another Greek and Orthodox territory like Constantinople.

Back in Zadar the first recorded encouragement of St Mark’s cult occurred in December 1243, soon after Venice had retaken the city after the revolt of that year. Doge Jacopo Tiepolo’s commission for the city’s count, given to the Venetian nobleman Leonardo Quirini, not only outlined the position’s responsibilities but also demanded that:

Item we [the Doge] want you [the Count] annually, on the feast of St Mark, to send and display in the church of our blessed Mark the Evangelist a samite or silk fabric of gold worth £40 denariorum venetialium from the income of the commune of Zadar for the reverence and honour of the name of the said St Mark our patron. This samite or silk fabric with gold must be given to the procurator of St Mark.73

Samite was a popular fabric in the thirteenth century. It was a heavy twill-weave silk with interwoven gold or silver threads that produced a brocade effect and it was particularly sought after for ecclesiastical vestments and embellishments.74 Throughout the medieval period these elaborately woven and embroidered coverings and robes were astronomically expensive because of the skills and time needed to create them.75 The money of account recorded in this document also reflects the high

73 Item volumus tibi committentes ut annuatem in kalendis marciis debeas mittere et exhibere ecclesie nostre beati Marci Evangeliste ysamitum vel drapum ad aurum valentem libras quadraginta denarorum venetorum de redditibus communis Jadere pro dicti Sancti Marci nostri patronis reverencia et honore nomine censi quod quidem ysamitum vel drapum ad aurum debeat consignari in manibus procuratoris Sancti Marci. ASV, Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.
75 For instance in March 1420 the procurators of St Chrysogonus commissioned the embroiderer Master Lorenzo dalla Seta of Venice to embroider with gold and silver threads thirty-six brachie of silk fabric from
worth of the samite and thus Zadar’s tribute. The *libra denariorum venetialium* was the money of account used in large government transactions of this period and indicated exceptional amounts of spending. 76

The Doge’s request for such a contribution from Zadar - one paid for by the commune’s taxes - is striking. Whether or not the Zaratini actually wanted to contribute to the purchase of the samite was not a consideration. For those who stood against Venice it would have been a symbol of their subjugation. For those Zaratini who supported Venice this would have been evidence of their willing support for the Republic. 77 In addition, the citizens of Venice proper would have seen tangible evidence of the Republic’s resumption of authority over the Dalmatian commune. There already was a Zaratine banner or *vexillum* in the treasury of San Marco that the Venetians had taken after the sack of 1202 and so there was already a memento in San Marco of the Republic’s military victory over Zadar. 78 The samite was an extension of that, and represented the metropole’s demand for the territory’s active participation in the cult of St Mark.

Doge Tiepolo’s role in promoting colonial involvement in this civic cult should also be considered. He had been the Duke in Candia when the submission of 1211 demanded that the Cretans participate in laudes on the feast day of St Mark. In 1239, four years before Quirini’s Zaratine commission, both the building of St Mark’s church in Candia and the development of the city as a proxy Venice had begun. This all
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76 In the middle of the thirteenth century, until 1280, the *libra denariorum venetialium* was the money of account used mainly in government dealings and larger commercial transactions. Lane and Mueller (1985), p. 471.

77 Indeed the postscript of Leonardo Quirini’s commission mentions the ‘faithful and friends’ who made up some of the commune’s familial patriarchs. ASV, Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.

78 The basilica’s treasury inventory of June 1283 noted that there was ‘item vexilla de cendato tria magna de victoris Constantinopolim et ladrae’. Rodolfo Gallo, *Il tesoro di S. Marco e la sua storia* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1967), p. 36.
happened during Tiepolo’s dogate and so the demand for a samite as tribute from Zadar seems a small request in the light of Candia’s monumental physical changes. It should also remembered that the samite would be sent to Venice and was not for public consumption in Zadar. What was happening to the cult in Zadar proper?

5.3.1 The Dominicans

Leonardo Quirini’s commission also hinted at what would become an attempt to bring St Mark into Zadar’s urban space. In the postscript at the bottom of the documents it states:

Item the place of the preaching friars [the Dominicans] will be handed over to the preaching brothers in the city of Zadar just as it is ordered by ourselves and our council.79

As noted in Chapter 2, Tiepolo had a personal interest in the promotion of the Dominicans in Venice. They were also encouraged in Candia during the mid-thirteenth century. The friar’s church of St Peter Martyr was probably founded whilst the Dominican Giovanni Morosini was bishop of Crete (1247-52).80 It seems that the Dominicans’ move into eastern parts of Christendom was closely allied to Venetian imperial expansion. In Zadar the Order of Preachers became a way of promoting St Mark in the city. In 1280 the friars’ new church, friary and high altar was consecrated and dedicated to the Evangelist. In attendance was Guido the Patriarch of Grado, Zadar’s archbishop Periandro, and the bishops of Nin, Rab and Senj.81 This choice of clerics clearly defined the hierarchy between the pro-Venetian patriarch and the local clergy who were subject to Grado’s jurisdiction and Venice’s political influence. The

79 ‘Item locum fraternam predicaturum quem deberis consignare pro fratribus predietoribus n civitate Jadere sicut ordinatum est per nos consiliarum nostrum.’ ASV, Collegio, Commissioni ai rettori e altre cariche, B. 1, n. 11.
81 See Chapter 2.
dedication of the church to St Mark also coincided with the building of a new palace for the count, which occurred between 1278 and 1283.81

These developments seem similar to those in Candia but the Zaratine Dominican church of St Mark, later St Platon, was in the Gothic style.83 Candia’s church and the Venetian prototype of San Marco were Byzantine in style.84 Zadar’s topography was also different. Although both the count’s palace and the Dominican friary were in the southeast of the peninsula, a city block separated them. (Fig. 2.1) The medieval count’s palace overlooked the piazza of the church of St Stephen (today St Simeon) and the city’s main street that ran north to south. The Dominicans were situated away from this thoroughfare. This was nothing like the grand theatrical setting and urban political statement that existed in Venice and was underway in Candia. Also in contrast to Candia, the Zaratine dedication of its Dominican church to St Mark did not endure. As early as 1287 or 88 a will referred to a property in the confines of St Platon.85 The church and friary were then interchangeably called St Platon or St Dominic until the mid-fifteenth century, when the latter became the standard name.86

81 From 1247 to 1278 the count had been based at the private house of the local nobleman, Damianus de Varicassis. In 1278 documents recorded that the count had his own house, although whether this was because the count had bought Varicassis’ house or built his own is unknown. What is certain is that by 1283 a document recorded that the house in which the count’s counsellor would live was completed. It seems unlikely that the count’s palace would not be finished before the house of his advisor. The first archival reference to the count’s palace was in 1288. Nada Klaić and Ivo Petricioli, Prošlost Zadra II: Zadar u srednjem vijeku do 1409 (Former Zadar II: Zadar in the Middle Ages to 1409) (Zadar: Narodni List, 1976), p. 281; Marija Stagličić, ‘Izgradnja kneževi i prividurove palače u Zadru (The construction of the Count’s and Proveditor’s palace in Zadar),’ Radovi Filozofskih fakulteta u Zadru, 20 / 9 (1982), p. 76.
84 Maria Georgopoulou has argued this architectural change was because of increased Venetian confidence after the mid thirteenth century. There was no longer the need to make a direct reference to Byzantium, spiritual and imperial model for the Republic. Venice was a force in its own right. Georgopoulou (2001), p. 131.
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More than a century later, the Apostolic Visitation of 1579 made no mention of an altar of St Mark: the high altar was by then dedicated to St Dominic. Why was it that by the early fourteenth century there was no church in Zadar dedicated to St Mark? There simply was no lasting impact upon the city fabric that stood testament to Venetian rule. As discussed in Chapter 2, the Mendicants enjoyed the considerable patronage of the local nobility and certain members of the cives class. The patronage might not have been so willingly bestowed upon an order closely connected to the Venetians. Pragmatism and the courting of local support might have been the reasons for the quick and quiet demise of the dedication to St Mark. Aside from the small hospital of St Mark there was no other titular church of the Evangelist in Zadar. It seems such monumental and ecclesiastical references to the saint were not an effective means of promoting the cult within the Zaratine context.

5.3.2 The Confraternity

In the 1920s Giuseppe Praga found evidence in the Zaratine archives of another, less physically present manifestation of St Mark’s cult. In February 1320, a decade after the revolt of 1310, a confraternity dedicated to the Evangelist was established, founded by Giovanni Contarini. The Contarini were a Venetian noble family, but Giovanni’s branch had settled in Zadar, intermarrying with members of the local nobility. Contarini also had a number of business interests in the city. Other confrères

---

89 See the transcription of the confraternity’s statutes or mariegola in Giuseppe Praga, 'La mariegola della Confraternita di San Marco in Zara (1321)', Rivista Dalmatica, VIII / 2 (1926), p. 49. For more about archbishop Butovane see Bianchi (1877), pp. 46-7.
90 A document written between 1270 and 89 referred to a ‘Iohanni Contarini’, married to Slava of Zadar. His will was also lodged in 1287. Whether this is the same Giovanni who founded the confraternity of St Mark is not clear. This particular section of the Contarini family were considered a separate entity from the original Venetian group by the late thirteenth century. Zjačić (1959), pp. 25 & 47-8; Žrinka Nikolić Jakus, The Formation of Dalmatian Urban Nobility: Examples of Split, Trogir and Zadar, Ph.D thesis (Central European University, 2004), pp. 63-5.
91 Praga, (1926), p. 45.
CHAPTER 5. ST MARK THE EVANGELIST

included Marino Çaçone, the *gastaldo*, and Collano de Meço, the *degano* or treasurer. Other members of the executive committee were the furrier Nicola, Bertolino the tailor and the wool carder, Franciscus. The confraternity’s aim was to provide spiritual and physical support to its members in times of poverty, infirmity and death. The members all had to contribute prayers, candles and masses to those who had passed away. Members also had to attend a weekly mass dedicated to St Mark.

A surprising element of the confraternity’s activities is that the group’s base was at the abbey church of St Chrysogonus. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 have all noted how the abbey had traditionally been a focus of Zadar’s Hungarian patronage and support. The statutes of St Mark’s confraternity were confirmed in the abbey church. Indeed, the weekly mass to St Mark was held there and the focus of this veneration must have been on the altar of the Evangelist that was still extant in the Apostolic Visitation of 1579. The monthly mass for the souls of departed confrères was celebrated in the church. The abbot’s participating in the confraternity’s activities is also worth noting as he was expected to take part in the mourning for confrères who had died. Every month and on the feast of St Mark the abbot contributed *caritas* or charity, probably some sort of financial donation, to the gastaldo and treasurer. Finally, on the feast day of St Mark, the abbot held a celebratory meal at his home for the confrères,

---

92 Ibid., pp. 49-50.
94 *Altari Sancti Marci habet palam veterem honorificam, duas tobales laceras, pallium ex tela fusca.* ASVat, Congregatio Vescovi e Regolari, Visite Apostoliche, n. 80, fol. 43v.
96 *Et pro [unoqu]oque mortuo, dominus abbas sancti Grisogoni cum fratribus suis sub[levare] teneatur et propter seputuram recipient quinque solidos.* Ibid., p. 49.
although attendees were expected to pay eight denarii a month for their food. In return the abbot attended the annual feast hosted by the gastaldo and treasurer.

The participation of one of the city’s most powerful ecclesiastical representatives in what was a small confraternity is highly unusual, with the particularly remarkable requirement for the abbot to host and feed the confrères on the feast day of St Mark. There is nothing comparable in the other surviving statutes of the city’s confraternities, neither in the 1426 rules of St Silvester’s confraternity nor those from 1457 for the scola of St James of Galicia. By the fifteenth century Venice had a tighter control of Zadar’s confraternities, but in 1320 relations between the Republic and the Dalmatian commune were still strained. Might the institution of a confraternity dedicated to St Mark be a subtle tool of imperial authority? Giovanni Contarini came from a family that was well known amongst the elite ranks of Venice, albeit an estranged expatriate branch. Praga identified Collano or Niccolo de Meça as another Venetian merchant. But the confraternity’s statutes did not record the origins of all the founding confrères so it is not certain that all were ‘probably’ Venetian. It does seem likely, though, that the choice of St Mark as the confraternity’s patron was a way of unifying a group of expatriate Venetian artisans and merchants.

Indeed, the confraternity’s statutes give no indication that the group was a tool of the Venetian government, as tempting as it might be to construe such an

---

98 ‘Et volumus quod omni anno in sollemnitate beati Marci apostoli et evangeliste] in domo domini abbatis sancti Grisogoni [gastaldus cum deganis et fratribus depascatur.’ Ibid., p. 50.
99 ‘Ordinamus etiam quod omni anno quando castaldus et [degan voluerint] fácere pastum, dominus abbas sancti Grisogoni [teneatur venire at pastum predic[tum.]’ Ibid., p. 50.
100 The manuscript of the statutes for St Silvester’s confrères were photographed before World War One but were lost during World War Two. Ivo Petricoli, ‘Dvije matrikule bratovštine sv. Silvestra u Zadru (Two statutes of St. Silvester’s confraternity in Zadar), Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta, Razdro društvenih znanosti (Zadar), 7 (1977), p. 146; For the full transcription of the statutes of the confraternity of St James of Compostella or Gallicia, see Maja Novak-Sambrailo, ‘Matrikula bratovštine sv. Jakova iz Galicije i Zadru (The statutes of the confraternity of St James of Gallicia in Zadar), Radovi Arhiva JAZU, 1 (1972), pp. 11-31.
102 See Chapter 2.
103 O’Connell has examined the development of Venetian colonial elites in Crete and their social status and identity, poised as it was between both the metropole and periphery. The Contarini in Zadar may have been another instance of this fracturing of Venetian patrician identity in the territories, a hybrid status neither Venetian nor Zaratine, but nonetheless useful to both communities. See O’Connell (2004), pp. 466-93.
104 Praga, (1926), p. 45.
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interpretation.104 Yet the close involvement of at least two identifiable Venetian expatriates in a cult of St Mark, and its close connections with the abbey of St Chrysogonus provides a powerful juxtaposition between the local symbols of Venetian and Hungarian political presence: St Mark and St Chrysogonus. At public events, such as the presence of the abbot at the funerals of confrères and his participation in the mass on St Mark’s feast day, this contrast would have been particularly pronounced.

The statutes are the last documented reference to the confraternity. When Giuseppe Praga discovered the manuscript it had been reused to bind together the protocolli of the fifteenth-century notary, Nicolaus Benedicti.105 Earlier historians such as Bianchi and Brunelli did not mention the confraternity and Praga implied this lacuna was a willful act of denial.106 More prosaically, the confraternity was not recorded simply because scholars before Praga did not know about the recycled parchment with its faded script. The fact that the rulebook was reused just over a century after the confraternity’s foundation indicate it had been inactive for a while before Nicolaus Benedicti’s notarial career began in 1436. Might the confraternity’s demise have occurred as early as 1345? We have already seen how during the height of the siege of Zadar the citizens gained strength from the exhortations to St Chrysogonus and his image.107 The confraternity of St Mark would have struggled to flourish in such a hostile environment.

5.3.3 The Scapula Relic

So far early material remains of St Mark’s cult in Zadar have been limited.

Topographical changes did not occur nor did the saint’s confraternity endure. What existed in Zadar that was notably lacking in Venice and Candia was a body part relic of

105 DAZD, SZB, Nicolaus Benedicti (1433-1469), B. 1, Protocolli; Praga, (1926), pp. 47-48.
106 Praga, (1926), p. 45.
107 See Chapter 3.
the Evangelist: his scapula. (Fig. 5.14) It appears that Zadar could provide tangible evidence and contact with the Evangelist that the Republic would not. Here was the opportunity for veneration and devotional practice akin to that found in the fragmented cult of St Chrysogonus.

The relic of the scapula or shoulder blade of St Mark is contained in a small reliquary, reflecting the shape of the bone within, an unusual distinction amongst anthropomorphic reliquaries.\(^{108}\) The reliquary is 13cm wide, 23cm in length and 13.5cm high at its tallest point. The box itself is constructed of wood wrapped in a silver gilt cover punched with a small star motif. The cover is attached to the main body of the reliquary by a hinge at its lower end and has four larger almond-shaped holes that form a cross motif. These also provide a means of seeing the sacred bone within. The whole construction sits atop three cast lions’ paws. In her recent thesis on the metalwork of fourteenth-century Zadar, Marijana Kovačević dated the piece to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Its simple ornamentation and punchwork at first suggested a Romanesque style but the anthropomorphic quality of the reliquary form was more in the spirit of the Gothic period. In addition the similarities between it and the reliquary containing the mandible of St Anselm from the treasury of Nin cathedral suggest that they were contemporaneous. Indeed, the mandible reliquary is firmly attributed to the Master of St Gregory’s Pax and was produced during the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century.\(^{109}\) (Fig. 5.15) The first documentary reference to

---


the scapula reliquary was only in 1427 when it appeared in the Venetian inventory of St Anastasia’s treasury.\textsuperscript{103}

Where did this relic come from? It could have been originally present in the high altar of the Dominican church in 1280, a sacred gift from the metropole as blessing to this new mendicant venture. The style of the metalwork, however, suggests that it was created in the early part of the fourteenth century, at about the time that the confraternity of St Mark was established in the city. It may have been that the confraternity commissioned the new reliquary for the scapula and placed it in the altar at St Chrysogonus. But it was not until Valerio Ponte in his seventeenth-century \textit{Storia delle Chiese di Zara} that the relic’s arrival in Zadar was recorded. Ponte wrote that the ship carrying the body of the Evangelist from Alexandria to Venice during the original \textit{translatio} of 828 stopped off in Zadar, an important port on the maritime routes between East and West.\textsuperscript{104} When the ship arrived the sacred body was placed on an altar in the cathedral’s crypt. A sacristan stole the shoulder blade from the Evangelist’s body. The rest of the relic was taken away back to Venice, presumably with no one on board the ship any the wiser about this \textit{furta sacra.}\textsuperscript{105}

Ponte gave no sources for this legend. His manuscript is the earliest known explanation for the scapula’s presence in Zadar. What it does reveal is how the city had become intertwined with the larger and more famous myth of Venetian identity and state creation. This might be why the Venetians tolerated the scapula relic in Zadar, rather than taking it to Venice after 1409. Certainly during this period the Republic was collecting relics associated with St Mark. In 1420 the Republic had acquired parts


\textsuperscript{104} See Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{105} Brunelli (1907), pp. 126-27. See also Bianchi (1877), p. 117.
of a gospel purportedly written by Mark himself that came from the treasury of Aquileia’s cathedral.\textsuperscript{103} San Marco also housed the relic of St Mark’s ring, worn by the Evangelist when he appeared to a Venetian fisherman in 1341.\textsuperscript{104} But surely a relic of the Evangelist himself, one originally in the keeping of another subject territory would have been an impressive addition to the treasury of San Marco, strengthening Venetian imperial claims and subverting Zaratine legitimacy?

The difference between Zadar’s scapula and the hand-written gospel or the ring relic of St Mark is that the latter were contact relics. The acquisition of contact relics would enhance the Republic’s claim on the Evangelist rather than, as would have been the case with a body part relic, undermine the assertion that the saint’s entire body was kept in San Marco. The revelation of the saint’s fragmentation might even confirm rumours that the Doge and his procurators had lost St Mark’s body. Andrea Dandolo wrote in his Chronica that as both Doge and a former procurator of San Marco he had seen the precious relic himself.\textsuperscript{105} This statement could be interpreted as a negation of concerns surrounding the existence of the saint’s body in Venice. Essentially, taking Zadar’s scapula relic to Venice would have raised too may questions about the Republic’s care of the Evangelist’s relics.

Instead it appears that the Venetian authorities were more considered in their response to the relic in Zadar. In the same way that Zadar’s inclusion within the narrative of St Mark’s translatio was allowed and possibly even cultivated in the local context of the Dalmatian commune, so the scapula was used in rituals that were meant for public consumption. On the 31st January, the feast day of the Evangelist’s translatio, a solemn mass was held in the cathedral and followed by singing in the crypt at the

\textsuperscript{105} Dandolo (1938), p. 219.
altar where the scapula was exposed.\textsuperscript{166} Ponte wrote that the mensa of this altar was the very one upon which the body was originally placed in 828.\textsuperscript{167} By combining ritual, place and sacred object, a local collective memory of the legend was created, making the commune of Zadar complicit in the grand narrative of sacred statehood enjoyed by the Republic of Venice. This was part of a new phase in the cultivation of St Mark in Zadar. After 1409, the Republic no longer feared local revolt or threats from Hungary and was increasingly confident as its empire in the Stato da Mar and Terra Firma grew.

5.4 The Cult of St Mark in Zadar after 1409

1409 heralded new strategies in the promotion of St Mark’s cult in Zadar, strategies that reflected Venice’s self-assurance and strengthening imperial identity. Rituals, objects and the development of monumental public spaces were all part of this cultivation. The remainder of this chapter examines examples of these, particularly how civic liturgy, coins and the development of St Anastasia disseminated St Mark’s cults into the public and private spheres of communal life.

One of the more effective ways of encouraging the veneration of St Mark and thus the cult of the Republic was with legislation. We have already seen how submission treaties of the thirteenth century demanded public engagement in laudes for the Doge on particular feast days. These were pale reflections of the civic celebrations in Venice itself but they had the desired effect of incorporating the territories into an image of shared identity. After 1409, to ensure this participation continued, more laws were added to the existing city statutes.\textsuperscript{168} This section was called

\textsuperscript{166} Bianchi (1877), pp. 117-18; Brunelli (1907), pp. 126-27.
\textsuperscript{167} Brunelli (1907), pp. 126-27.
\textsuperscript{168} The lex nova of 1280 codified and recorded the original le antiqua of the city. In 1305 another edition was produced, the lex novissima. Vitaliano Brunelli, Storia della città di Zara : Dai tempi più remoti sino al 1409 compilata sulle fonti e integrata da tre capitoli sugli usi e costumi. Sotto gli auspici del libero comune di Zara in esilio nel 125° anniversario della nascita dell’autore, 2nd edn (Trieste: LINT, 1974), p. 533. See also Chapter 2.
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deployment of the Reformationes. The first law demanded that in commemoration of the Santa Intrada of 1409, an annual procession would be held on the 31st of July to the glory of God, the Virgin Mary and St Mark 'protecor of the city of Zadar'. The commune's laity and clerics processed through the city with lit candles before arriving at the cathedral. There a mass was sung in honour of St Mark.

The next law stated that those in debt could come to the city for eight days without fear of harassment by their creditors. Might this generous gesture of tolerance towards debtors be a means of bringing the Zaratini even further under the patronage of both the Evangelist and the Republic? If this was indeed the case, it does not appear that the local community were overly willing to participate in this festival, arguably a celebration of Venetian imperial success with a thin veneer of religious sobriety. The third law of the Reformationes prohibited any form of work on the 31st July in either Zadar or its suburbs. Anyone caught would suffer a fine of £2. This would certainly ensure mass participation in such feasts.

As had been the case in Venice and Candia so it was in Zadar: the liturgical calendar was a useful way of punctuating the religious life of a community with political significance. The processions through the streets of the city were markedly similar to the Doge's andate and helped unite the temporal and spiritual spheres of the urban space. The eighteenth-century canon Giovanni Maria Ferrari recorded in his

109 Two important hand-written copies of the statutes still exist. The version that Brunelli dated to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century was in the collection of the city's Italian high school or gymnasm in the early twentieth century. This document was written during a period of instability for Venetian rule in Zadar and so, Brunelli suggests, has no reforms or additions at the end. The surviving manuscript from the Franciscan friary of Male Brće in Dubrovnik was written in the 1460s, fifty years after the Santa Intrada. This version included 137 reforms. The edition with the largest number of laws in the Reformationes was the Statuta ladrentina cum omnibus reformationibus in hunc usque diem factis, additoque indice lacopletissimo, nunc primum typis excussa. This was published in Venice in 1564 and included reforms instigated in 1536. Josip Kolanović and Mate Križman, eds, Statuta ladrentina cum omnibus reformationibus usque ad annum MDLXIII Factis, (Zadar & Zagreb: Ogranak Matice hrvatske & Hrvatski državni archiv, 1997), pp. 9-12.

110 ...protecoris civitatis ladrensis... Ibid., p. 520.

111 Ibid., p. 520.

112 Ibid., p. 522.
Zaratine Cerimoniali how the processions of the 31st July and the feast day of St Mark passed under the city loggia in the Plathea Magna. This was the city’s business centre and the location where many contracts were negotiated and signed.124 A comparison can be made with the Piazza San Marco as both the Piazza in Venice and Zadar’s Plathea Magna were important communal spaces and commercial centres in which impressive displays of civic liturgy bound together the religious and secular elements of society.125

In Venice and Zadar the participation of or at least witness by the entire community was demanded.126 Some of the participation was financial, such as the purchase of candles for the procession. Candle wax was an important and expensive commodity,127 and in Zadar’s case each island community was expected to contribute 30 soldi and 2 piccoli specifically for the candles in the 31st July procession.128 This reflects the processions in Venice on the feast day of the apparitio, when members of the city’s Scuole Grande and ecclesiastical representatives donated candles to the Doge.129 In Zadar this gesture ensured that all members of the subject community, both in the city and on the islands, contributed to the commemorative procession of the Santa Intrada, be it as active participant or financial contributor. With this tribute the laity recognised the temporal and ecclesiastical authorities that ruled and the

124 Zadar’s loggia was erected during the thirteenth century but underwent reconstruction in 1565. This might be an instance where the Venetian model proved an influence in the territory: a loggia or loggetta was constructed near San Marco in 1282 but was rebuilt beneath the basilica’s campanile in 1537 by Sansovino, decorated with reliefs that reflected contemporary ideals of Venetian imperial identity. Might the restoration of Zadar’s loggia reflect Sansovino’s renewal in the metropole? Giovanni Maria Ferrari, Compendio di tutte le funzioni e cerimonie che si praticano per tutto il corso dell’anno nella Chiesa Cattedrale di Zara (Zadar: 1716), p. 184; Giuseppe Sabalich, Guida archeologica di Zara con illustrazioni araldiche (Zadar: Tip. di Leone Woditzka, 1898), p. 6; Wolfgang Wolters, Der Bilderschmuck des Dogenpalastes. Untersuchungen zur Selbst: Darstellungen der Republik Venedig im 16. Jahrhundert (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1983), p. 236; Schultz (1992), p. 141.
sanction for that rule was granted by the patron saint: in both fifteenth-century Zadar and Venice that patron was St Mark the Evangelist.

After 1409, as well as pervading the city’s public space through civic ritual and ceremony, the presence of St Mark permeated other spheres of communal life, from the commercial to the domestic. The means by which this occurred was with coins, objects that defined almost every activity in daily life. Gold ducats, silver soldi and copper or billon piccoli were used in a variety of transactions, from important international commercial deals to the commonplace activity of buying bread.\textsuperscript{130} By stamping representations of rulers or symbols of imperial authority onto coins, political figureheads quite literally watched over and participated in the day-to-day transactions of their subjects.\textsuperscript{131}

In Zadar the images on coins provided proxies for the power of the ruling state, be it centred on an individual ruler like the Kings of Hungary or the collective authority of the Venetian Republic.\textsuperscript{132} Saint cults were a key component of that formation and definition of rule, or at least the right to rule. Symbols of patron saints had become as fundamental a means of representing secular power as portraits of individuals. Using patron saints in conjunction with portraits or coats of arms on coins emphasised the divinely sanctioned link between the spiritual and the temporal. Coins from the reign of King Louis demonstrate this, with the Hungarian Angevin coats of arms on one side of the coin and Louis’ Hungarian patron saint and ancestor, St Ladislaus, on the other. (Fig. 5.16)

\textsuperscript{130} For more about the economic history of medieval Zadar see Antonio Teja, \textit{Aspetti della vita economica di Zara dal 1289 al 1409: La pratica bancaria}, II vols (Zadar: Tipografia edit. S. Artale, 1942), 1.

\textsuperscript{131} The images and symbols stamped upon the coins had a rather singular potency and could be compare with the use in Late Antiquity of the lauraton or official portrait of the emperor. These portraits were scattered throughout his territories and functioned as visual proxy for the emperor himself, a reminder of who held the reigns of power. Herbert Kessler, \textit{Spiritual seeing: Picturing God’s invisibility in Medieval art} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2000), p. 1.

Coins minted in Venice originally depicted a Christ Pantocrator on one side and the Doge receiving the city’s *vexillum* from St Mark on the other. This latter image was a reference to Doge’s investiture during which he was presented with the banner over the Evangelist’s tomb and relics. Within Venice, as Iain Fenlon has described, ‘this potent image became the most familiar expression of the conception of divinely sanctioned authority…’. Christ bestowed temporal power on the Doge through the intercession of St Mark and these coins were perfect summations of this relationship between secular authority and the divine.\(^{133}\) A significant shift occurred during the mid-fourteenth century when Venetian communal and imperial identity underwent dramatic changes. The soldino from Giovanni Dolfin’s (1356-61) reign,\(^{134}\) mentioned above, introduced the lion of St Mark as the visual shorthand for saint and state but at a cost: the Doge remained on the obverse but the lion of St Mark *in moleca* replaced Christ Pantocrator on the reverse. (Fig. 5.9) Simply having the symbol of the saint and the Doge were now sufficient to convey this divinely sanctioned authority. Christ was discretely pushed into the background.

So these were the images of the political status quo that permeated the lives of the citizens in Venice and Hungary, the direct subjects of the Doge or the King. But what of Zadar? Its turbulent history demanded shrewder interaction with foreign rulers, interaction that responded to the city’s desire for increased autonomy. Coins were a way that a local sense of identity could combine with that of the external rule. In 1371 King Louis granted the privilege of minting Hungarian coins in Zadar to the cives, Luca Leonis.\(^{135}\) The copper *folar* - one of the lowest denominations - produced during Louis’ reign had an image of St Ladislaus of Hungary, sitting on a throne, holding a processional cross in his right hand. The words S. LA. R. VNGARIE were

---


\(^{134}\) Lane and Mueller (1985), p. 169.

stamped around the edge.\textsuperscript{136} (Fig. 5.17) The reverse had the inscription + MONETA IADRE encircling the letter ‘G’ in the centre. Whether this letter stands for Grisogono, as a reference to the city’s patron saint Chrysogonus, or Giadera, an early Italian name for Zadar, is unclear.\textsuperscript{137} Whatever the case, the coins that were used and seen the most by the general public would have a figure that combined sacral and royal power, a providing a reference to the blessed dynasties, both Árpád and Angevin, from which Louis came.

After 1409, the Republic swiftly realised that it had to introduce coinage particular to its rule in Zadar. On the 31\textsuperscript{st} May 1410, a ducal order recorded that the Zaratini were using three sorts of coinage. These were silver groats minted by the Bosnian commander, Hrvoje Vukčić, Hungarian silver soldini and frignachi and Venetian grossi. None of these contained sufficient silver to command the exchange rate that the Zaratini were using. If this were to continue, it could threaten the worth of the Venetian currency, with Zaratini receiving more in goods and services for their Venetian coinage than those who lived in Venice itself. As a result the Signoria ordered the Venetian mint to produce a new, higher worth coin particularly for use in Zadar: the soldo.\textsuperscript{138}


\textsuperscript{137} As these small copper coins were used in daily transactions they swiftly wore out and as a result are very rare today. The two examples in Zadar are extremely eroded and battered by use. A number of local Croatian and Dalmatian historians suggest that the ‘G’ on the coin stands for Grisogono, the Italianate form of Chrysogonus. Apparently as a gesture of gratitude to the monastery of St Chrysogonus for its support of the Hungarian cause, King Louis allowed the city’s coinage to carry the image of its patron, St Chrysogonus. However, none of the secondary sources cite a primary document to support this assertion. Both Brunelli and Radomir Jurić proposed Giadera as an alternative, but this seems a strange thing to do as the inscription already states that the currency is from Zadar. Brunelli (1974), p. 513, note. 26; Klaić and Petricioli (1976), p. 337; Jurić (1987), p. 69; Eduard Peričić, ‘Samostan Svetog Krševana kroz lik i djeolovanje njegovih opata (The monastery of St Chrysogonus through the figure and activities of its abbots)’, in 1000 godina samostana Sv. Krševana u Zadru: Prilozi sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 11 i 12 prosinca 1986 u Zadru (1000 years of the abbey of St Chrysogonus in Zadar: the proceedings of the conference held 11-12 December 1986 in Zadar), ed. Ivo Petricioli, (Zadar: Narodni List, 1990), p. 100; Kovačević (2009), p. 609.

\textsuperscript{138} Sime Ljubić, Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike (1409-1412) (Documents regarding contact between southern Slavs and the Venetian Republic), ed. Accademia Scientiarum et
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[They] may... strike and make a coin, which hold three ounces to the mark, and is worth 42 per ounce. The figure of St Mark appears on one side [of the coin] and on the other side a high shield, which shall be left empty, which will thus become a modest difference...because the said frignachis are made and struck with different stamps, our coinage will immediately seize the way [i.e. differentiate themselves].

This silver coin with the blank shield surrounded by the words + MONETA DALMATIE on the reverse and St Mark standing with arms open in the orans gesture, identified with the inscription SANTVS MARCVS on the obverse. (Fig. 5.18) Although the blank shield was a conscious visual distinction between this new coin of the new government and the frangnachi of the past, the image of St Mark does not break with a familiar visual vocabulary. This orans figure is similar to that of St Ladislaus on the Angevin coins or even St Doimus of Split on coins minted by Ban Hrvoje Vukčić.

Whilst these were coins of lower value, the Venetian ones with the figure of St Mark were of a higher denomination. Smaller coins had the Evangelist’s lion stamped on them. In this way St Mark as a symbol of Venice’s temporal rule in the region quickly infiltrated all spheres of Zaratine society. This helped support Venetian rule to the detriment of local identity. The Republic now controlled coin production and removed all references to ladra on the reverse of the coins. This removed any sense of unity between the local community and the foreign power, as was the case during the reign


139 ‘...quod possint...cudi et fieri una moneta, que teneat tres uncias argenti pro marcha, et vadant XLII pro uma, faciendo figuram sancti Marci apparati ab uno latere, et ab altero latere unum schutum altum, in quo sit nichil, ita quod erit ita modica differentia...quod de dictis frignachis fiunt et cuduntur cum diversis stampis, dicta nostra moneta capiet subito cursum.’ Ljubić (1878), p. 94.


of King Louis of Hungary. The choice of the phrase ‘MONETA DLMATA’ suggests that the commune was already being absorbed into an ideologically charged construct of ‘Dalmatia’, a Dalmatia in which communal distinctions were erased in the Venetian mind. Indeed, it was not until 1491 that a new bagatin was minted for Zadar with St Simeon the Prophet - not Chrysogonus - adorning the reverse: Mark remained firmly in place as representative of the Republic and its secular authority.

5.4.1 The Choir Stalls of St Anastasia

During the fifteenth century the cult of St Mark in Zadar was demonstrated on a grand scale by the ephemerality of instituted civic ceremonies as well as on a micro level with coins. Were there any monumental and permanent manifestations that supported the cult? Although city spaces in Zadar were not modified to produce a colonial facsimile of the metropole that recreated secular and sacred geographies, communal rituals did evoke a precedent forged in Venice. This was most keenly felt in the cathedral. At the end of the procession of the 31st July, ‘a solemn mass would be sung in the cathedral church of St Anastasia to the honour of the said most blessed Mark the Evangelist’.

The setting in which this event occurred appears to have taken as its model the home of the Evangelist’s relics and religious centre of the Venetian Republic: the Basilica of San Marco.

Development of St Anastasia’s choir precinct began on the 23rd July 1418. The archbishop Luca Turriano and the cathedral procurator, Tomaso de Petriço, commissioned Matteo Moronzon incisor lignamis et civis venetus to create a set of choir stalls as per the design he had submitted to the Archbishop. Beginning 1st

---

142 Only Kotor in what is now Montenegro was allowed to have a regional mint. All other coins had to be produced in Venice proper. Ibid., pp. 42-3.
145 Regarding Petriço and his connections with the Venetian administration see Chapter 2.
October of that year Moronzon had eighteen months in which to complete it. He would receive sixteen ducats for each large stall with a smaller one attached, the same price for large stalls that stood alone as well as the more elaborate Archbishop’s throne. Moronzon would be paid in three instalments: first at the start of the project, then the middle and finally when the work was finished.\textsuperscript{146}

The stalls are still in situ today, (Fig. 5.19) lining the north and south walls of the cathedral’s chancel end. Each section of the choir is composed of two rows with seventeen upper stalls (between 60 & 70cm wide and 396cm high) and ten lower ones (between 63 & 68cm wide and 154cm high).\textsuperscript{147} The backs of the upper stalls have an upright rhombus carved onto them, in the centre of which is a cross, formed of a vegetal motif. The motif continues in the partitions between the stalls with curved stems consisting of an upper pentagonal volute and a lower spiral.\textsuperscript{148} Each of the upper stalls has its own shell-shaped niche that frames a round, gilded embellishment. From the top of the niches more vegetal elements curve upward from which the busts of Old Testament prophets and elders seem to grow.\textsuperscript{149} Between the shells small figures of angels are in niches topped with Gothic pinnacles.\textsuperscript{150}

At the end of the upper stall on the north section is the elaborate and larger Archbishop’s throne as stipulated in the contract of 1418. (Fig. 5.20) The wider dimensions of the archbishop’s throne are reflected in the length of the upper row in the north section, 13.10m in contrast to the 12.55m of the southern row.\textsuperscript{151} The throne is also higher than the other stalls and the archbishop had to take two steps up to reach it. Once there he was presented with a seat 98cm wide and embossed with elaborate

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{147} Petricioli (1972), p. 43.
  \item \textsuperscript{148} Ibid., pp. 43-4.
  \item \textsuperscript{149} Ibid., p. 48.
  \item \textsuperscript{150} Ibid., pp. 46-47.
  \item \textsuperscript{151} Ibid., p. 42.
\end{itemize}
tracery on its back. Originally this was gilded and painted in many colours; the restoration of 1884 stripped the wood of its original polychromy and stained and varnished the stalls instead.  

Above this backrest is a delightful panel with Maffeo Vallaresso’s coat of arms, flanked first by his initials and then two cherubim. (Fig. 5.21) This panel and the two-stepped podium make the stall much taller than the others in the upper row, with an additional cornice atop the gothic pinnacle (the bust figure of God the Father or Christ is now missing) and shell niche emphasising the seat’s importance.

Directly opposite the archbishop’s chair in the south section of the choir stalls is another specially decorated stall, the ‘ducal throne’ as Petricioli called it, or stall for the Venetian count. (Fig. 5.22) This seat was not mentioned in the original contract. Matteo Moronzon and his family still maintained important professional connections in Venice but he lived in Zadar until 1451 and had other projects within the cathedral during this period. Thus it seems likely that he produced the count’s throne for the choir stalls. This was not as highly decorated as the Archbishop’s throne nor as tall but it is distinct from the other stalls. A podium beneath elevated the count’s throne. It is also 17 cm higher and at 78 cm wide, noticeably wider than even the largest stall of the canons. Both the backrest and main backboard are more elaborate than those of other stalls in the upper level. Above the back section is a panel with Maffeo Vallaresso’s coat of arms and initials - both gilded- that reflect the panel on the archbishop’s seat, but without the exuberant cherubim. (Fig. 5.23) Above this is the shell niche. Atop it all in the intricate arches and that crown the niche, a small lion of St Mark, also gilded, replaces the latticed spherical ornament that is found above all of the other stalls, even that above the archbishop’s throne. (Fig. 5.24) This was the seat

---

152 Ibid., p. 43.
153 Ibid., p. 51.
154 See Chapter 3.
155 Petricioli (1972), p. 49.
of secular power and by now the lion of St Mark had become firmly associated with the secular identity of the Venetian Republic.

The cathedral underwent another important addition to its choir precinct: a presbytery screen. Returning to 1421 and the will of Ludovico de Matafari,\(^{156}\) the testator requested that:

Item he [the testator] wanted... all his books that are now in his house to be sold and from their price the top end of the church of St Anastasia of Zadar be adapted and decorated in that manner deemed best by his said executors [and] thus it will be seen that the most beautiful memorial shall be made for the soul of lord Petrus de Matafari, once Archbishop of Zadar.\(^{157}\)

Ludovico’s library was clearly of the highest quality and its sale generated much income.\(^{158}\) It was sufficient enough that on the 21\(^{st}\) May 1426 the archbishop Biagio Molin, in the presence of the Venetian count Fantino de Ca’ da Pesaro, commissioned Moronzon to produce a number of wooden statues for the ‘top end’ of the cathedral. The most important was a ten-foot high crucifix with symbols of the Evangelists on its arms and an image of the Annunciation and God the Father above it all. In addition Moronzon had to carve four-foot high statues of Mary, John and the twelve apostles. He had eighteen months in which to complete the commission. Moronzon would

---

\(^{156}\) For a brief summary of the archival documents pertaining to Ludovico and his brothers Guido and Petrus, archbishop of Zadar, see BMV, Praga fondi, MSS.II.VI, 530 (=12324), fol. 27; Giuseppe Praga, ‘Guido Matafari, statista zaratino del Trecento’, Rivista Dalmatica, XXV / 1 (1953), 17-20 & 24-5; O’Connell (2009), p. 64 as well as Chapter 2.

\(^{157}\) ‘Item voluit ...omnes sui libri qui sunt iam in domo sua... vendantur et de precio ipsorum aptetur et ornetur cima Ecclesie sce Anastasie de Jadra prout dictis suis commisionis melius videbitur ita qvp aliquod pulcherime memoriale fiate pro anima quondam domini petri de Matafaris olim Archiepiscopis Jadrensis.’ DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrai (1403-1439), Br. 9, ff. 221v-222r.

\(^{158}\) In his will Ludovico also left a Florentine Chronica to one of his executors, Simon de Detrico, and a copy of the Letters of St Jerome to the abbey of St Chrysogonus. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrai (1403-1439), Br. 9, ff. 220v-222v.
receive 225 ducats, 5 ducats of which would come from the cathedral treasury and the remaining 220 ducats came from Ludovico de Matafari’s estate. ¹⁵⁹

Five years later, on the 16th June 1431 archbishop Lorenzo Venier and the cathedral procurators - Zoius de Fero and the archdeacon Luca - commissioned the painter Giovanni quondam Pietro of Milan to paint and gild the statues ‘carved by Master Matheu Morzonon’. ¹⁶⁰ Giovanni also had to decorate a panel that would be placed beneath the cross, embellished on one side with stars and on the other with gilded half busts of apostles or prophets. He had two years in which to produce this work and would receive 400 gold ducats. ¹⁶¹ Over sixty years later, another Milanese, the pilgrim Pietro Casola, recorded the entire effect of the renewed choir and presbytery precinct.

There is a choir well adorned with stalls after our fashion; they are beautiful, and rightly so, for it is the archiepiscopal church... Over the choir, high up between one wall and the other, [beneath] the crucifix, which is in the middle and very ornate, there is a beam which supports fourteen very large figures all covered with gold; they are beautiful and very natural. ¹⁶²

But the presbytery screen did not survive very long. By 1512 the screen had been pulled apart and the crucifix placed above the ciborium of the high altar. ¹⁶³ Today the crucifix and ten of the fourteen statues survive and are in the collection of the Museum

¹⁶⁰ ‘...intaglata per magistrum matheum Morzononm...’ The transcribed contract is in Petricioli (1972), pp. 123-4.
¹⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 59 & 124.
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of Sacred Art in Zadar.\textsuperscript{164} (Fig. 5.25) The Madonna, St John and two of the apostles are missing. The reconstructed presbytery screen depicts the fourteen statues and the central crucifix atop an architrave supported by two columns, which themselves stood on a small balustrade. Croatian scholars have noted the similarities between this screen and the central iconostasis of Jacopo and Pierpaolo delle Masegna produced in 1394 in the basilica of San Marco.\textsuperscript{165} (Figs. 5.26 & 5.27)

5.4.2 San Marco as Model

The resemblance between the configuration in San Marco in Venice and the cathedral of St Anastasia in Zadar is indeed striking. The 1308 ceremonial rubric of San Marco recorded that in the Venetian basilica’s crypt were altars dedicated to the Virgin Mary, St Theodore and the four Aquileian Virgins.\textsuperscript{166} How fitting that the crypt in St Anastasia housed the relics of the Aquileian martyrs Agape, Chonia and Irene.\textsuperscript{167} St Mark’s apparitio legend also stated that his relics were stored in the crypt of San Marco.\textsuperscript{168} As noted above, Zadar’s scapula of St Mark was also exposed on the Evangelist’s feast day down in the crypt. But the audience for these relics, shrines and associated rituals in the crypts of both churches would have been limited. The fifteenth-century choir and presbytery spaces, however, were a much more public theatre for liturgical sets and spectacle.

In Zadar, the configuration of the choir stalls, with the archbishop’s chair directly opposite to that of the count, presented the laity in the nave with an image of the city’s secular and ecclesiastical figureheads as equals. The count’s presence in the

\textsuperscript{167} Brunelli (1907), p. 203.
\textsuperscript{168} Demus (1960), p. 12.
cathedral on particular feast days, most notably those associated with St Mark, would have given this seating plan particular resonance and confirmed the association with San Marco. His place on the right or the south side of the choir stalls mimicked that of the Doge in the chapel of St Clement in San Marco. The archbishop’s throne on the north side was located in the same place as that of the Patriarch of Grado in the chapel of St Peter. In Zadar the archbishop sat in front of St Anastasia’s chapel whilst the count’s throne was next to the chapel of St Thomas a Becket. (Fig. 5.28) Bishop Donatus’ role in St Anastasia’s translatio would make the archbishop’s proximity to her relics and chapel all the more fitting.\footnote{See Chapter 3.}

In both Venice and Zadar, the iconostasis or rood screen with the statues of the apostles, Mary, Joseph and the cross were atop a permeable balustrade. Behind these dramatic ciboriums provided an impressive canopy for the high altar. The illustrations give some sense of the similarity. (Figg. 5.26 & 5.27) Zaratini of all classes and professions, be they noble hostages, merchants, artisans, sailors or labourers, did travel between their commune and Venice, particularly with the introduction of the de intus status of citizenship soon after 1409.\footnote{For more about Zaratini and other Dalmatians in Venice see Lovorka Čoralić, ‘Bratovština slavenskih doesljenika Sv. Jurja i Trpuna u Veneciji. Izvori, Historiografija i mogućnosti istraživanja (The slavic confraternity of Saints George and Trifone in Venice: Sources, historiography and possible avenues of research), Radovi. Zavod za hrvatsku povijest, 27 (1994), pp. 43-58; Bruneilde Imhaus, Le minoranze orientali a Venezia 1300-1510 (Rome: II Veltro Editrice, 1997).} They would have been familiar with the space of San Marco proper and witnessed the various andate that proceeded out from the Doge’s basilica and around the city space. This would have had a familiar resonance to all.

Although San Marco was the model for the development of St Anastasia’s choir innovation did occur.\footnote{Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg, ‘Centre and Periphery’, trans. by Claire Dorey, in History of Italian Art, ed. Peter Burke, II vols (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994), I, p. 69.} The most obvious distinction was that St Anastasia was not built on a Greek cross form like San Marco. Even though the Apostoleion in
Constantinople was the original model for the Doge’s chapel, the high altar was situated in the east end of the church, as was fitting for the Western rite, rather than the central space. Modifications were made to accommodate local need but not to the detriment of the original archetype’s significance. This was the case in Zadar and the count’s throne is an instance of local responses to the metropolitan model.

As noted above, the count’s throne was not mentioned in the choir stalls contract of 1418. The possible reason for its initial absence may have been because archbishop Luca Turriano was not Venetian and he controlled the cathedral. Turriano died in January 1420, fifteen months into the eighteen-month period stipulated for the project’s completion. Might the arrival of a new Venetian archbishop or the involvement of a more vigorous Venetian count have prompted the addition of the count’s throne? What is conspicuous about this stall are the three escutcheons on it, all belonging to the archbishops of fifteenth-century Zadar. Beneath the stall’s canopy is Maffeo Vallaresso’s coat of arms flanked by his initials. The two side partitions of the stall are also decorated. On the right partition the red and gold stripes of Lorenzo Venier are on display whilst the left has a gryphon holding a red book on a blue ground that is the coat of arm of Luca da Fermo. (Figg. 5.29-5.30)

Grouping together the archbishops’ coats of arms on the count’s throne was a public record of their involvement in the construction of the choir stalls during the fifteenth century. The significance of the count’s throne built with archbishops’ escutcheons could refer to the idea of the temporal state supported by the Church and its representatives. In reality Venice traditionally did not promote a balance between the ecclesiastical and secular arms of state: the power of the Doge and his

---

173 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 8, ff. 205v-206v.
174 Petricioli noted that the Molin and Venier devices are by the same hand but that the Vallaresso coats of arms were of a later period. Petricioli (1972), pp. 42 & 49-50.
representatives ultimately trumped those of the Republic's highest-ranking clergymen. But preserving and advocating an image of equality was part of the Republic’s cultural rhetoric.

Yet in Zadar, the choir precinct became a distinctly clerical space dominated by the archbishop. The larger size of his seat, the higher canopy and more elaborate tracery all contribute to a more impressive throne than that of the count. As the position of count was only for two years there was not the opportunity for an individual to make his mark. By contrast, the Venetian archbishops potentially had decades - and in the case of Vallaresso about half a century - in which to establish themselves and assert their position within Zadar. Even though the celebration of the individual was not encouraged amongst the colonial administrators and ambassadors of the Republic, it seems that Venetian ecclesiastics were able to establish the foundations for posterity. For example, archbishop Biagio Molin’s coat of arms, represented by a mill wheel, was carved on the front balustrade of the choir stalls, juxtaposed with the iconostasis that he had commissioned. (Fig. 5.31) This coat of arms on the choir stalls was the most visible to the laity standing in the nave. Thus the viewer had a reference (iconostasis) to the architectural focus for the collective veneration of St Mark’s cult (the basilica of San Marco) that was developed and enhanced by the celebration of the individual (Biagio Molin’s mill wheel).

Unfortunately, aside from the notarial contract of 1426, no other mention of Ludovico de Matafarri's financial support of the iconostasis survives. The Venetian archbishops had claimed the cathedral for themselves.

The archbishops may have believed they deserved the honour of posterity. They were the leaders that provided spiritual and temporal continuity for the

---

175 O’Connell (2009), p. 60.
176 Petricioli (1972), p. 44.
community. This is quite similar to their predecessors of the high Middle Ages. The archbishop was a permanent Venetian presence in the city, ensuring the celebration of various annual feasts to St Mark, the patron saint of the Republic, whilst counts would come and go. San Marco provided the archetype for the ecclesiastical setting in which these demonstrations of civic liturgy occurred. The Zaratine configuration of choir stalls and the construction of the iconostasis all referenced this powerful precedent. But in Venice the Doge and secular power held sway. In Zadar local demands and personalities, primarily those of the archbishop, influenced and modified the liturgical space in which the veneration of the Church and State occurred.

But what of the local community? It seems that during these feast days to St Mark the choir precinct was only accessible to the count, the archbishop and the cathedral canons. Members of the nobility had no permanent seat within the choir. The city statutes demanded all members of the community participate in the celebration of the 31st July. The people were expected to do so by laying down all tools for the day because of the occasion’s solemnity. Others contributed candles or competed in various sporting competitions - running, archery or equestrian races - that took place after the grand procession. But there does not appear to have been a distinct role and ceremonial place for the nobility within these processions or competitions. The cathedral’s most sacred space, that of the high altar, was restricted to the Venetian representatives, thus confirming their position as citizens of a Republic chosen by God through the intercessory figure of St Mark. The nobility of the fifteenth century may have enjoyed a number of personal privileges and benefits when Zadar returned to the Stato da Mar, but when it came to the ritualisation of sacred narratives that defined Venetian identity and rule of the city, their role was that of witness rather than active participant.

177 See Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 5. ST MARK THE EVANGELIST

* * *

The cult of St Mark was in effect a tool of the Venetian state, a sacred framework from which civic and imperial identity grew. Over time, these extraneous cultic manifestations became the cult itself. The Evangelist’s absent relics were not the focus of veneration or pilgrimage in the manner more commonly associated with saints of the medieval period. The basilica of San Marco was more important with the processions that flowed from it into the Venetian urban space spread the symbols and images of secular power and continuity. Images, ceremony and architectural models are easier to disseminate than relics. Thirteenth-century Candia was the trial for these experiments in the cult of Venetian civic and imperial identity. Elements of Candia were modified to emulate the metropole and thus enforce the rhetoric of power upon the local community. In the early Zaratine context, the lack of political continuity and ecclesiastical instability meant that the cult of St Mark never took real hold. The attempt to use the Dominicans as purveyors of the cult was unsuccessful as ties with the Venetian dogate dwindled. The establishment of a confraternity dedicated to St Mark, even one closely associated with the traditionally ‘Hungarian’ abbey of St Chrysogonus, also failed to become a permanent fixture in the city’s civic and religious life. This may have been because of the saint’s Venetian connotations and the instability that characterised the first half of the fourteenth century.

Only after 1409, and with a sense of purpose and stability in Venice itself was the cult with all its political connotations and imagery finally brought to Zadar. Strategies of image, ritual and architectural model, originally used centuries before, were deployed again. Feast days and celebrations associated with St Mark were the means by which native Zaratini became part of the narratives of empire promoted by Venice. Coinage and the use of saints’ images brought these narratives into the domestic and commercial realms of city life. The modification of the cathedral’s choir
precinct reflected those made in San Marco and provided the perfect backdrop for those feast days upon which to convey the perceived ideal relationship between Church and State, as espoused by the Republic. As we have seen though, this backdrop was in turn modified to reflect the realities of personality, colonial administration and social distinction. The ‘absent’ saint and his cult proved as effective a political and social tool as the fragmented and whole relics that defined the cults of St Chrysogonus and Simeon the Prophet.
Conclusion

The saint cults of medieval Zadar have proved powerful signifiers of contemporary identities and political need. Starting with artistic objects - reliquaries from the city’s metalwork collection and the remains of Zadar’s rich architectural heritage - my research quickly diversified. It began to incorporate concepts of devotional practice and experience that became increasingly intertwined with the city’s larger historical narratives. As a result, I have brought to light unpublished archival documents and proposed fresh interpretations of published primary sources that have produced novel analyses of the cults surrounding Saints Chrysogonus, Simeon the Prophet and Mark the Evangelist. Saints aside, I anticipate that my work will bring the significance of the Dalmatian commune of Zadar to the attention of historians and art historians from beyond the Balkans. Medieval scholarship is increasingly aware of the intercultural nuances of its subjects and the Venetian Stato da Mar is a prime example of this. However, this intercultural component requires scholars to master linguistic skills beyond the usual European canon of Germanic and Romance languages. By integrating scholarship from Italian, Croatian and English sources, this thesis will supply a valuable starting point for future art historical research into Zadar and the Dalmatian region.

Chapter 1 provided the historical framework for the thesis. This was a necessary, if at times fraught and febrile, introduction to the region and the context in which Zadar’s saint cults flourished. The challenge was marrying the histories of
Hungary, Venice and Zadar itself, finding the connections between events on a macro scale and the impact they had on the micro. Zadar was not powerful enough to stand alone: the city needed the protection of a more formidable overlord, but was unwilling to relinquish any autonomy. Whilst negotiating these relations, policy decisions in the Venetian or Hungarian centres - sometimes with Zadar in mind, sometimes without - often had monumental effects on the periphery. Hungary’s internecine conflicts not only resulted in domestic instability but also had repercussions for Zadar, creating instability and discontent. Meanwhile, Venetian commercial and political ambitions often focused on the strategic port city. The Signoria and colonial administrators alike were keen to exploit the city’s resources and wealth. This is not to suggest that the Zaratini were passive in the face of these larger interests. Local interests and factionalism responded with either violence or diplomacy to external pressures, which would instigate changes in imperial policy, particularly in Venice.

What sort of society was medieval Zadar? Chapter 2 presented a deeper study of the city revealing elements akin to contemporary Italian city-states but married with aspects that reflected the city’s location close to a Central European hinterland. The ‘national’ identity of Zadar and the other Dalmatian communes has been a sensitive topic during the twentieth century. At times, Italian, Yugolsav and Croatian scholars have placed anachronistic models of ethnic homogeneity upon these complex medieval communities. This complexity required a nuanced approach that considers the melting pot of Zadar with both its ‘native’ and ‘foreign’ inhabitants. A discussion of language was one way to highlight the unique blend of Slavic and Latin that defined the city’s population. In addition, trade and marital connections broadened the commune’s societal interaction beyond the city walls, tying families and groups into larger networks that extended along the Dalmatian littoral and across Europe. This was not an isolated community, but a port city in tune with economic and cultural
currents from around Christendom. It is perhaps no great surprise that lay support of
the Church and the veneration of the city’s saints reflected these trends.

Certainly my analysis of a sample of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century
testamentary bequests during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries revealed patterns
of patronage similar to those in other parts of Europe. For example, during this later
medieval period, Zaratine bequests to the Benedictine abbey of St Chrysogonus were
few (although often more generous when they did occur). This follows a greater trend
throughout Italy and the Adriatic when lay patronage of the Benedictines peaked
during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.\(^1\) From the thirteenth to the fifteenth century
lay support moved to the Mendicants, first the Conventuals and then the Observants.
This may have been due to the increased presence of the Mendicants in public life: as
priests with churches.\(^2\) In Zadar, the friaries were certainly the most popular recipients
of testamentary bequests, followed by the city’s nunneries. There were different
motivations driving these donations, with individual nuns - be they sisters, daughters
or aunts of testators - often the main recipient whilst money and other gifts were
donated to the friaries as institutions. Secular churches, such as the parishes, collegiate
churches and the cathedral, were the least likely to receive testamentary support. Like
the abbey of St Chrysogonus, however, amongst these few legacies came significant
endowments for St Mary the Great and St Anastasia that have great relevance to these
thesis.

The testamentary bequests also revealed particular familial allegiances to
ecclesiastical institutions and gave some hints as to the interior decoration of
churches. Many monuments have been lost or church interiors modified so notarial


\(^2\) Vauchez talks about the increased interaction between the laity and the Mendicants as the latter strove
to use *exempla* from everyday life in their sermons. André Vauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious
Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans. by Margery J. Schneider (Notre Dame & London: University of
evidence is an alternative to recovering the configuration and experience of many ecclesiastical spaces. St Francis and St Anastasia had particular significance for the Matafarri family. In St Francis the family tomb was in the chapel of St John the Baptist located close to the high altar. This complemented the development of the chancel end in the 1390s, when a generous bequest given by Georgio de Matafarri provided a substantial proportion of the funds used to construct the church’s choir stalls. Thus the sacred area around the high altar became a memorial to the lay members of the Matafarri clan. In the cathedral, the fifteenth-century bequests of Ludovico and Guido Matafarri suggest a similar programme of familial reverence but this time it would be an architectural commemoration for their ecclesiastical relatives: the archbishops of Zadar - Nicola and Petrus - and the bishop of Nin, Demetrius. The modifications of these two choir precincts confirm Joanne Allen’s observation that choir stalls were ecclesiastical spaces in which the laity could play a part. The Matafarri were active participants in the blurring of boundaries between the temporal and spiritual spaces of the family’s chosen churches.

What the testamentary survey did not show were special bequests for patron saints. Aside from general funds to support the building of St Simeon’s chapel, little or no reference to saints’ relics *per se* were indicated in the wills. Mara de Mance’s 1385 request for a silver chain and *ex voto* image of a finger was a revelatory piece of evidence for devotional practice and engagement with St Simeon’s shrine, but this was the exception rather than the rule in the testamentary sample. Other sources were required to establish the significance of Zadar’s saint cults as well as the experiential elements of the sacred relics.

---

3 See Appendix C - Zaratine Family Trees.
5 See Chapter 4.
CONCLUSION

As part of this exercise I assessed the ways in which the foreign powers of Hungary and Venice ruled over Zadar and interacted with the local population. Hungarian rule could be condensed into three strategies: personal presence, presence by spectacle, presence by proxy or patronage. The first was the ideal situation of having the King’s representative present in the Zadar, primarily the Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia. This was followed by the use of royal visits and oaths to bind centre to the periphery and ensure the pageantry of the events fixed them in the communal memory. Memory could then prop up future loyalty. Finally, acts of patronage that defined particular sites - such as the abbey church of St Chrysogons - as particularly ‘Hungarian’ in the eyes of the Zaratini established a royal presence by proxy. In this way tangible and permanent evidence complemented the ephemera of spectacle and memory. Analyses of Zadar’s saint cults also reveal these same themes of presence, place, permanence and performance, indicating the fluid nature of the temporal and spiritual realms of the city.

Hungary was a feudal monarchy rocked by instability and so the Kingdom’s imperial strategies were often different from those of the Republic of Venice. Events in Hungary could change dramatically depending on which King took the throne and so personalities were a significant factor in the Hungarian Crown’s relations with the Zaratini. The Venetians by contrast evolved a strong colonial administration in Zadar that became increasingly bound to the metropole, countering the autocratic personalities of early counts and reducing some catalysts for rebellion. Punishments and economic control were other ways that the Republic strengthened its dominion over Zadar. After 1409, personal allegiances and patronage became a more important part in Venetian rule. Rather than isolation and aloofness, interaction between the nobility of both Venice and Zadar created the context in which a ‘hybridisation’ of
identities emerged. Individuals such as Petrus de Crissava and Deodatus Venier, the 
abbots of St Chrysogonus, were illuminating examples of this process.

The city's medieval saint cults were an equally important reflection of these 
societal changes. Vauchez wrote that:

Most commonly, devotions arose and developed within the boundaries of 
limited groups which gradually endeavoured to convince the urban 
collectivity to adopt the cult in question.⁶

This was certainly applicable to Saints Chrysogonus, Simeon the Prophet and Mark the 
Evangelist. Hungarian patronage rejuvenated the cults of Saints Chrysogonus and 
Simeon, which were then cultivated by the elite groups of Zadar. The rest of the 
population then joined the collective participation in the saints' veneration. Examples 
of this can be seen during the siege of Zadar (1345-6) and when the Venetians were 
ousted in 1357 when St Chrysogonus became a rallying symbol for the entire 
community. As for St Simeon, in 1494, Pietro Casola described the throng of local 
supplicants who gathered around the Prophet's shrine. The cult of St Mark was a 
slightly different case but it also developed within the confines of a select group - that 
of the Venetians - who then had the challenge of convincing foreign territories to 
participate in the cult's associated devotional practices and civic rituals.

The theme that defined all of the saint cults in this thesis was variety. St 
Chrysogonus' relics were fractured and disseminated, while St Simeon had a full and 
whole body relic. St Mark's relics were notable by their absence: the emphasis upon 
ritual and civic liturgy became the cornerstones of the cult. The different form of relics 
and cultic definition all demanded different forms of interaction between the faithful 
and the sacred intercessors. The impact of form upon a reliquary's function has not, 
until now, been thoroughly considered in the Zaratine context. I have shown how St

Chrysogonus’ portable relics disseminated Hungarian political connotations into the civic space beyond Zadar’s Benedictine abbey. The configuration of St Simeon’s shrine - both as an elevated arca in the fourteenth century and then as a double shrine incorporating the silver and stone arcas in the fifteenth - also created questions about devotional practice. Returning to Mara de Mance’s will of 1385, her request for a silver chain for St Simeon’s arca revealed local devotional interaction between supplicants and saint. I hope that by placing this highly unusual bequest into a larger context of the encirclement of saints’ tombs found in Italy and relating it to neighbouring instances - such as the wax girdle of Pag cathedral during the Zaratine raid of 1394 - a greater understanding of Zaratine saint veneration and experience is possible.

The emphasis upon a broader framework has driven much of this thesis. Curiosities within the immediate confines of Zadar make more sense in the light of comparisons from beyond the region. This complements the societal analysis of Chapter 2, of an energetic port city in tune with contemporary economic and political developments. Devotional practice and cultural developments were not immune to this. The examination of larger contexts led to a consideration of themes of transmission. How did these practices and artistic developments actually come to Zadar? In the case of St Chrysogonus, political considerations came to the fore with my proposition that Hungarian royal saint cults influenced the Early Christian martyr’s cult in Zadar. The decision to begin fragmenting St Chrysogonus’ body with an arm relic is very similar to the promulgation of the Holy Dexter cult in Hungary. These were almost contemporaneous cultic developments and King Coloman’s patronage in Zadar was a significant cultural conduit between metropole and territory.

The idea of a political ‘presence by proxy’ was developed further with St Simeon’s shrine. Árpád and Angevin donations to sacred shrines throughout Europe promoted the families’ political capital beyond the borders of their kingdoms and had
emphasised the spiritual and temporal legitimacy of their dynasties. Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić’s patronage of St Simeon was part of this pattern. Past scholarship has, however, possibly placed too much value upon the connection with Queen Elizabeth. Iconographic analyses of the arca’s panels have led to extremely elaborate interpretations and my proposal that these oral legends are seventeenth-century in origin will have implications for a re-reading of the shrine and a possible reconstruction of the medieval panel sequence.

An overly complex iconographic analysis was also an issue relating to St Chrysogonus and his veneration within the Venetian context. Michele Giambono’s *Saint Chrysogonus* panel in the church of San Trovaso is the only surviving memento of the medieval cult in Venice. Without the context of the original church and the saint’s relics, scholars have struggled to explain the unusual character of the panel’s iconography. I have proposed that the iconographic transmission occurred through the network of artistic professionals that spanned the Adriatic, from the Moronzon in Zadar to Giambono in Venice, thus bringing a unique representation of Zaratine civic identity into the Venetian sphere.

The effigy of St Simeon’s arca in the Venetian church of San Simeone Profeta or Grande - attributed to Marco Romano - provided a similar instance of this transmission of saintly ‘type’ from periphery to centre. Although the exact means by which this occurred are unknown, my examination of the 1581 Apostolic Visitation⁷ - a document so far ignored in the secondary literature pertaining to this magnificent effigy - together with a close study of the object and an analysis of all relevant sources, strongly suggests that scholars should finally dismiss the attribution of this nineteenth-century confection of medieval elements to ‘Marco Romano’.

---

⁷ ADV, Curia Patriarcale di Venezia, Visite Apostoliche, i, ff. 226r-229r.
**CONCLUSION**

Why these transmissions occurred required some consideration. With the expansion of the Venetian *Stato da Mar* and its territories on the *Terra Ferma*, the involvement in and manipulation of local saint cults became an important way of justifying temporal rule. Chapters 3 and 5 introduced other colonial case studies that complemented the Zaratine analysis, primarily Candia in Crete and Padua on the *Terra Ferma*. As the Republic was keen to maintain stability in all of its subject territories, it did not commit *furta sacra*, arguably the riskiest but surest means of ensuring a saint’s favour. However, Venetian responses to the cults of St Titus in Candia, St Luke in Padua and Saints Chrysogonus and Simeon in Zadar suggest a subtle and visual undermining of the territorial cults in the secure space of the metropole.

Venice’s particular colonial challenges also defined the promotion of St Mark both within and without the metropole. Chapter 5 provided a necessary discussion about the cult’s evolution with Venice, with a special focus on the increasingly symbolic configuration and decorations in presbytery end of San Marco’s basilica. This prepared the way for an analysis of the cult’s dissemination in the *Stato da Mar*. Candia was an especially important point of comparison with Zadar, revealing different ways of disseminating the cult in different territories. Rituals and spectacles played a part in both cities but the manipulation of the urban space in Zadar was never attempted on the scale found in Candia. There was also a distinction between St Mark’s promotion in Zadar before 1358 and after 1409. The earlier period had discrete cultic manifestations - such as a church dedication, a confraternity (in a different church) and a scapula relic - but there was no coherent programme of encouragement. After 1409, the Republic of Venice legislated on coin iconography, feast days and civic liturgy as a conscious and consolidated promotion of St Mark’s cult. The main setting for the cult’s liturgical performances was the cathedral of St Anastasia, with a particular focus on its choir precinct.
Initially intended by the Matafarri family as a monument to their ecclesiastical relatives, instead the presbytery area of St Anastasia reflected that of San Marco. The choir stalls’ spatial arrangement and seating of the Zaratine archbishop and count mimicked that of the Patriarch of Grado and the Doge in San Marco. Scholars have not proposed such an in-depth analysis of the seating configuration in Zadar’s cathedral before now. The fifteenth-century choir stalls not only disseminated sacredness and political significance into the public space of the cathedral, but also articulated the increasing hybridity of the metropole and its Dalmatian periphery.

My research has also revealed a number of topics demanding further investigation: time restrictions and word limits mean it has not been possible to scrutinize them in this thesis and I hope a few of the following lacunae will be filled in the future. For example, I have touched upon a significant yet little studied resource is the Praga fondi in the Biblioteca Marciana in Venice. These include transcriptions of medieval documents from the Pasini-Marchi and Zanchi families’ archives, destroyed by the bombing of Zadar in 1943. The collection also contains Praga’s own research manuscripts on a range of themes; the private lives of the Zaratini, the War of Chioggia (1378-1381) from the perspective of contemporary Zaratine documents, book-collecting and libraries in the city during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and genealogical research on the Zaratine nobility of the late trecento. At the time of writing, the Marciana was still preparing an analytical catalogue of the seventy-eight buste that make up the collection. With more research, many of these topics will provide crucial contributions to Zadar’s cultural history. An impressive start has been made: in 2005 Praga’s busta on the Documenti per la Storia dell’arte was published, making available a

---

CONCLUSION

corpus of Zadar’s medieval and renaissance artistic activity to scholars in both Italy
and beyond, proving an invaluable complement to the Croatian and Yugoslav
scholarship available today.

In Zadar itself another question arose following research into saint cults on the
Italian peninsula. Was there any veneration of beati in the medieval commune? In 1426
the nobleman Thomaso de Petriço left a bequest of 30 ducats for the production of a
reliquary for the bones of a ‘blessed Ćiconis’, whose tomb was at the Observant friary
of St Doymus on Pašman. This is a tantalising piece of evidence for one small cult but
were there others? Future research into the topic of Dalmatian beati would illuminate
another facet of local devotional practice and deepen our understanding of Zaratine
medieval experience.

Zadar has provided such a great richness of artistic production and historical
context in which to analyse the commune’s saint cults that boundaries were necessary:
it was not possible to examine the saint cults in other Dalmatian communes. The cities
of Trogir and Split for example had particular affinities with the Hungarian crowns and
Croatian nobility. Might there be familiar patterns of Hungarian patronage like those
found in Zadar? Is there evidence of the deployment of sacred models to promote a
political agenda by proxy? And what of the Venetian influence upon the saint cults of
these cities? Was there a coherent strategy across the Dalmatia or were there tailored
responses to the demands of local populations? Some work in this field has begun but
the emphasis has been on literary and visual sources rather than reliquaries and

10 Giuseppe Praga, Documenti per la storia dell’arte a Zara dal medioevo al settecento, ed. Maria Walcher,
Studi e recerche d’arte veneta in Istria e Dalmazia (Trieste: Edizioni “Italo Svevo”, 2005).
11 DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 11,
f.290v.
12 For more about the cult of the beati in medieval Europe, see André Vauchez, Sainthood in the Later
Middle Ages, trans. by Birrell, Jean (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
13 See Chapter 1.
CONCLUSION

shrines. By extending the geographic parameters of research further along the Dalmatian coastline, a greater understanding of the cultural richness of this corner of South Eastern Europe will surely become available to all.

Appendix A

Hungarian Royal Family Trees

A.1 The Árpáds in the Tenth Century

A.2 The Árpáds in the eleventh and twelfth centuries (the Vazul branch)
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**APPENDIX A - HUNGARIAN ROYAL FAMILY TREES**
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A.3 The Árpáds at the beginning of the thirteenth century (the descendants of Béla III)

Béla III
King of Hungary 1172-96
*1148, +23 April 1190
m. 1 Anna (Agnes) Chiaböllon, fc. 1184
m. 2 Margaret Capet, daughter of Louis VII,
King of France, +1187

---

Margaret (Mary)
*1178, fc. 1229
m. 1 Isahakios Angelou, Byzantine emperor, 1185-93, 1203-4
m. 2 Boniface of Montfort, margrave, King of Thessalonika 1204-7
m. Nicholas of Saint Omer, fc. 1212

---

Andrew II.
King of Hungary 1205-35
*c. 1177, +21 September 1235
m. 1 Gertrude, daughter of
Bertold IV, Duke of Meran
+28 September 1213
m. 2 Jolanta, daughter of Pierre Courtenay, later emperor of
Constantinople, +1230
m. 3 Beatrice Este, +1245

---

Sibylla
Salonen
Stephen

Constance
16 December 1240
m. Ottokar Premysl, King of Bohemia
1198-1230

---

Louis III.
King of Hungary
1204-5
*1200, +7 May 1205

---

Elisabeth (Saint)
Béla IV.
*C. 1205, +1237/8
King of Hungary
*1207, +11 Nov. 1235
m. Ivan Asen II, Tsar of Bulgaria 1218-41

---

Elizabeth (Saint)
Béla IV.
*1205, +1237/8
King of Hungary
*1207, +11 Nov. 1235
m. Ivan Asen II, Tsar of Bulgaria 1218-41

---

Ulmot, Duke of
Cracow, 11267

---

Hermann II,
Count of Thuringia
*1222, +1241

---

Stephan

---

Sophie,
Princess of Briemut
*1224, +1281

---

Gertrude (Blessed),
mother superior of the
Premonstratensian
monastery of Altanberg

---

Andrew III.
King of Hungary
1360-1301
*1269, +14 Jan. 1301
m. 1 Fennena, daughter of
Zimmerman, Duke of
Cojavia +1295
m. 2 Agnes, daughter of
Albert of Habsburg,
Prince of Austria, +1304

---

Elisabeth of Tros (Blessed)
+C. 1292, +30 May 1338
A.4 The Árpáds in the second half of the thirteenth century (the descendants of Béla IV)

Béla IV, King of Hungary 1255-70
*1206, †13 May 1235
m. Mary, daughter of Theodorus Lascaris, emperor of Nice, †1270

Margaret (Saint)  
*1224, 124 July 1292
m. Boleslav V, Duke of Croatia 1243-79

Anuia  
*1225  
†c. 1270

Elisabeth  
*4 Oct. 1271
m. Henry, Duke of Bavaria 1255-90

Elisabeth  
†c. 1255
m. Leo, Duke of Calabria 1270-1301
m. Boleșlaw, Duke of Kalis, †1279

Yolanda  
†c. 1269
m. Stephen V (Saint), King of Hungary 1270-2
m. Elizabeth, daughter of Seiljan, Prince of the Cumans

Margaret (Saint)  
*1246, †1269
m. Cunegund, Princess of Brandenburg, †1288

Cunegund  
†9 Sept. 1285
m. 1 Ottokar Prinys II, King of Bohemia 1253-78
m. 2 Záviš, Bohemian lord, †1290

Otto, King of Hungary 1305-7
*1261, †1312
m. Catherine Habsburg, †1318

Mary  
*1257, †1323
m. Charles II, King of Naples 1289-1302

Ladisla IV, King of Hungary 1272-90
*1262, †10 July 1290
m. Isabella (Elizabeth), daughter of Charles I, King of Naples, †c. 1304

(see table 11)

(1)

Wenceslas II, King of Bohemia 1283-1305  
*1271, †21 June 1305
m. 1 Inga Habsburg, †1297
m. 2 Elizabeth, †1335

(1)

Wenceslas III (Ladislas), King of Hungary 1301-5  
King of Bohemia and Poland 1305-6
*1289, 14 August 1306
m. Viola, †1317
A.5 The Hungarian Angevins

Charles I,
King of Hungary 1301–42
*30 Nov. 1337
+16 July 1342
m. 1 Mary, Princess of Galicia
m. 2 Mary, daughter of Kazimir, Duke of Lithuania, 1317
m. 3 Beatrice, daughter of Henry VII, Holy Roman Emperor, 1319
m. 4 Elizabeth, daughter of Vladislas I, King of Poland, 1330

Catherine
m. Henry II, Prince of Schweinitz, 1343

(2)

Elisabeth
m. Boleslav, Prince of Troppau, 1367

(4)

Charles
+1321
+24 Feb. 1359

(4)

Ladislaus

(4)

Louis I the Great,
King of Hungary 1342–82
*5 March 1326, +10 Sept. 1382
m. 1 Margaret, daughter of John, King of Bohemia, 1349
m. 2 Elizabeth, daughter of Stephen Krotomanić, Ban of Bosnia, 1367

(4)

Andrew, Prince of Calabria
*30 Nov. 1337
+1 Aug. 1354
m. Joan, Queen of Naples, 1382

(4)

Stephen, Prince of Slavonia
*20 Aug. 1332
+9 Aug. 1354
m. Margaret, daughter of Louis IV, Holy Roman Emperor, 1374

(2)

Catherine
+1370, +1378
*1371, +17 May 1395
m. Sigismund, King of Hungary, Holy Roman Emperor

(2)

Mary, Queen of Hungary
+1382–95

(2)

Hedwig, Queen of Poland
*1373, +17 July 1399
m. Vladislaus Jagiełło II, Grand Duke of Lithuania, King of Poland

Charles Martell, Prince of Calabria
*25 Dec. 1345
+19 June 1348

(2)

John, Prince of Slavonia
*1353
+1351
m. Philip II, Prince of Taranto
APPENDIX A - HUNGARIAN ROYAL FAMILY TREES

A.6 The Neapolitan Angevins

Louis VII,
King of France
†1126

Louis IX (Saint)
King of France, †1270
ancestor of the Capet, Valois and Bourbon dynasties

Charles I,
Count of Anjou, King of Naples 1265–85
ancestor of the Anjou dynasty

Charles II the Lame,
King of Naples 1285–1309
m. Mary, daughter of Stephen V, King of Hungary, †1323

Isabelle (Elizabeth), m. Ladislas IV, King of Hungary
1272–90

Philip I,
Prince of Taranto, 11331
m. Catherine Courtenay, daughter of Baldwin, Latin emperor

John,
Prince of Durazzo
†1135
m. Agnes Perigaud

Philip II,
Prince of Taranto, 11356
m. Mary, daughter of Charles, Prince of Calabria

Louis,
Prince of Durazzo
†11362
m. Margaret, daughter Charles II, King of Naples

Charles, Prince of Calabria
†11328

Robert, Prince of Taranto
†11364
m. Joan I, Queen of Naples

St Louis,
Bishop of Toulouse
†11299
m. Clementine Habsburg, daughter of Rudolph Habsburg, King of Germany

Charles I,
King of Hungary 1301–42

(continued on next table)

Louis, Queen of Naples 1343–81
†11382
m. Andrew, Prince of Hungary, †11345
m. 2 Louis, Prince of Taranto, †1362
m. 3 James III, King of Maltece

Mary, Charles, Prince of Durazzo

Jean
Queen of Naples 1343–81
†11382
m. Andrew, Prince of Hungary, †11345
m. 2 Louis, Prince of Taranto, †1362
m. 3 James III, King of Maltece

Margaret, Charles II, King of Naples
1351–86
King of Hungary 1385–86

Ladislas
Queen of Naples 1386–1414
1414–35
predecessor to the throne of Hungary
Appendix B

List of noble hostages taken after 1345

This list was first compiled from archival and published sources by Zrinka Nikolić Jakus and can be found in her doctoral thesis, *The Formation of Dalmatian Urban Nobility: Examples of Split, Trogir and Zadar*, (Central European University, 2004), p. 79.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Names</th>
<th>Number of Hostages</th>
<th>Names of the Hostages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de Begna</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Damian, son of Philip; Philip, son of Dobre; Krešo, son of the late Damian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Bogde</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Botono</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nicholas, son of Michael; Michael, son of Černe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Butuano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John, son of Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Calcina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Krešo, brother of Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Cande</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andrew and Gallo, sons of Černe, their nephew Nicholas, son of Cande, their cousin Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Carbanosso</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Carbonis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Zaninus (John)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Cesamo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>James ‘Subić’ and Žuve (John), sons of Sergius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Civalellis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Krešo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Ciprianis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Damian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Drechia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colanus (Nicholas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Fanfogna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>John; Nicholas, son of the late Francis; Krešo; Matthew, son of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Figasolo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colanus (Nicholas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Galellis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nicholas Galellus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Georgiis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Francis, son of Paul (royal knight); Krešo; Andrew, son of Paul; George; Colanus (Nicholas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Gerardo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bartholomew, son of Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Ginannis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michael, son-in-law of Marin de Canaruto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Grisogonis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mauro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Grubogna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Krešol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Martinussio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nicholas, son of Vučina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Matafaris</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vučina and John, sons of Peter; Krešo, son of the late Lompre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Nassis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guy, Frederic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Parlumbardo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Petrizoto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nicholas, son of Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Petriço</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>John, son of Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Qualis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stephen, son of John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Raua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Saladinis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saladin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Slorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Madius, Bartholomew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Soppe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grisogonus, son of Marin; John, son of Blaise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Varicassis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Raddi; James, son of Michael; Daniel, Michael, son of Damian of Pasqual ‘Toscanus’; Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Vichor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nicholas, son of the late Krešo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Čadulin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nicholas; Krešo, son of Francis, ‘Crisolinus’; Francis, son of the late John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Zauata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Zaratine Family Trees

The transcriptions in this Appendix are taken from Giuseppe Praga’s reconstructed family trees found in BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2. The busta includes approximately 120 folios with Praga’s proposed Alberi Genealogici Zaratini, none of which have been published. His work was the result of many year’s archival research and includes the main Zaratine noble families from the early fourteenth century until the sixteenth. There are some surprising lacunae from Praga’s opus, such as the Petriço and Boton families, but it still provides a very thorough insight into the familial networks of late medieval Zadar. Where possible, Praga continued the family lines well into the sixteenth and sometimes as far as the seventeenth centuries, but because of the chronological boundaries of this thesis I have only gone so far as the late fifteenth century.

I have chosen to reproduce here only four family trees, those of the Civallelis, Crissava, Matafari and Nassi as a means of highlighting the familial complexities of the Zaratine elites. The Civallelis were the city’s wealthiest family during the fourteenth century (as indicated by Cressio’s considerable will and inventory of 1384) and were well connected by marriage to other influential families, such as the Crissava, Grisogono and Nassi. The second family tree of the Crissava helps illuminate the discussion in Chapter 2 regarding the abbot of St Chrysogonus, Petrus de Crissava, a man torn between a pro-Angevin family in Zadar and his Venetian connections as a

1 See Chapter 2.
Benedictine. The third set of family trees belongs to the Matafarri family, a remarkable clan whose ecclesiastical and lay members heavily influenced Zadar’s political destiny during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Finally, the Nassi family were amongst the largest and richest in Zadar. Their familial patronage of the Dominican friary of St Platon was some of the most significant of the period.²

² See Chapter 2.
C.1. Civallelis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lorenzo m. Gruba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marinom. Cecilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/2/1308 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/1/1395 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cressio [Grisogono]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/10/1384 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/13/[8]4 Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoilo m. Dobra de Matteo Nasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/1393 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoilo m. Mandicta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenzo m. Percia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolò m. Pria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7/1345 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesco m. Bona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1345 Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pellegrina Nun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2., c. 34.
C. 2 Crissava
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Nicolaus
m. Marchesina q.
Marcus de Grubogna

Cressius
m. Gelenta

Petrus
Abbot of St
Chrysogonus
(1420-1447)

Nicolaus

Simon
m. Dobrina q.
Antonio
Ciprianis
d. 1471-74

Donatus
d. 1465-1473

Marchesina
m. Michele de
Ginano

Marina
m. Ludovico
de Matafari

Giovanni
Legal doctor

Cressio

Catarina
m. Simon q.
Gregorio
Civalleli

Petru
1474 Will
d. by 1505

Nicolò
1489 Will
d. by 1505

Girolamo
Doctor & poet

Marino
d. by 1505

\[1\] See Appendix C 3, BMV, Praga *fondi*, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 81. Praga did not record Ludovico's marriage to Marina in that family tree, nor is there a reference to any wife - living or dead - in Ludovico's will of 25th July 1470 that would clarify matters. DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1493), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 125r-126r

Transcription from BMV, Praga *fondi*, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2., c. 40.
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C. 3 Matafarri

Guido

Vulcina Guidonis
m. Honesta q.
Cosa de Saladin
d. by 1367

Demetrius
Bishop of Nin
d. 1387

Nicola
Archbishop of Zadar
(1333-1367)

Guido, milites
m. 1 Fumica
m. 2 Michelia q.
Johannes de Boton
5/11/1414 Will

Ludovico, regius milites
m. Nicolotta q. Petrus q. Zoilus
de Nassi
3/10/1421 Will

Petrus
Archbishop of Zadar
(1376-1398)

Chiara
m. 1 Tomaso q. Nicolò Venier²
m. 2. Michele Giustinaini
d. after 1459

Simon
Priest at St Mary
the Great
4/8/1419 Will

---

1 Praga did not include Archbishop Nicola in his family tree so I have added this very important relation to this particularly influential branch of the Matafarri family.

² Praga was perhaps unaware of Chiara’s first marriage to Tomaso Venier, grandson of the Doge Antonio Venier. See Chiara’s will of 2nd August 1425 ASV, Archivio Notarile, Testamenti, B. 54 (de Andronico, Matteo), n. 3, fol. 1r-v.

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 79.
C. 3 Matafarri
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Petrus or Petrius

Vulcina Petri
m. Perucia de Georgiis
21/3/1346 Will

Petrus
d. by 1373

Filippus
m. 1 Catica q. Zoilus de Civallelis
m. 2 Stana q. Mattei de Carbone
m. 3 Begnuta, relict Ermolao de Arbe (Rab)
d. by 1428

Mina
m. Antonio q. Colanus de Cipriano

Simon
m. Radislava q. Giovanni de Grisogono
21/5/1449 Inventory
18/3/1448 Will\(^1\)
d. 1449

Marcheta

Dobriza

Petrus

Marinus
m. Marcheta q. Federico de Grisogono
2/4/1394 Will

Petrus
d. after 1367

Federicus
m. Elena q. Francesco de Çadulin
30/7/1392 Will

Marina
m. Marino q. Blasio de Soppe

Catarina
m. Giorgio de Giorgi

Perucia
Nun at St Nicholas

Johannes Petri
m. Bétha

Mapheus
m. Palmucia
13/6/1380 Will

\(^1\) Praga records that Catica died in 1370 but does not note her on his Civallelis family tree (See C. 1)

\(^2\) Praga may not have been aware of Simon’s will. DAZD, SZB, Johan de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 57r-58v

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 80.
C. 3 Matafarri

(Brothers?)

Jacobus Benedicti
d. before 1376

Thomasius q. Benedicti
d. before 1367

Vulcina q. Benedicti
d. before 1369

Franciscus
m. Catarina
3/5/1392 Will
13/1/1394 Will

Colanus (Nicolaus)
m. Marcheta q.
Johannis di Gallo
d. after 1404

Pria
(Lampridia)
m. Grisogono
de Grubogna

Isabetta
Nun at St
Mary

Mandiza
Nun at St
Nicholas

Georgius
m. 1 Rada q. Viti de Zamagna of
Ragusa (Dubrovnik)
m. 2 Anna q. Johannes de Gracti di
Ragusa (Dubrovnik)
14/7/1391 Will

Simon

Pria
m. Franciscus q.
Cressio de Nassi

Guido
d. after 1450

Catarina
m. Jacobo
de Gliubavaz

Alvisius
d. after 1432

Aliseta
m. Giovanni
de Gallelis

Ludovicus
m. Catarina de Calcina
Relict Bernardino de Carnaruti
25/7/1470 Will

1Praga may not have been aware of Ludovic's will. DAZD, SZB, Johannes de Calcina (1439-1492), B. 8, Fasc. 3, Testamenti registrati (1439-1491), ff. 125r-126r

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 8i.
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C. 4 Nassi

Gregorius
m. 1 Catarina q. Zuve q. Sergio de Cesanis
m. 2 Marchesina q. Pietro Biondo
d. after 1391

Nicolaus
m. Lucia q. Petrus
Monetario de Florentia
d. before 1388

Catarina

Bivaldi

Damianus
m. Catarina Basilio of Ragusa (Dubrovnik)
d. 1388

Maria
Nun at St Mary

Petrus
m. Nicolota q. Andrea
q. Sime de Binciola of Ragusa (Dubrovnik)

Cressius

Antonius
d. after 1403

Marcus

Daria
m. Johannes q. Blasii de Illenze of Ragusa (Dubrovnik)

Clara m. Vitolus q. Natalini de Çadulin

Teobaldus (?)

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 83.
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C. 4 Nassi

Mica Federici  
m. Zanetta q.  
Nicolai de Gallelis  
d. 1393

Federicus

Johannes  
d. 1404

Federicus  
d. before 1398

Lompré  
*Filio naturale*

Catrina  
m. Cressio q.  
Rainerii de  
Varicassiss  
d. 1400

Moretta

Zuviza  
(Zoiluccia)  
m. .... Fanfogna  
d. 1400

Maria  
Nun at St Mary

Transcription from BMV, Praga *fondi*, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 84.
C. 4 Nassi

Nicolaus

Grisogonus (Cressius) m. Bumiza d. before 1400

Damaran m. Nicolotta d. before 1398

Johannes d. after 1403

Catarina m. Carlo q. Marino de Ginano

Nicolota m. Augustino de Cigalis

Gregorius (?)

Mariza m. Mica de Soppe d. 1398

Donata m. Giorgio de Rosa

Simon 1403 Procurator of St Platon

Jeronimus m. Bina q. Rafaelei de Sorba

Franciscus m. Pria q. Nicolai q. Jacobi de Matafarri

Hieronymus d. 1498

Nicolò d. after 1478

Simon m. Catarina

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 88.
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C. 4 Nasi

Petrus (Perussa) m. Margarita 2/7/1395 Will

Duimus m.1 Brana q. Francesco de Čadulin m. 2 Madalena q. Nicola Teodosi de Spalato (Split) Johannes Nicolotta m. Ludovico q. Vulcina de Matafarri 8/6/1436 Will 1 Perutia m. Simon Detrico Zuviza (Giovanna) Nun at St Mary Catarina m. Johannes q. Andrea q. Nicolai de Grisogonis Clara

Nicolaus 10/8/1477 Will Zoilo Margarita

1 Praga did not include Nicolotta’s will. In this family tree. DAZD, SZB, Theodorus de Prandino (1403-1441), B. 6, Fasc. 1, Testamenti registrati (1403-1439), Br. 12, ff. 141r-15v

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 89.
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C. 4 Nassi

Zoilus
d. 1370

Petrus
(Perussa)
m. Margarita
2/7/1395 Will¹

Dominicus
m. Slavizza
d. before 1383

Matheus
(Mathule)

Johannes

Zoil
(Zuvelo)
Egregius et
famosius regius
miles

Marina
m. Marcus q.
Jacob de
Cesanis

Dobra
m. Zoilo q.
Laurenzo Civallesis
10/1/1393 Will

Catarina
m. Jancio (?) de
Cucolis de Spalato
(Split)

¹ For the continuation of Petrus’s line, see the transcription of BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 89 above.

Transcription from BMV, Praga fondi, Mss. It. VI, 508 (=12302), Fasc 2, c. 90.
Appendix D

The Commission of St Simeon’s Silver Arca

The following two documents pertain to Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić’s commission of St Simeon’s silver casket reliquary in 1377. The original documents are from DAZD, SZB, Petrus Perecanus (1365-1392), Istrumenti (1373-1381), B. 2, Fasc. 6, ff. 13v-14r & ff. 27v-28r. The manuscripts have since suffered water damage and the text is exceptionally difficult to read. These transcriptions were made by Marijana Kovačević and can be found in her doctoral thesis, Umjetnička obrada plemenitih metala u Zadru u 14. stoljeću (The artistic working of precious metals in fourteenth-century Zadar), (University of Zadar, 2009), pp. 1366 - 8.

D.1 The Commission

5th July 1377

The representatives of Queen Elizabeth Kotromarić commission the goldsmith Francesco da Milano to produce a silver reliquary for the relic of St Simeon the Prophet.

(in margine: Compositionis pro archa argentea Sancti Simonis fabricanda per magistrum Franciscum, aurifficem.)
Suprascriptis millesimo, indictione et die dominico quinto mensis iulii, regnante ut supra.

Cum illustriissima principissa et domina nostra naturalis domina Helisabet Dei gratia regina Hungarie, Polonie et Dalmatie et gloriosi dicti domini nostri regis Hungarie consors, diuino spiritu comota visitare voluisset corpus Beati Simonis Iusti in sua fideliter ciuitate existens, quo viso humilli conpassione comota non iacere ut conueniens est, idcirco Iadram post recessum suum destinauit mille marcas argenti causa ipsi beatissimo corpori Sancti Simeonis Iusti fabricandi arcam unam argenteam in qua dictum corpus sanctum reponetur et conseruetur ut dictum est, et pro dicto opere cicius conficiendo idem dominarum nostra per suas generosas literas scrisisset dilliectis fidelibus suis Iadrensis dominis Francisco de Georgio, Mapheo de Matafaris et Paulo de Georgio, strenuis militibus regii ac ser Grixogono de Ceualellis et Francisco de Çadulinis ut ipsi prout cicius fieri poterit dictum opus perficiatur. Qui strenui milites, dominus Franciscus, dominus Mapheus et dominus Paulus, ut fidelissimi regiae maiestatis tam suis nominibus quam nominibus ser Grixogoni de Ceualellis et ser Francisci de Çadulinis qui absentes erant, cupientes beneigne regia mandata pro posse adimplere, se regio nomine conuenerunt cum magistro Francisco, aurifice quondam Antonii de Mediolano, nunc habitatore Iadre, pro dicto opere coficiendo hoc modo videlicet, quod dictus magister Franciscus se solemniter obligando prefatis strenuis militibus nomine qua supra solempni stipulatione promisit et se obligauit eisdem dictum opus siue dictam arcam argenteam bene, fideliter et legaliter omnibus malicia et fraude postpositis facere, operare et exercere hinc ad vnum annum proxime venturum de bono et puro argento secundum quod ei per viros nobles ser Iohannem ser Galli et ser Bartulum de Cipriano, honorandos ciues
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ladrenses quibus dictum argentum totum in custodia datum est ad conservandum, dabitur et de illa liga bonitate argenti ad illam formam et similitudinem dicte arche argenteae conficiende et cum illis formis, imaginis, signis, miraculis et Presentatione domini nostri Ihesu Christi presentati ad altare, prout est quedam arca in carta bonbicina data et facta ad similitudinem dicte arche argenteae conficiende, que figure omnes releuate esse debent ut conueniens erit et dictam arcam intus et extra et desuper et de subtus indaurare debet per totum cum omnibus illis figuris que daurande erunt, et ut dictum opus perficiatur dictus magister Franciscus solemni stipulatione promisit et se obligauit dictis strenuis militibus regis mitere pro magistris ad conficiendum dictum opus. Que omnia et singula suprascripta promisit quoque dictus magister Franciscus stipulatione solemni dictis strenuis militibus stipulantibus et recipientibus ut supra actendere, obseruare et adimplere et non contrafacere uel venire aliqua ratione uel causa, modo uel ingenio de iure uel de facto sub pena quarti valoris predictorum tociens comittenda et cum effectu exigenda reiterando quociens contrafactum fuerit predictis uel aliquo predictorum, qua soluta uel non nichilominus contractus iste suam semper obtineat roboris firmitatem et cum reflectione omnium damnorum, interesse et expensis litis et extra et cum obligatione omnium suorum bonorum presentium et futurorum. Et dicti regii milites nomine quo supra solemni stipulatione promiserunt ipsi magistro Francisco dari facere per dictos ser Iohannem et ser Bartolum conservatores tocius dicte quantitatis argenti pro vna quaque vice marchas quinquaginta argenti ad laborandum aut tantum plus aut tantum minus quantum dictis conservatoribus uidebitur pro dicto opere expediendo, quo laborato idem magister Franciscus dictis conservatoribus dicti argenti ad illud pondus et tale argentum restituere prout ipse magister Franciscus habuit et sic et taliter usque ad finem dicti operis, et totam quantitatem auri pro indaurando dictum oppus, que
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opportuna erit ad hoc, cum ea quantitate argenti viui ad hec necessaria. Et pro suis
fatichis ducatum vnum auri pro qualibet marca argenti laborati per dictum magistrum
Franciscum in dicto opere, et pro arris et parte solutionis dicti operis dare hinc ad
paucos dies ipsi magistro Francisco florenos ducentos auri sub pena et obligatione
predictis. Et pro predictis omnibus et singulis melius actendendis et obseruandis
sponte et per pactum dictus magister Franciscus obligauit se suosque heredes et
successores et omnia sua bona presentia et futura penes dictos regios milites
stipulantes ut supra et ad conueniendum tam realiter quam personaliter semel et
pluries usque ad plenarium et condignam satisfactionem omnium predictorum Iadre,
Dalmacie, Croacie, Sclauonie, Obrouacii, Ancone, Marchie, Ystrie, Foroiullii, Venecie,
Lombardie et ubique locorum et terrarum et omni tempore in quacumque curia et
coram quacumque dominatione. Et voluerunt ipse partes ambe contrahentes ut de
predictis ego notarius infrascriptus duo debeam publica conficere instrumenta unius
eiusdem tenoris et parti cuilibet tradere vnum.

Actum Iadre sub Logia magna comunis, presentibus viris nobilibus ser Saladino
quondam ser Chose de Saladinis, ser Nicolao quondam ser Grixogoni de Marino et ser
Marino quondam ser Vulcine Petri de Matafaris, omnibus ciuibus Iadrensibus testibus,
vocatis, rogatis et aliis.
D. 2 The first payment

13th August 1377

The goldsmith Francesco of Milan received his first instalment of 200 florins from the Queen’s representatives.

(in margine: Finis pro archa Sancti Simonis florenorum II° auri.)

Suprascriptis millesimo, indictione et die. Regnante ut supra.

Magister Franciscus, auriffex quondam Anthonii de Mediolano, nunc habitator ladre guarentuit, contentus et confessus fuit se manualiter habuisse et recepisse et in se habere dixit a strenuo milite regio domino Mapheo de Matafaris, cive ladrensi, dante et soluente suo nomine ac nomine et vice strenuorum militum regiorum dominorum Francisci de Georgio et Pauli de Georgio regio iussu florenos ducentos auri computando pro quolibet florento libras tres et soldos duodecim denariorum paruorum, et hoc pro parte solutionis laboris et fatiche dicti magistri Francisci fiendi et fiende per eum in operando et faciendo vnam archam argenteam beato corpori Sancti Simeonis Iusti, pro quo opere per eum fiendo idem magister Franciscus habere debeat pro quilibet marca argenti per eum laborati ad opus dicte arche argenteae per eum fiende ducatum vnum boni auri et iusti ponderis ut patet publico instrumento obligationis dicte arche argenteae conficiende ipsi beato corpori Sancti Simonis Iusti per dictum magistrum Franciscum scripto manu mei notarii infrascripti in presentibus millesimo,
indictione et die quinto mensis iullii nunc preteriti, renuncians super hoc sponte et per pactum dictus magister Franciscus exceptioni et probationi non dorum, habitorum et receptorum ac sibi manualiter numerorum dictorum ducentorum florenorum auri valencium ut supra a dicto domino Mapheo milite dante suo nomine quo supra et dicta de causa tempore huius contractus omni spey future numerationis et tradicionis omnique alii suo iuri et legum auxilio, faciens dictus magister Franciscus per se et suos heredes et successores ipsi domino Mapheo stipulanti et recipienti suo nomine et nominibus quibus supra et occasione predicta de dictis florenis ducentis auri finem remissionem quietationem ac perpetuum liberationem ac eciam pactum perpetuum et speciale de nil ulterior petendo de dictis florenis ducentis auri dicta de causa ipsis streuis militibus nomine quo supra in toto uel in parte per se uel per suos heredes et successores aut per aliquam aliam personam ipsius nomine sub pena quarti, qua soluta uel non nichilominus contractus iste suam semper obtineat roboris firmitatem, et cum reflectione omnium damnorum interesse et expensis litis et extra et cum obligatione omnium suorum bonorum presentium et futurorum. Actum ladre iuxta Logiam magnam comunis, presentibus Colane, filio ser Madii de Cipriano et Martino quondam Paladini, ambobus de ladra testibus, vocatis, rogatis et aliis.
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Figure 2.2 Bell tower of King Coloman, c. 1110, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, view to the south east, Photograph: Author’s Own.
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Figure 2.8 Palace of the Nassi family, Zadar, view of the exterior facing north east, Photograph: Author’s Own.
Figure 2.9 Giovanni di Sansepolcro, *Choir Stalls*, c. 1395, Church of St Francis, Zadar, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 2.10 *Matafarri coat of arms*, detail of Figure 2.9.
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Figure 3.2 Church of St Donatus (formerly the Holy Trinity), Zadar, view of the exterior facing north, Photograph: Author’s Own.
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Figure 3.6 *St Chrysogonus*, between 526 and 570, mosaic, nave of Sant’ Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna.
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Figure 3.9 Reliquary of Saints James and Orontius, late eleventh century, wood and silver gilt, Treasury of the Church of St Anselm, Nin, 42cm long x 8.5cm deep x 9.5cm high
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Figure 3.11 Reliquary of St Quirinus with (from left to right) St Quirinus, Christ and St Chrysogonus, first half of the fourteenth century, wood and silver gilt, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, 19cm long x 17cm wide x 21cm high.
Figure 3.12 Reliquary of St Chrysogonus’ Shirt, 1326, wood, silver gilt and enamels, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, 30cm long x 17cm wide x 17cm high.

Figure 3.13 St Chrysogonus enamel, detail from Fig. 3.12.
Figure 3.14 Workshop of Francesco da Milano of Zadar(?),
Processional Cross with enamels of Franciscan and Zaratine
patron saints, second half of the fourteenth century, wood, silver
gilt and enamels, Museo Civico of Amedeo Lia, La Spezia, 56cm
high x 31cm wide.
Figure 3.15 *St Chrysogonus enamel*, detail from Fig. 3.14.

Figure 3.16 *St Louis of Toulouse and donor figure*, detail from Fig. 3.14.
Figure 3.17 St Chrysogonus, 1385, wax seal, Archivio di Stato, Venice, Senato, Dispacci antichi di ambasciatori, rettori e caltre cariche (1321-1528), b. 1, n. 61.
Figure 3.18 Head Reliquary of St Zoilus with figure of St Chrysogonus, late fourteenth century, wood and silver gilt, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, 28cm long x 18cm wide x 24cm high.
Figure 3.19 Arm reliquary of St Chrysogonus, early fifteenth century, gilded silver with enamels, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, 17cm diameter x 57cm high.
Figure 3.20 *St Chrysogonus*, detail from Fig. 3.19.

Figure 3.21 *St Chrysogonus*, detail from Fig. 3.19.
Figure 3.22 Church of San Trovasso, Venice, view of the exterior facing east.
Figure 3.23 Michele Giambono, *San Chrysogono*, 1444-1450, panel painting, Church of San Trovaso, Venice, 199 cm x 134 cm.
Figure 3.24 Detail of Fig. 3.243

Figure 3.25 Arca of St Luke the Evangelist, 1316, green & red marble with alabaster reliefs raised on granite and alabaster supports, Church of Santa Giustina, Padua
Figure 4.1 Francesco da Milano, *Arca of St Simeon the Prophet*, 1377-80, wood and silver gilt, Church of St Simeon, Zadar, 192cm long x 62cm wide x 127cm high.
Figure 4.2 Remains of the Church of St Mary the Great, Zadar, view of the exterior facing south.

Figure 4.3 Effigy from the early arca of St Simeon now the mensa in the Church of St Simeon, thirteenth century (?), stone, Church of St Simeon, Zadar.
Figure 4.4 Nicola Pisano, *Tomb of St Dominic*, 1264-7, St Dominic, Bologna.

Figure 4.5 Proposed reconstruction of the tomb of St Dominic, from Anita Fiderer Moskowitz, *Nicola Pisano’s Arca di San Domenico and its Legacy* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), figure 4.
Figure 4.6 Giovanni di Balduccio, *Arca of St Peter Martyr*, 1339, Sant’Eustorgio, Milan.

Figure 4.7 *Current configuration of the Tomb of St Anthony of Padua*, c. 1263, the Santo, Padua.
Figure 4.8 *Tomb of Antenor*, c. 1283, Padua

Figure 4.9 *Tomb of the Blessed Odorico da Pordenone*, 1331, Sta Maria del Carmine, Udine.
Figure 4.10 Lando di Pietro, Arm Reliquary of St Louis of Toulouse, 1337, Silver gilt, translucent enamel over basse-taille silver, opaque enamel, rock crystal, Musée du Louvre, Paris, 20.5cm wide x 63cm high.
Figure 4.11 Tino di Camaino, *Tomb of Catherine of Austria*, c. 1323, San Lorenzo, Naples.

Figure 4.12 Detail of Fig. 4.11.
Figure 4.13 Tino di Camaino, *Tomb of Mary of Hungary*, 1326, Sta Maria Domina Regina, Naples.

Figure 4.14 Tino di Camaino, *Tomb of Charles of Calabria*, 1332–3, Sta Chiara, Naples.
Figure 4.15 *Effigy of St Simeon*, detail of Fig. 4.1.

Figure 4.16 *Reverse view of St Simeon’s arca*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.17 *St Simeon’s arca when open*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.18 The Presentation at the Temple, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.19 *The Dream of the Three Rectors*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.20 The Miracle of St Simeon’s intercession for the Sailors and Angevin Coat of Arms, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.21 *The Shipwreck*, detail of Fig. 4.6.
Figure 4.22 Death of Ban Stjepan Kotromarić, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.23 *Dedictory Panel*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.24 Donatrix Panel, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.25 *Theft of the Holy Leg*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.26 Portrait of Francesco da Milano / the Construction of the Original Arca, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.27 *The Punishment of the Perjurer*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.28 *The Theft of St Simeon’s Finger*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.29 *The 1357 Arrival of King Louis in Zadar*, detail of Fig. 4.1.
Figure 4.30 *The Exorcism*, detail of Fig. 4.17.
Figure 4.31 The Rescue of the Drowning Child, detail of Fig. 4.17.
Figure 4.32 *The Heretical Cleric*, detail of Fig. 4.17.
Figure 4.34 Hypothetical Reconstruction of the Narrative Panels 2
Figure 4.35 Hypothetical Reconstruction of the Narrative Panels 3.
Figure 4.36 Modern day pilgrims pass beneath the arca of St Peter Martyr
Figure 4.37 Church of St Simeon, Zadar, view of the interior towards the high altar and silver arca.
Figure 4.38 Church of San Simeone Grande, Venice, view of the exterior facing east.

Figure 4.39 Marco Romano (?), Arca, Effigy and Dedicatory Panel of St Simeon, c. 1317 (?), marble, San Simeone Grande, Venice, arca: 179cm long x 46cm wide x 46cm high, effigy: 210cm long x 52cm wide, panel: 180cm long x 42cm high.
Figure 5.1 Basilica of San Marco, Venice, 1063-96, view of the exterior facing east, Photograph: Author’s Own.
1) Doge’s Principle Seat (*bigonzo*)
2) Doge’s Secondary Seat
3) Dogaressa
4) Ambassadors
5) Signoria
6) Senate
7) *Primicerius*
8) Canons of San Marco
9) Clergy
10) Gospel pulpit
11) Seat of the Patriarch of Grado

Figure 5.2 Floor Plan with seating arrangements in the East End of the Basilica of San Marco before 1530, with additions to the original plan published in Andrew Hopkins, ‘Architecture and Infirmitas: Doge Andrea Gritti and the Chancel of San Marco’, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 57 / 2 (1998), p. 186.
Figure 5.3 *Reception of St Mark’s Relics*, twelfth century, mosaic, Chapel of San Clemente, Basilica of San Marco, Venice.

Figure 5.4 *The Privilege of Pope Pelagius II*, twelfth century, mosaic, Chapel of St Peter, Basilica of San Marco, Venice.
Figure 5.5 *Pala d’Oro*, 1102-18, ebony, gold, precious and semiprecious stones, cloisonné enamels, Basilica of San Marco, Venice, 210cm x 350cm, Photograph: Author’s Own.
Figure 5.6 (from left to right) *Pulpito lectionem*, *presbytery screen*, and *pulpitum magnum* ('bigonzo'), Basilica of San Marco, Venice, view of the interior facing the northeast.
Figure 5.7 *The Apparitio of St Mark*, second half of the thirteenth century, mosaic, south transept of the Basilica of San Marco, Venice.
Figure 5.8 Aerial view of the city of Venice with the Piazza and Piazzetta of San Marco circled.
Figure 5.9 Venetian soldo from the dogate of Giovanni Dolfin, 1356-61, silver, Arheološki muzej, Zadar, 16mm, 0.480g.
Figure 5.10 Jacopo and Pierpaolo dalle Masegna, *Presbytery Screen with statues of the Madonna, St Mark and the Apostles*, 1396, stone and marble, with Jacopo di Marco Benato, *Crucifix*, 1397, wood covered in copper and silver gilt, Basilica of San Marco, Venice, Photograph: Author’s Own.
Figure 5.11 Paolo Veneziano, *The Tomb of St Mark*, detail from the *Pala Ferialia*, 1345, Basilica of San Marco, Venice, panel dimensions: 56cm x 42.5cm.

Figure 5.12 Venetian ducat from the dogate of Doge Giovanni Dandolo, 1284, gold, British Museum, London, 21mm.
21) Cathedral of St Titus
25) Church of St Mark

Figure 5.13 Map of Thirteenth-Century Candia, from Maria Georgopoulou, Venice’s Mediterranean Colonies: Architecture and Urbanism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 49.
Figure 5.14 Scapula Reliquary of St Mark, early fourteenth century, wood and silver gilt, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar, 23cm long x 13cm wide x 13.5cm high.
Figure 5.15 Master of Gregory’s Pax, Mandible Reliquary of St Anselm, late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, silver and silver gilt, Treasury of St Anselm, Nin, 12cm long x 5cm wide x 6cm high.
Figure 5.16 Hungarian denar from the reign of Louis I of Hungary, 1342-82, silver, Arheološki muzej, Zadar, 14mm, 0.357g.

Figure 5.17 Zaratine folars from the reign of Louis I of Hungary, 1342-82, copper billon, Arheološki muzej, Zadar, 12mm, 0.43g.
Figure 5.18 Zaratine Soldo or Moneta Dalmata, after 1410, silver, Arheološki muzej, Zadar, 16-18mm, 0.5-0.7g.

Figure 5.19 Matteo Moronzon, Choir stalls, 1418-c. 1451, wood and gilding, Cathedral of St Anastasia, Zadar, view facing northeast, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 5.20 Archbishop’s Stall, detail of Fig. 5.19, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 5.21 Archbishop Maffeo Vallaresso’s coat of arms, detail of Fig. 5.20, Photograph: Author’s Own.
Figure 5.22 *Venetian Count’s throne*, detail of Fig. 5.19, Photograph: Author’s Own.

Figure 5.23 *Archbishop Maffeo Vallaresso’s coat of arms*, detail of Fig. 5.22, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 5.24 *Shell Niche Canopy with Lion of St Mark*, detail of Fig. 5.22, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 5.25 Matteo Moronzon and Giovanni da Milano, *Ten Apostles and Crucifixion from the Presbytery Screen of St Anastasia*, 1426-c.31, painted and gilded wood, Museum of Sacred Art, Convent of St Mary, Zadar.
Figure 5.26 Basilica of San Marco, Venice, view of the interior towards the high altar.

Figure 5.27 Cathedral of St Anastasia, Zadar, view of the interior towards the high altar with reconstructed presbytery screen, Photograph: Author’s Own.
1) Archbishop’s Throne
2) Count’s Throne
3) Chapel of St Anastasia
4) Chapel of St Thomas a Becket
5) Original location of presbytery screen
6) Ciborium

Figure 5.28 Seating configuration in St Anastasia after 1418, using floor plan from Cirillo M. Iveković, 'Krstionica kod stolne crkve sv. Stošije u Zadru i vrijeme građenja nejzina i crkve sv. Donata (The baptistery at the main church of St Anastasia in Zadar and the period of its construction as well as the church of St Donat)', Rad JAZU, 258 (1937), p.2.
Figure 5.29 Archbishop Lorenzo Venier’s coat of arms on the partitions of the Count’s throne, detail of Fig. 5.22, Photograph: Joanne Allen.

Figure 5.30 Archbishop Luca da Fermi’s coat of arms on the partitions of the Count’s throne, detail of Fig. 5.22, Photograph: Joanne Allen.
Figure 5.31 Archbishop Biagio Molin’s coat of arms, detail from Fig. 5.19, Photograph: Author’s Own.