

THE LASTOVO REBELS OF 1602

NENAD VEKARIĆ

ABSTRACT: A group of old noble families of the island of Lastovo—under the leadership of the descendants of *župan* (chieftain) Desislav—rose to prominence on the local political scene through a specific form of oligarchy. They were confronted, however, by a group of local noblemen supported by the central Ragusan government which considered the oligarchy a threat to its sovereignty over Lastovo. Placed under control, the former ruling faction tried to restore its position. Their revolt was articulated in the form of resistance against the new limits of Lastovo's autonomy, trying to arouse the allegiance of many islanders, in which they partly succeeded. The group managed to involve the Venetians into the conflict, as well. However, given the European power constellation, the rebellion was doomed to failure. Though militarily inferior to Venice, the Republic of Dubrovnik managed to retain the island and consolidate its sovereignty over the territory. In practice, this implied the end of Lastovo's oligarchy and the permanent limitation of the island's autonomy.

Nenad Vekarić, head of the Institute for Historical Sciences of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Dubrovnik. Address: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU, Lapad-ska obala 6, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia. E-mail: nenad.vekaric@du.t-com.hr.

This article has already been published in Croatian under the following title: »Lastovski pobunjenici 1602. godine.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 43 (2005): pp. 43-73. Translated by Vesna Baće.

Introduction

Historiography has taken certain interest in the Lastovo rebellion of 1602, in the events pertaining to it as well as in its aftermath.¹ The circumstances leading to the rebellion have been established: by the Senate's decree of 22 November 1601 the remuneration paid by the islanders to the count appointed by Dubrovnik was raised from 75 to 200 scudas, the construction of two prisons (one for men and one for women) was required at the islanders' expense, as well as the reconstruction of the count's residence, the duty of day and night guard at the Lastovo castle was imposed, etc.² The position of the two protagonists is also clear: Venice with the aspirations to press its claim of lordship over the island on one hand, and the Republic of Dubrovnik struggling to maintain control of its remotest territory on the other. However, interpretation of the causes which led to the rebellion is being reduced to a simplified black-and-white explanation. One interpretation, supported by old Ragusan chroniclers but also adopted by the historian Antonije Vučetić, is based on the standpoints of the Ragusan Senate itself which tended to attach the blame on the people of Lastovo who, "accustomed to disorder and violation of other people's rights were led astray by some mischief-makers and villains, most of all by some priests, who were willing to submit Lastovo to the Venetians".³ Later historians tended to disregard such an interpretation and pin all the blame on the Venetian expansionistic policy (Jovan Radonić)⁴, which persisted in its "claim of sovereign rights over all the islands in the Adriatic" and "should the right moment arise" tried to "actualise" such a position (Vinko Foretić)⁵, or

¹ Šime Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom.« *Rad JAZU* 53 (1880): pp. 94-185; Antonije Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija i slobodne plovidbe prema Mlečanima početkom XVII. vijeka«. *Glasnik dubrovačkog učenog društva "Sveti Vlaho"* 1 (1929): pp. 84-117; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III.1, ed. Jovan Radonić. [Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, III.9]. Beograd: SKA, 1939: pp. 22-163; Marin Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«. *Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku* 3 (1954): pp. 253-295; Vinko Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808.*, vol. II. Zagreb: NZMH, 1980: pp. 80-84; Radovan Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika*. Beograd: Prosveta, 1983: pp. 17-43; Josip Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«, in: *Lastovski statut*, ed. Antun Cvitanić. Split: Književni krug, 1994: pp. 61-70; Tonko Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*. Lastovo: Matica hrvatska Lastovo, 2001: pp. 115-140.

² M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 262.

³ A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86.

⁴ *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: p. V.

⁵ V. Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808.*, vol. II: p. 80.

on the Ragusan “centralistic policy, exercised in other administrative units as well, which, as a rule, disregarded the local statute and centuries-old autonomy” (Josip Lučić)⁶, or on the “traditional Ragusan negligence of the island interior problems, particularly the imposition of the Republic’s policy” (Tonko Jurica)⁷, or as Marin Lucijanović would put it: “we are unable to pinpoint any other reason for rebellion apart from blind observation of the old legal framework and the ensuing economic privileges”⁸ which Dubrovnik had “ruthlessly” violated by altering the provisions in 1601 (Šime Ljubić).⁹

In all of the above-mentioned readings the role of the islanders is being simplified. They are either ‘mischief-makers accustomed to disorder’ who should be ‘disciplined’, or ‘popular rebels’ revolting against the hegemony of a specific feudal system such as that of the Dubrovnik Republic and who, at the same time, were being manipulated within a broader context of the Veneto-Ragusan power struggle.

In truth, the perspective on these events does strike as somewhat reduced.

Based on the sources available, this article aims to identify the rebels in order to grasp the underlying reasons of the revolt and to establish the circumstances which led to a bipolar political division among the islanders.

Archive materials related to the onset of the rebellion in 1602 offer evidence on a group of 36 rebels who, led by Marin Stjepanov, Frano Paskov and Marin Bartulov, Lastovo priests, made their way to Korčula determined to submit Lastovo to Venice. The first two were strangled in the Dubrovnik jail. They were also accompanied by Lukša Antičin.¹⁰ On 13 August 1602 the ringleaders were sentenced to death: Antun Bartulov, Pasko Antica, Vitko Lukšin Antica,

⁶ J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 62.

⁷ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 122.

⁸ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 261.

⁹ Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 14.

¹⁰ *Annales Ragusini Anonymi item Nicolai de Ragnina*, ed. Natko Nodilo. [Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium, vol. 14]. Zagabrie: JAZU, 1883: p. 140 (*un Lagostano chiamato Luxsia*); A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 87; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: p. 27; M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 263; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 64. Lukša is not mentioned among the rebels who fled to Korčula.

Pasko Marinov, Ivan Mariničin and Matija Dumfrankov, along with Ilija Paskvin, Antun Đurović, Cvjetiša Ivanov, Lukša Marinov Frnjiz, Ilija Antunov Kučičić, Marin Lazarov, Marin Jakobov, Antun Šoljatović, Marin Ivanov Graničić, Kuzma Živićev, Tonko Lučin Tomašinović, Ivan Kolendin, Luka Voić, Luka Rešić, Petar Ilijin Perić, Frano Viceljnin Masarović, Kuzma Masarović, Ivan Lučin Marinica, Antun Ivanov Santolo, Ivan Lučić Lucijanović, Ivan Antunov Perić, Marin Đivojević, Jakov Marinov Birović, Antun Vasiljev, Bogdan Kolendin and Petar Antunov Prceljjev.¹¹

The rebels are listed either by surname (21) or patronymic (15). The persons noted down by patronymic only have been fully identified by means of genealogical reconstruction with their contemporary surnames added (bolded without solidus). Each rebel has also been identified in terms of lineage (bolded within solidus).¹² I have also attempted to establish the eventual kin relations between the rebels themselves as well as their status. Thus the term *plemić* (nobleman) has been used to denote a member of the ruling elite, disregarding the formal particularities of his noble status. Apparently, the nobility was recognised only within the Lastovo community (*universitas*), and was finally defined with the ‘closing’ of the Council in 1367. It was then that a group of twenty members was elected to Council for life, and most strict rules for the entry of the new members were established. When a place became vacant, a new councillor had to be elected by majority vote. Apart from being fit and eligible, prudent and capable, the candidate was to be “Lastovo born” and “in no case an outsider”, i.e. his father and grandfather on the father’s side had also sat on the Council.¹³ This provision actually provided a legal framework for the definition of a noble group consisting of the elected councillors, i.e., their families. Namely, the councillors held the most prominent local offices, and judges were appointed from their circle only.

¹¹ The list of the rebels, though with many surnames misread (Lučićić, Šuljata, Divićev, Rešić, Divoević, Pirović, Perceljjev), was published by A. Vučetić, (»Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86) and J. Radonić, (*Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: p. 35), who misread the surnames as Birošić, Lučićić, Mastarović.

¹² Most of the Lastovo families can be reconstructed genealogically up to three hundred years before the rebellion. The entire period was marked by unstable surname system, hence the frequent changes. At the time of the rebellion most persons bore a different surname from the original.

¹³ *Lastovski statut*, chapter XLIX.

The ringleaders

1. Priest Marin (Maroje) Stjepanov /**DESISLAVIĆ-PRIMILIĆ/ČIKUT** (c. 1525-1602), son of Stjepan Čikut and Stane, daughter of Kolenda Dragosaljić Uvetić. Member of the Desislavić noble family,¹⁴ thus a descendant of župan Desislav from the thirteenth century. This branch of the Desislavić family was renamed into Primilić after Desislav's grandson Primil Bogdanić. Maroje Matkov Primilić, Marin's grandfather, was the first to bear the new surname Čikut.¹⁵ Priest Marin was the only male successor of his father Stjepan,¹⁶ whose will was drafted on 19 November 1558.¹⁷ Marin had four sisters: Marta (d. c. 1543), wife of Antun Marinović Budislavić (of the Galčić family), Lucija (d. c. 1560), wife of Ostoja Bošković (of the Kunzulić family), Bijela, and Paulina (d. c. 1593), wife of Bartul Marinov Grdobić. In 1581 Marin was dismissed from the office of Lastovo's chancellor on account of alleged malpractice. At the same time, the Ragusan Minor Council decided that the Lastovo chancellery could be run by a non-cleric only.¹⁸ The dismissed chancellor became one of the leaders of the Lastovo rebellion of 1602. He was

¹⁴ The Grozanić, Marićević, Vlahojević and Sokolić are also the branches of the Desislavić.

¹⁵ Marin's grandfather, Maroje Matković, together with Dragoš Žuvanović were elected into the Council of Twenty in 1483. Due to electoral malpractice, their membership was cancelled. In 1489, however, the Ragusan Minor Council decided to support and confirm their aborted election: "Since the whole Commune, the judges and the Lastovo community nominated and elected them to sit on the Council, the seats of which they held complacently for as long as 16 months, the expulsion of the said Dragoš and Maroje from the Council is apparently out of proportion, as neither of them is known to have erred in any way. It must also be taken into consideration that Dragoš and Maroje had not entered the Council either by fraud or force, but through a properly conducted electoral procedure carried out by the whole community. The latter should have been more cautious in the election of Dragoš and Maroje, but once elected and appointed to the duty they were known to hold for a certain period of time on the said Council, there is no legal ground for their recall." (*Lastovski statut*, chapter LXXXVIII). Maroje Matković (Čikut) was one of Lastovo's delegates before the Ragusan government in 1497 on the matter of the tenancy and mortgage decree (*Lastovski statut*, chapter XCIX). In 1509 he was a judge on Lastovo (*Lastovski statut*, chapter CIII).

¹⁶ Marin's father, Stjepan Marinović (Čikut), was Lastovo's delegate to Dubrovnik on the matter of the damage caused by livestock (*Lastovski statut*, chapter CIII).

¹⁷ *Testamenti di Lagosta*, (hereafter cited as: *Test. La.*), ser. 91.3, vol. 5, ff. 17-18, State Archives of Dubrovnik.

¹⁸ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 282; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 114, 117.

arrested and strangled in Dubrovnik prison on 13 August together with another priest from Lastovo, Frano Paskvić.¹⁹ He left a will dated 13 December 1600.²⁰ Marin was the last descendant of the Čikut family, while the family house in Grmica was inherited by his nephew (son of Marin's sister Paulina) Antić Bartulov Grdobić (progenitor of the Antićević branch).

2. Priest Frano Lukšin /**LUKŠIĆ/ PASKVIĆ** (c. 1530-1602), son of Lukša Paskvić and Đivana, daughter of Maroje Živković. Descendant of the Lukšić noble family, the Paskvić branch.²¹ As a representative of Lastovo's community, in 1517 priest Pasko Marinović, Frano's uncle, commissioned a mason Nikola Milovtić, to build an apse in the Church of St Mary in Polje.²² Frano's father Lukša wrote a will in 1569, according to which Frano was to give one half of the movable property he had inherited from his uncle, priest Frano, to his brother Marin if he was to receive half of his father's livestock. Should he be willing to inherit half of the father's estate, he was to give one half of the house in Zvijezdićeva street in Dubrovnik to his brother, the very same house Lukša had purchased together with his brother, priest Frano, but which they failed to divide.²³ In his will of 1586,²⁴ Marin Lukšin Paskvić states that his brother Frano had made an unrightful claim over the entire property of their father and mother, as well as the property of their uncles, priests Pasko and Frano.²⁵ As one of the leaders of the Lastovo rebellion, priest Frano Lukšin Paskvić was arrested and strangled in the Dubrovnik

¹⁹ *Annales Ragusini Anonymi item Nicolai de Ragnina*: pp. 142-143; Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 115; A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: pp. 86, 89; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 25, 32, 40-45; M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 263; R. Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika*: p. 19; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 63; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 119.

²⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 44v-45.

²¹ The progenitor Lukša Marinović held judicial office in 1458, when it was decided to appoint an overseer (*Statute of Lastovo*, chapter LXXXI). The branches Paskvić, Donživković, Grzelinović, Damjanović, Despotović, Pasquali, Škratuljić and Fantela all descend from the main Lukšić branch. Frano was of the Paskvić branch, named after his great-grandfather Pasko Lukšić.

²² Cvito Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«. *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 16 (1966): p. 66; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 412.

²³ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 117.

²⁴ *Test. La.*, vol. 5, ff. 139v-140. *Test. La.*, vol. 5, ff. 139v-140.

²⁵ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 117.

prison on 13 August 1602.²⁶ According to the chronicle of *Anonym*, Frano's surname was Lacman,²⁷ although such a family name has not been traced in the chancellery records. Besides brother Marin, Frano had five sisters: Rusa, Slava (married to Antica Ivanović of the Siračić branch), Marna, Anica and Katarina. Pasko Antica, his great-nephew (Slava's grandson) and ringleader, inherited his property.²⁸

3. Priest Marin Bartulov /**VERAMENTIĆ-SKVRAKE/ GRDOBIĆ** (b. c. 1570), son of Bartul Grdobić and Paulina, daughter of Stjepan Čikut. Member of the Veramentić noble family, Grdobić branch.²⁹ Nephew of priest Marin Stjepanov Čikut (no. 1). Having fled to Rome, he escaped arrest, but continued to plot against Dubrovnik.³⁰ When the Ragusans sent 276 soldiers and masons to Lastovo in order to demolish the castle (Kaštel) in 1607, Marin Bartulov immediately informed Venice about it.³¹ Besides two brothers—Maroje (ancestor of the Grbin branch) and Antić, also a rebel leader (no. 4)—he had three sisters: Lucija, married to one of the ringleaders, Pasko Marinov Lukšić (no. 8), Marta and Slava, married to Antun Lukin Marinica. The exact date of his death has not been established, but he could be traced on Lastovo even after the rebellion. In 1617, Marin, his brother Antić and nephews from the third brother, the late Maroje, were involved in the inheritance division of his brother-in-law Antun Lukin Marinica.³²

²⁶ *Annales Ragusini Anonymi item Nicolai de Ragnina*: pp. 142-143; Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 115; A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: pp. 86, 89; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 25, 32, 40-45; M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 263; R. Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika*: p. 19; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 63; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 119.

²⁷ *Annales Ragusini Anonymi item Nicolai de Ragnina*: pp. 142-144 (Frano Paskvaličević Lacman).

²⁸ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 117-118.

²⁹ The vineyards of the Veramentić are mentioned in the will of don Antun Nikolin in 1467 (*Test. La.*, vol. 14, no pagination, the will of don Antun Nikolin). The family was nicknamed Skvrake. Later it branched out into the Skvrake, Grdobić, Marojević, Grbin, Antićević and Višković.

³⁰ A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 61-63. V. Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808.*, vol. II: pp. 81-82; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 63; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 116-119.

³¹ Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 135; M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 286.

³² *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 168v-171.

4. Antun (Antić) Bartulov /**VERAMENTIĆ-SKVRAKE/ GRDOBIĆ** (c. 1570-1623), son of Bartul Grdobić and Paulina, daughter of Stjepan Čikut. Elder brother of priest Marin (no. 3), and nephew and heir to priest Marin Stjepanov Čikut (no. 1). Progenitor of the lineage later to be known as Antićević. He married Lucija, daughter of Mato Bogdanović Masarović, with whom he had three sons and a daughter. Although he was one of the leaders of the Lastovo rebellion,³³ after 1602 he remained on the island. Councillor in 1618,³⁴ and died in 1623.³⁵
5. Pasko /Antičin/ /**SIRAČIĆ-SENKOVIĆ-VITKOVIĆ/ ANTICA** (c. 1553-1604), son of Antica Ivanović Vitković and Slava, daughter of Lukša Paskvić (of the Lukšić family). Member of the Siračić noble family, Senković branch, Vitković subbranch.³⁶ The patronymic Antica was derived from his father's name—Antica Ivanović Vitković, who drafted a will on 12 January 1589, and a codicil dated 16 August 1593. Since his three sons, Lukša, Franko and Pasko, did not stay to provide maintenance for him, Antun appointed his grandson Antun, son of his late son Marin, his universal successor.³⁷ Besides the mentioned brothers, Pasko had a brother, Ivan, who was a priest, and sisters Anica, married to Marić Kolendin Marićević (of the Desislavić) and Marija. Pasko's brother Franko was in the service of the Dubrovnik Republic as a cannon forger from 1578 to 1585. Preserved are the three bells he had made in Lopud (1579), Slano (1580) and in Dubrovnik. In 1589 he moved to Venice to join the workshop of the brothers de Tonis, and then to Gandino (Bergamo), where he made a bronze fence in front of the main altar of the Cathedral bearing his signature—FRANCISCVS LAGVSTINVS

³³ A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 35-36; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 63; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 117-119.

³⁴ *Knjiga o uredbama i običajima skupštine i občine otoka Lastova*, ed. Frano Radić. [Monumenta historico-juridica Slavorum Meridionalium, VIII]. Zagreb: JAZU, 1901: p. 126.

³⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 234v-236v.

³⁶ In the rape trial against Bogdan, son of Desislav, former *župan*, in 1285 Grdomil Siračić testified as defence witness (Gregor Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«. *Spomenik SKA*, Beograd, 91 (1939): pp. 5, 9). The Siračić later branched out into the Senković, Cubrijanović, Čučević, Vitković, Antica and Marinica.

³⁷ *Test. La.*, vol. 5, f. 203v-204v.

EPIDAVRIVS.³⁸ In 1581 Pasko Antica was elected the first secular chancellor of the Lastovo community after the dismissal of priest Marin Stjepanov Čikut.³⁹ Pasko was one of the rebel leaders in 1602. With the arrival of 500 Ragusan soldiers on Lastovo in July of 1602, he fled to Korčula together with most of the conspirators. He was tried *in absentia* and sentenced to death by hanging on 1 August. On a stormy day of 5 January 1603, the rebels landed on Lastovo, overpowered the Ragusan guards and seized the fort. They captured Captain Šiško Sorgo and Count Serafin Zamagna, and took control of the place and the island. Assembly (*zbor*) was summoned and Pasko Antica was elected chamberlain (*camerlengo*) and captain. He died in Venice on 6 July 1604, most likely of poisoning.⁴⁰ His uncle, priest Franko Lukšin Paskvić (apprehended in Dubrovnik and executed, no. 2), in 1602 bequeathed him a newly-built house in Ograda in Laze and a house in Dubrovnik.⁴¹ By local tradition,

³⁸ Lukša Beritić, »Frano Antica Lastovac«. *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 8 (1954): pp. 87-90; Lukša Beritić, *Dubrovačka artiljerija*. Beograd: Vojni muzej JNA, 1960: pp. 85-86; Cvito Fisković, »Bilješke o kulturnoj baštini otoka Lastova«. *Mogućnosti* 24/5 (1977): pp. 598-603; Igor Fisković, »Antica Lastovac, Frano (Franciscus Lagustinus)«. *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* 1 (1983): p. 175; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 555-556. Frano's sons, Frano (b. c. 1585), Antun (b. c. 1595) and Gaudencije (b. c. 1600) moved to Krakow where they took up their father's craft. Preserved is a drawing of the cannon made by Frano Antica in 1624 for Ferdinand Gonzaga Myszkowski with an inscription FRANCISCVS LAGUSTINVS. In 1631 a Venetian Andrea dell'Acqua gave him credit for the development of gunnery in Poland. See: Giuseppe Praga, »Di alcuni fonditori Dalmati dei secoli XVI-XVII«. *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia* 29 (1940): pp. 163-172; L. Beritić, »Frano Antica Lastovac«: pp. 87-90; L. Beritić, *Dubrovačka artiljerija*: pp. 88, 159-160; C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 137; S. Szymanski, »O Lastovcima ljevačima topova i zvona u Poljskoj«. *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 20 (1975): pp. 119-133; Igor Fisković, »Antica Lastovac, Frano ml. (Franciscus Lagustinus)«. *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* 1 (1983): p. 175; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 556.

³⁹ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 282; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 114.

⁴⁰ Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: pp. 115, 117, 131; A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 35-36, 77-79; M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: pp. 263-266; Stjepan Antoljak, *Bune pučana i seljaka u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb, 1956: pp. 51-53; Trpimir Macan, »Antica Pasko (Paško Antunović, d'Antizza)«. *Hrvatski biografski leksikon* 1 (1983): p. 175; R. Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika*: pp. 20-21, 39; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: pp. 63-65; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 116-119, 557-558. The secondary sources have 21 July 1604 as his date of death but, judging by the will of his cleric son, Kolenda, 6 July is more probable (*Test. La.*, vol. 7, f. 143).

⁴¹ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 117-118.

the house of his descendants in Laze was torn down (ground plan is still visible), and the ground sterilised with salt. In 1606, priest Bonino Jeronimov took action against Antonija, widow and heir of the rebel leader Pasko Antica, demanding compensation for the damage suffered in the period of the Venetian rule over Lastovo, during which Pasko Antica unlawfully claimed the benefices of the parish of St John.⁴² Pasko married Antonija, daughter of Ivan Rešić (of the Rehojević). He had four sons and three daughters. One of the sons, Ivan-Antun, took part in the unsuccessful rebellion of 1652, after which he fled and never returned from exile.⁴³

6. Lukša Antičin /**SIRAČIĆ-SENKOVIĆ-VITKOVIĆ**/ **ANTICA** (b. c. 1530), elder (half) brother of Pasko Antica (no. 5), progenitor of the branch nicknamed Burluk. In 1585 mason Luka Nikolin was commissioned to construct his family house,⁴⁴ and that was probably when Lukša moved out of his parents' household in Grmica and settled on the new location in Pećnica. He married Mara, daughter of Ivan Cvjetanović (of the Jurinić family). His son Vitko was also one of the rebellion leaders (no. 7). The date of Lukša's death is obscure, yet his wife's will, dated 25 June 1614, provides evidence on his presence on the island.⁴⁵
7. Vitko Lukšin /**SIRAČIĆ-SENKOVIĆ-VITKOVIĆ**/ **ANTICA** (c. 1560-1643), nicknamed Burluk, son of Lukša Antica and Mara, daughter of Ivan Cvjetanović (of the Jurinić family). Nephew of Pasko Antica (no. 5). He had four sisters: Marta, Slava, Marija and Anica, wife of Antun Ivanov Voić (of the Uvetić), brother of the rebel Luka Voić (no. 23). Vitko married Lucija, daughter of Frano Trkalović, and had a son, Luka, and a daughter, Marija, who married the rebel Antun Ivanov Šantulović (no. 29). His will was drafted on 6 August 1643.⁴⁶
8. Pasko Marinov /**LUKŠIĆ**/ **PASKVIĆ** (b. c. 1545- d. c. 1627), son of Marin Paskvić and Stoja, and nephew of priest Frano Lukšin Paskvić (no. 2). Born into Lukšić noble family, and progenitor of the branch

⁴² M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 266; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 125.

⁴³ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 268.

⁴⁴ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 125.

⁴⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 172-175.

⁴⁶ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 104v-106v.

which, from the end of the seventeenth century, bore the surname Paskvalović, and from the latter half of the eighteenth century an Italian form—Pasquali. One of the rebel leaders in 1602,⁴⁷ councillor in 1618.⁴⁸ He had a brother, Frano, and five sisters: Đivana, Slava, Antuna, Mara and Pera. Pasko's first wife, Lucija, niece and sister of the leading agitators Marin Stjepanov Čikut (no. 1), priest Marin Bartulov Grdobić (no. 3) and Antić Bartulov Grdobić (no. 4), died around 1599, before the rebellion.⁴⁹ Frano remarried, his second wife being known only by her first name, Marta. In 1626 he bequeathed his entire estate to his son Mato, instructing him to help his brother, priest Mansueto,⁵⁰ should there be need.⁵¹ Paulina, one of Pasko's daughters, became wife of the rebel Luka Voić (no. 23).

9. Ivan Mariničin /**SIRAČIĆ-SENKOVIĆ-VITKOVIĆ/ MARINICA** (around 1540-1606), son of Marinica Ivanov Vitković (patronymic Marinica being derived from his name) and Franka, daughter of Cvjetan Bogetić (of the Rehojević family). Descendant of the Siračić noble family. First cousin of Pasko Antica (no. 5). Apart from sister Marija, he had two brothers, Luka and priest Ivan, both of whom died before the rebellion, and a half-brother Ivan-Andrija (Đanandrija). The rebel Ivan Lučin Marinica (no. 28) is his nephew. He married Draža, daughter of Vitko Cvjetanović (of the Jurinić family). He had no children. His will is dated 16 February 1606.⁵²
10. Matija Marinov **ANUHLIĆ** (c. 1565-1634), member of the Anuhlić nobility.⁵³ Nephew of priest Franko Matov Anuhlić (around 1535-around 1592), thus the identification "Dumfrankov". He had a brother, Kolenda. First cousin of Mara Kolendina Anuhlić, wife of Maroje Bartulov

⁴⁷ A. Vučetić, »Dubrovčani na obrani svog teritorija«: p. 86; *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: pp. 35-36.

⁴⁸ *Knjiga o uredbama i običajima skupštine i občine otoka Lastova*: p. 126.

⁴⁹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 8rv.

⁵⁰ On the Franciscan friar Mansueto (c. 1585-1653) see: Bonaventura Rode, *Necrologium fratrum minorum de observantia provinciae S. Francisci Ragusii*. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi) prope Florentiam, 1914: p. 47.

⁵¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 259-260.

⁵² *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 88v-90.

⁵³ The family was named after Anuhla, wife of Franko Marinović, her will being drafted on 13 April 1517 (*Test. La.*, vol. 2, ff. 79v-80). The Anuhlić family died out in 1868.

Grdobić, who was brother of the two leaders, priest Marin (no. 3) and Antić (no. 4). Matija did not marry. After the rebellion, he lived on Lastovo, where he died in January 1634.⁵⁴

Each of the ten ringleaders listed above was either a member of the nobility or closely tied to it: Vitko Antica was the son of Lukša Antica. Lukša and Pasko Antica were brothers. Both of them were Frano Paskvić's nephews. Frano Paskvić was Pasko Paskvić's uncle. Ivan Marinica was the first cousin of Lukša and Pasko Antica. Antić and Marin Grdobić were brothers. Antić's wife was the sister of Marin Čikut, while Marin's wife was the niece of Ivan Marinica. Matija Anuhlić (Dumfrankov) was related to the Grdobić brothers (Diagram 1). The leaders, thus, came from the marriage-tied noble families of Desislavić (Čikut), Siračić (Antica and Marinica), Lukšić (Paskvić), Veramentić (Grdobić) and Anuhlić. Among the ringleaders was a dismissed chancellor (priest Marin Stjepanov Čikut), but also his successor to the post (Pasko Antica). It is clear that the rebellion proceeded under the leadership of a clan well established in the local hierarchy.

The rebel supporters

11. Ilija Paskov /**LUKŠIĆ-PASKVIĆ-PRHUN**/ **ŠKRATULJIĆ** (b. c. 1570), son of Pasko Škratuljić and Mara, daughter of Mato Anuhlić. Descendant of the Lukšić nobility, Paskvić branch, Prhun or Škratuljić subbranch.⁵⁵ Related to the rebel leaders. His great-grandmother Bijela Čikut, aunt of don Marin Stjepanov Čikut (no. 1), and great aunt of don Marin Bartulov Grdobić (no. 3) and Antić Bartulov Grdobić (no. 4). His great-grandfather Živko Paskvić was the brother of Marin Paskvić, grandfather of Frano Paskvić (no. 2). Matrilineally closely related to Matija Dumfrankov (no. 10). His mother Mara and Matija's father Franko were brother and sister, offspring of Mato Anuhlić. Ilija had three brothers (Matija, Frano and Marin) and two sisters (Pera and Toma). He never married. Date of his death unknown. He has been located on the island after the rebellion. His father Pasko mentions him in his will of

⁵⁴ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 290v-292.

⁵⁵ His father Paskoje was the first to be recorded with the surname (*Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 127-128v).

16 February 1604,⁵⁶ as well as his brother Matija Škratuljić who bequeathed to him on 4 April 1611 half of the house inherited from the late Pera Prhunova.⁵⁷

12. Antun Đurov/**GALČIĆ-BUDISLAVIĆ/ALETIĆ** (b. c. 1580), descendant of the Galčić noble family, Budislavić branch, Aletić subbranch.⁵⁸ His father, Đuro Antunov Aletić, was a Lastovo councillor in 1618.⁵⁹ Antun had a brother, Marin. He married after the rebellion, the identity of his wife being unknown. He had three sons: Đuro, Frano and Ivan.
13. Cvjetiša Đivanov **CVJETIŠA** (c. 1575-1642), progenitor of a non-noble Cvjetiša family. In 1600 he was mentioned in the will of Marin Ivanov Marković,⁶⁰ but also in 1611 as a witness to the will of Marin Živkov Svirić.⁶¹ Son-in-law and successor of Bogdan Žilić.⁶² He left a will dated 28 July 1642. His wife Mara and son Antun were his beneficiaries.⁶³
14. Lukša Marinov/**TOLOSEVIĆ-ŠIRUNIĆ-MIAČIĆ/FRNJIZ** (c. 1580-1642), son of Marin Frnjiz and Kata. Descendant of the Tolosević noble family, Frnjiz branch.⁶⁴ There is reason to believe that he was an only

⁵⁶ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 56v-57v.

⁵⁷ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 125v-126v.

⁵⁸ The first mention of the Galčić on Lastovo dates from the first quarter of the fourteenth century. Bogdan Galčić was mentioned as witness in 1326 (G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: p. 18, no. 11); in 1317, his son Marin, but with no family name, was indicated as witness and owner of the neighbouring property (G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: p. 16, no. 3; J. Lučić, »Miscellanea saeculi XIV ex Archivio Ragusii (Dubrovnik). Lastovo, I. dio.« *Arhivski vjesnik* 17-18 (1974-1975): p. 73). Bogdan Marinić was one of the twenty councillors elected to life-term office when the Lastovo Council was closed in 1367 (*Lastovski statut*, chapter XLIX). Budislav (Buden) Marinić Galčić is progenitor of the Budislavić branch. He is mentioned in 1347 (G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: p. 34, no. 50). He was a judge when, in 1375, a decree on the theft of livestock was issued (*Lastovski statut*, chapter L). Progenitor of the Aletić is Franko Marinov Budislavić, Antun's great-grandfather.

⁵⁹ *Knjiga o uredbama i običajima skupštine i občine otoka Lastova*: p.126.

⁶⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 10-11.

⁶¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 130-131.

⁶² *Genealogije Lastovaca*, a copy by don Antun Dundović (Parish Archives of Lastovo, hereafter cited as: *Dundović*), genealogy 10.

⁶³ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, f. 91rv.

⁶⁴ Vlada Tolosević is mentioned as a landowner in Prgovo in 1334 (G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: p. 30, no. 40). The family later branched out into the Širunić, Škaljković, Miačić, Frnjiz and Diodati. Lukša's father, Marin Lukšin Miačić, was the first to bear the surname Frnjiz (*Dundović*, genealogy 30). By family tradition, Marin Frnjiz sought political asylum on Lastovo. The family legend proved false.

child. Mentioned as a member of the carnival company of Marin Bošković in 1597.⁶⁵ After the rebellion he married Marta, with whom he had two sons and two daughters. His will was drafted on 20 January 1642.⁶⁶

15. Ilija Antunov /**ČUKOVIĆ**/ **KUČIČIĆ** (c. 1555-1639), son of Antun Kučičić and Marija Dragomilović (of the Siračić family). Member of the non-noble Čuković family, Kučičić branch.⁶⁷ His father died before 1581 and his mother a year before the rebellion. He had a brother, Ivan. Member of the carnival company of Marin Bošković in 1597.⁶⁸ Married and had two sons. Mentioned after the rebellion as an executor of the will of Luka Ivanov Reša in 1613.⁶⁹ He drafted a will on 19 February 1639.⁷⁰ His descendants bear the surname Čengija.
16. Marin Pavlov **LAZAROVIĆ** (b. c. 1565), son of Pavle Lazarović and Marna. Descendant of a non-noble family, probably outsiders, their family background being obscure. In 1586, in the probate procedure following the death of his mother, Marin was confirmed as the only successor.⁷¹ There is no evidence on him after the rebellion.
17. Marin Jakobov /**KRAGULJEVIĆ**/ **JAKOBAC** (b. c. 1565- d. c. 1624), son of Jakov Kraguljević and Marija Bensajević. Descendant of the Kraguljević noble family, nicknamed Jakobac.⁷² His father died in 1600,⁷³ and his mother shortly after the rebellion, in 1603.⁷⁴ He had a sister, Kata. Before the rebellion he married Kata, daughter of Maroje Šoljatić, whose brother Antun was also a rebellion supporter (no. 18). With Kata Marin had two sons and three daughters, while after the rebellion he remarried, and with his second wife Mara he had a daughter. His will is dated 22 January 1624.⁷⁵

⁶⁵ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 105, note 412.

⁶⁶ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 87v-88v.

⁶⁷ Hranija, wife of Bodgan Čuković, drafted a will on 23 March 1414 (*Test. La.*, vol. 1, f. 31v). The family later grew through the branches Kučičić and Čengija.

⁶⁸ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: n. 105, note 412.

⁶⁹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 136v-137v.

⁷⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 63v-66v.

⁷¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 5, f. 142rv.

⁷² Desoje Kraguljević witnessed the will of Prva, wife of Marin Kunzul in 1372 (*Test. La.*, vol. 1, f. 1).

⁷³ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 9v-10.

⁷⁴ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 53rv.

⁷⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 265.

18. Antun Marojević **ŠOLJATOVIĆ** (c. 1575-1627), son of Maroje Šoljatović and Slava, of non-noble birth.⁷⁶ He had a brother, Ivan, whom he succeeded in 1618,⁷⁷ and also three sisters—Antuna, Jakna and Kata, married to the rebel Marin Jakobov Kraguljević (no. 17). Antun married after the rebellion. He left a will dated 22 February 1627.⁷⁸
19. Marin Ivanov **GRANIČIĆ-FAFURINOVIĆ** (c. 1576-1656), son of Ivan Graničić-Fafurinović and Marija, of non-noble birth.⁷⁹ He had a brother Luka and a sister Franka, wife of the rebel Ivan Lučić Lucijanović (no. 30). Member of the carnival company of Marin Bošković in 1597.⁸⁰ Shortly before the rebellion, he married Antuna, daughter of Dražina Dražinić, with whom he had two sons and a daughter. He died on 3 October 1656.⁸¹ Seven days upon his death probate procedure was held on the basis of his nuncupative will.⁸²
20. Kuzma Živićev /**ŠETIĆ/ ŽIVICEVIĆ** (c. 1585-1624), son of Živić Šetić and Marna. Descendant of a non-noble Šetić family.⁸³ According to Živić's will of 21 November 1608, the sole heir to his father.⁸⁴ After the rebellion he married Marija, with whom he had two sons and a daughter. He drafted a will on 5 January 1624.⁸⁵
21. Tonko (Antun) Lučin **TOMAŠINOVIĆ** (b. c. 1580), of non-noble birth.⁸⁶

⁷⁶ The oldest evidence on the Šoljatović is the will of Mara Cubrijanović, widow of Paskoje Marojević (Šoljatović), dated 7 January 1570 (*Test. La.*, vol. 5, f. 56v-57).

⁷⁷ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 181-182.

⁷⁸ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 266rv.

⁷⁹ His grandfather Radovan Granica witnessed the will of Kuzma Radovanović Palirić in 1503 (*Test. La.*, vol. 2, ff. 28v-29). His grandfather Marin was nicknamed Fafurin. The Graničić family died out in the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

⁸⁰ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 105, note 412.

⁸¹ Lastovo parish register of deaths (1651-1747), hereafter cited as: *LalM* (Lastovo Parish Archives).

⁸² *Test. La.*, vol. 8, ff. 38-39.

⁸³ Progenitor of the Šetić is Nikša (b. c. 1415). Both genealogy copies from the *Lastovo Statute* cite their surname as Vetić (*Dundović*, genealogy XVI; *Genealogije Lastovaca*, a copy by don Niko Antunov Kurelja of Lastovo, priest of the Slano parish, from the manuscript of the Lastovo Statute, transcribed in September 1894, IV/31, Bogišić Library in Cavtat, genealogy XVI). In the sources, however, Šetić is the only form I have been able to trace. The family later branched into the Živićević, towards Živić Živilov Šetić (c. 1520-1608), Kuzma's father. The family died out in 1702.

⁸⁴ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 101rv.

⁸⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 243v-244v.

⁸⁶ In 1509 there is mention of an estate in Pržina, the owner of which was Tomašin Marinović (*Test. La.*, vol. 2, ff. 9v-10v). The patronymic was derived from his name in the sixteenth century.

He had a brother, Kuzma, who was a cleric, and sisters Anica and Jakovica. He married Kata, daughter of Ivan Šantulović and sister of Antun (no. 29). Their son and two daughters were born after the rebellion. Date of his death is unknown.

22. Ivan Kolendin/**DESLAVIĆ-PRIMILIĆ/MARIĆEVIĆ-KOLAJIĆ** (b. c. 1575), son of Kolenda Marićević-Kolajić and Pera, daughter of Dragoš Ostojić (of the Jurinić family). Descendant of the Desislavić noble family, Primilić branch, Marićević subbranch, nicknamed Kolajić.⁸⁷ He had two brothers, Kuzma and Luka, as well as a sister, Agata. Nephew of the translator and cleric Đanko Kuzmić (c. 1560-1638).⁸⁸ His fate after the rebellion is obscure.
23. Luka Ivanov /**UVETIĆ-PAVLOVIĆ/ VOIĆ** (c. 1567-1657), son of Ivan Voić and Lucija, daughter of Prvoš Jurinić. Descendant of the Uvetić nobility, Pavlović branch, Voić subbranch.⁸⁹ Among other things, his mother bequeathed to him a house in Smokvica on the Island of Korčula.⁹⁰

⁸⁷ The surname Marićević is a patronymic derived from the name of Ivan's great-great-grandfather Marić Vitkov Primilić, whose will was drafted on 27 February 1553 (*Test. La.*, vol. 4, ff. 49v-51). The nickname Kolajić is derived from Kolenda, the name of Ivan's father.

⁸⁸ Sebastiano Dolci, *Fasti litterario-Ragusini*. Venetiis: Gaspar Storti, 1767; reprint and translation with commentary by Pavlo Knezović. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001: pp. 34, 117, 214-215, notes 737-739; Seraphinus Maria Cerva, *Bibliotheca Ragusina*, vol. II, ed. Stjepan Kراسić. Zagreb: JAZU, 1977: p. 178; C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 135; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: pp. 305, 366-367; *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 24-30v.

⁸⁹ On 16 December 1349, Dragoslav Uvetić, as an executor of the will of Druž Milošević, sold his property to Dekoje Stačić of Korčula, with residence on Lastovo (G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: p. 39, no. 66; Čremošnik misinterprets this surname as Vujetić). His father, Dragislav Stojković, was among the twenty councillors elected to hold office for life in 1367 (*Lastovski statut*, chapter XLIX). The family later branched out into the Pavlović and Voić. Antun Ivanov Pavlović (c. 1610-1670), participant in the unsuccessful uprising in 1652 (M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 268), died in exile in 1670. On 20 July 1668, his sons had beaten up Mato Zanetti from Korčula, born in Dubrovnik. Sigismund Tudisi, Lastovo count, informed the Ragusan government of this ominous incident, which, as he saw it, could at any moment develop into a large-scale revolt. He added that the Pavlović brothers, two of whom were clerics, also threatened to kill the parish priest Vido Diodati. Apparently, their father was behind the assault (Radovan Samardžić, *Borba Dubrovnika za opstanak posle velikog zemljotresa 1667 g.* [Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, III.19]. Beograd: SAN, 1960: pp. 346-347). The ruffians were Ivan (c. 1641-1678), priest Josip (c. 1645-1678), Pavle (c. 1646-1691), Marin-Marije (c. 1650-1680) and Bartul (1652-1719). The Voić branch descends from the rebel's father, Ivan Marjanov Pavlović, while the surname Voić is probably derived from the name Prvoš (Prvoje), after his grandfather on the mother's side, Prvoš Jurinić, whose estate he inherited. The Voić branch died out in 1796.

⁹⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 140v-142.

Luka had two brothers, Marin and Antun, the latter being married to Anica Antica, sister of the rebel Vitko (no. 7), as well as a sister, Kata, wife of Nikola Kureljčić. Luka married Paulina, daughter of one of the revolt leaders, Pasko Marinov Paskvić (no. 8), with whom he had three daughters. He left a will dated 23 December 1655, and died in the early March of 1657.⁹¹

24. Luka Ivanov /**REHOJEVIĆ**/ **REŠIĆ** (c. 1565-1613), of the Rehojević noble family.⁹² He had a sister, Slava. Luka married Toma, with whom he had three sons and three daughters. His last will was drafted on 9 March 1613.⁹³
25. Petar Ilijin **PERIĆ** (b. c. 1550), of non-noble descent.⁹⁴ He had a brother, Antun, and two sisters: Margeta, wife of Kolenda Vitežević, and Slava.⁹⁵ His fate after the rebellion is obscure.
26. Frano Viceljini **MASAROVIĆ-VICELJIĆ** (c. 1580-1622), son of Vicelja Masarović (progenitor of the Viceljčić branch) and Margeta, daughter of Juraj Tomašinović. Descendant of the non-noble Masarović family.⁹⁶ He remained on Lastovo after the rebellion. In 1610 he was witness and executor of the will of blacksmith Stjepan Karaguzov.⁹⁷ He had two brothers, Marko and Kuzma, who also joined the rebels (no. 27), as well as four sisters: Nikoleta, married to Marin Ivanov Lucijanović, Jakna, Margeta and Franka. He married after the rebellion. In his will, dated 9 July 1621, he made successors his wife Slava, sons Boško and Marin, and daughter Marija. He probably died at the beginning of 1622.⁹⁸

⁹¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 8, ff. 52v-55.

⁹² On 17 December 1285, Rehoje Draživojev, progenitor, took action against Milgost Desijin, demanding compensation for a cow stolen on Lastovo by some men from Korčula, in whose company the said Milgost was seen. Upon the closing of the Council in 1367, among the twenty councillors elected for life were two of Rehoje's descendants: son Stjepko Rehojević and grandson Stanko Bratošević (*Lastovski statut*, chapter XLIX). The family later developed through the branches Rešić, Bogetić, Radostić, Talintić, Cvjetković, Papić and Domić.

⁹³ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 136v-137v.

⁹⁴ Luka Ivanov Perić drew his will on 2 February 1544. His heirs were wife Slava, and sons Ivan and Antun. In the will Ivan also mentions his mother Brata and brother Ilija (*Test. La.*, vol. 3, f. 122v). The Perić family died out by the end of the seventeenth century.

⁹⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 5, f. 167rv.

⁹⁶ Progenitor of the Masarović is Bogdan Radovanović (b. c. 1425) (*Dundović*, genealogy 5). The family later branched out into the Šarbotanović and Viceljčić.

⁹⁷ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 121-122.

⁹⁸ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 207rv.

27. Kuzma Vicelj in **MASAROVIĆ-VICELJIĆ** (c. 1575-1627), nicknamed Kvilin, elder brother of the rebel Frano (no. 26). He married after the rebellion. His will is dated 15 March 1627.⁹⁹
28. Ivan Lučin /**SIRAČIĆ-SENKOVIĆ-VITKOVIĆ/ MARINICA** (c. 1584-1659), nephew of Ivan Mariničin Marinica, one of the revolt leaders (no. 9). He had two brothers, Marin and Antun, married to Slava, sister of the cleric Marin (ringleader no. 3) and Antić Grdobić (no. 4), and two sisters: Franka, wife of Stjepan Lukin Toljenović, and Anica. After the rebellion in 1606, he and Marin Lukin Bošković pleaded for pardon before the Ragusan Minor Council on behalf of the whole community of Lastovo.¹⁰⁰ He married Elizabet, daughter of Frano Anuhlić, most likely after the rebellion. He had two daughters. His will is dated 9 August 1659.¹⁰¹
29. Antun Ivanov /**KRIVATOVIĆ/ ŠANTULOVIĆ** (b. c. 1580-d. c. 1622), son of Ivan Šantulović and Maruša. Descendant of the Krivatović noble family, Šantulović branch.¹⁰² He had two brothers, Cvijeto and Kolenda, and sister Kata, wife of Antun Lukin Tomašin. He married Marija, daughter of Vitko Antica, one of the rebel leaders (no. 7). He had two daughters and a son, Ivan, a priest who took part in the unsuccessful rebellion of 1652, after which he was forced to flee.¹⁰³ By tradition, his house was demolished and the ground sterilised with salt.¹⁰⁴ Antun's will is dated 15 September 1622.¹⁰⁵
30. Ivan Lučin /**ŠAPETIĆ/ LUCIJANOVIĆ** (b. c. 1550-d. c. 1626), son of Luka Lucijanović and Toma. Descendant of the Šapetić nobility, Lucijanović branch.¹⁰⁶ Had no brothers, only a sister, Mara. Member of

⁹⁹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 261rv.

¹⁰⁰ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 266; J. Lučić, »Prošlost otoka Lastova u doba Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 69; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 124.

¹⁰¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 8, ff. 77-79.

¹⁰² The Krivatović family can be traced from the fifteenth century (*Dundović*, genealogy 13), and later developed into the Šantulović and Žilić branch. The first Šantulović was Antun's grandfather Antun Ivanov Krivatović (b. c. 1530). The Šantulović branch, sometimes known in the Italian forms of Sciantoli or Santolo, died out in 1749, the successor being Lekšić (later Lešić-Šantulović).

¹⁰³ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 268.

¹⁰⁴ The house stood opposite today's residence of the Lešić-Šantulović.

¹⁰⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, f. 231.

¹⁰⁶ Radovan Đivanović Šapetić is mentioned in a purchase contract in 1478 (*Dundović*, genealogy 9). The family later developed as the Lucijanović, Karlović and Kvinta. The Lucijanović branch derived its name from Lucijan Radovanović (c. 1465-1534), Ivan's great-grandfather.

Marin Bošković's carnival company in 1597,¹⁰⁷ and councillor in 1618.¹⁰⁸ Married Franka, daughter of Ivan Graničić and sister of the rebel Marin (no. 19). He had a son and two daughters. He provided his daughter Lucija, who married Ivan Brain, with a dowry consisting of 9 sheep and goats, as evidenced in her will of 16 May 1608.¹⁰⁹ He left a will dated 11 April 1626.¹¹⁰

31. Ivan Antunov **PERIĆ** (c. 1575-1624), yet another descendant of the already mentioned non-noble family. His father, Antun Lukin Perić, was the first cousin of the rebel Petar Ilijin Perić (no. 25). Ivan had four sisters—Kata, Jakna, Pera, and Mara—whom, according to their father's will of 13 December 1610, he had to provide with dowry.¹¹¹ He married Marija after the rebellion and had two sons. He drafted a will on 23 September 1624.¹¹²
32. Marin Đivojev /**KRAGULJEVIĆ/ĐIVOJEVIĆ** (b. c. 1565-d. c. 1633), son of Đivoje Kraguljević and Pera. Descendant of the Kraguljević noble family, Đivojević (later Đivoje) branch. Had a brother, Jakov. Before the rebellion Marin married Mara, daughter of Marin Vlahojević (of the Desislavić) and had a son, Đivoje. He left a will dated 14 June 1632.¹¹³
33. Jakov Marinov **BIROVIĆ** (c. 1565-1608), son of Marin Birović and Antonija Jakovljeva Masarović, first cousin of the rebel Bogdan Kolendin Masarović (no. 35). Of non-noble descent.¹¹⁴ He had two brothers, Matija and Jerić. He married Margarita, but had no children. His will is dated 2 April 1608.¹¹⁵
34. Antun Marinov **VASILJEVIĆ** (b. c. 1570), son of Marin Vasiljević and Draža. Of non-noble descent.¹¹⁶ He had two brothers, Frano and Dominik,

¹⁰⁷ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici.«: p. 105, note 412.

¹⁰⁸ »Knjiga o uredbama i običajima skupštine i občine otoka Lastova«: p. 126.

¹⁰⁹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 115-116v.

¹¹⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 125v-126.

¹¹¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 123v-124v.

¹¹² *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 244v-245.

¹¹³ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 289v.

¹¹⁴ Jakov's uncle, Tomko Kristićev Birović, left a will dated 9 March 1589 (*Test. La.*, vol. 5, ff. 173v-174). The family later branched out into the Jerićević and Trojković.

¹¹⁵ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 93v-94v.

¹¹⁶ The progenitor of the Vasiljević family has not been established. The oldest known member, Jun Nikolić, witnessed the will of Vidoš Dražojević in 1401 (*Test. La.*, vol. 1, f. 18). Dražić Žunjević, Antun's great-great-grandfather, was delegated to Dubrovnik in 1472 to resolve the issue of the communal overseer (*Lastovski statut*, chapter LXXIX). The Vasiljević later developed as Šagor.

and two sisters, Marna and Lucija. Registered as a member of Marin Bošković's carnival company in 1597.¹¹⁷ Marin Matijašev Bratić bequeathed a house in Grmica to him in 1611.¹¹⁸ He married Anica after the rebellion, and had two sons and a daughter. The date of his death is unknown.

35. Bogdan Kolendin /**MASAROVIĆ/ ŠARBOTANOVIĆ** (c. 1565-1638), son of Kolenda Šarbotanović. Descendant of the non-noble Masarović family, Šarbotanović branch. His name has been traced on one of the old gravestones in the yard of St Mary's Church in Polje.¹¹⁹ He had three brothers, Frano, Lukša and Marin, and a sister, Marija. He married shortly before the rebellion and had three sons: Kolenda, cleric Antun and Marin. His will is dated 2 March 1630.¹²⁰
36. Petar Antunov **PRCELJEVIĆ** (b. c. 1580), descendant of a non-noble family we know little about. His piece of land in Potsuhačje, Prgovo, is mentioned in a will of blacksmith Stjepan Karaguzov of 1610.¹²¹ Petar was married, but there is no evidence on his wife's name or the date of his death. His daughter, Antonija (c. 1625-1679), was the family's last issue.

Four out of the eleven supporters from the nobility rank were closely related to the ringleaders (Ilija Paskov Škratuljić, Luka Ivanov Voić, Ivan Lučin Marinica, Antun Ivanov Šantulović), or, like Ivan Kolendin Marićević of the Desislavić, came from one of the rebel families. No kinship ties with the leaders have been established for the remaining six noblemen (Antun Đurov Aletić, Lukša Marinov Frnjiz, Marin Jakobov Jakobac, Luka Ivanov Rešić, Ivan Lučin Lucijanović, and Marin Đivojev Đivojević), thus their families (Galčić, Tolosević, Kraguljević, Rehojević and Šapetić) pertain to a broader rebel circle.

¹¹⁷ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 105, note 412.

¹¹⁸ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 128v-129.

¹¹⁹ C. Fisković, »Lastovski spomenici«: p. 73:

BOGDAN. DI. COLDA
MASA ROVICH
REDE DE DE BOGDAN.

¹²⁰ *Test. La.*, vol. 7, ff. 47-49.

¹²¹ *Test. La.*, vol. 6, ff. 121-122.

None of the fifteen non-nobles (Cvjetiša Đivanov Cvjetiša, Ilija Antunov Kučićić, Marin Pavlov Lazarović, Antun Marojević Šoljatović, Marin Ivanov Graničić-Fafurinović, Kuzma Živićev Živićević, Tonko Lučin Tomašinović, Petar Ilijin Perić, brothers Frano and Kuzma Viceljini Masarović-Viceljjić, Ivan Antunov Perić, Jakov Marinov Birović, Antun Marinov Vasiljević, Bogdan Kolendin Šarbotanović and Petar Antunov Prceljjević) were in any way related to the rebel leaders. The link should be sought in some form of existential interdependence.

The loyalists

When the Ragusans crushed the rebellion and restored the sovereignty on the island on 13 July, Lastovo castle, as described by Šime Ljubić, “was then manned by 60 soldiers and 25 men of Lastovo who sided with Dubrovnik and openly resented the idea of revolt”.¹²²

In 1606 don Bonino Jeronimov took action against Antonija, widow and heiress of the rebel leader Pasko Antica, demanding compensation for Pasko’s unlawful claim of the benefices of St John during Venetian occupation.¹²³ Don Bonino Jeronimov was a descendant of the Dobrićević nobility. Dobrić Dobrićević (Boninus de Boninis), the famous printer, was his great-grandfather’s brother. The fact that Bonino was against the rebel clan seemed to be a perfect excuse for Pasko Antica to appropriate his revenues.

In 1606 a non-noble Luka Siketić took action against a nobleman Kuzma Toljenović, judge during the Venetian rule over the island, by whose order Luka was deprived of the financial assets on account of his pro-Ragusan position during the rebellion, and the money used for the reconstruction of the castle. Toljenović was to compensate the damage.¹²⁴ It is interesting to note that Kuzma Toljenović was not among the rebels, but being a judge during the rising, he too was probably conforming to the rebels’ political terror.

These examples prove that the islanders’ solidarity in their cause was questionable, and so was Šime Ljubić’s Romantic assessment of “the most

¹²² Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 115.

¹²³ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 266; T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 125.

¹²⁴ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 266.

distinguished fifty islanders”,¹²⁵ a statement readily adopted by Vinko Foretić himself.¹²⁶

We owe the identity of the Lastovo rebels to the documents on death sentences passed upon them, but “the twenty-five Lastovo men” who “sided with the Ragusans” were not tried and thus remained anonymous. Apart from a few exceptions, the attitude of the loyalists remains obscure, since there is no primary evidence to support it. Yet, lack of evidence speaks for itself.

Thus among the rebels we were unable to trace a nobleman from the families who entered the Council after its closing in 1367: Dobrićević,¹²⁷ Dragošević¹²⁸ and Gišljić (at the time of the rebellion lived under the surnames Bižajić and Čalić).¹²⁹ It indicates that they probably remained loyal to Dubrovnik rule. Besides the already mentioned don Bonino Jeronimov (Dobrićević), who was unlawfully deprived of the benefices of St John by one of the rebels, his brother Juraj has been traced in 1602 as one of the representatives of the Lastovo community responsible for the administration of the rebels’ confiscated property.¹³⁰

Among the noble families who decided not to side with the rebels were the Dobrojević (at the time of the rebellion bore the surname Draganović), Jurišić, Kunzulić (Ostojić during the uprising), Mirković (Dražinić and Arkašević during the rebellion), Stanić (Šipotić at the time)¹³¹, Lučić (Toljenović and Fulmiz at the time) and Trkalović. The revolt was not supported by some

¹²⁵ Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 114.

¹²⁶ V. Foretić, *Povijest Dubrovnika do 1808.*, vol. II: p. 81.

¹²⁷ The family descends from Miloš Dragoslavić (b. c. 1350-d. c. 1395), of unknown origin, who married the daughter of Dobroslav Usinić (Desislavić) and thus settled on Lastovo in 1380. Miloš died before his father-in-law (his will is dated 15 October 1395, *Test. La.*, vol. 1, f. 5), and Usinić’s estate was inherited in 1409 by his grandson Dobrić (*Test. La.*, vol. 1, ff. 24v-25), the patronymic Dobrićević being derived from his name. It is assumed that the Dobrićević filtered into the noble circle at the end of the fifteenth or the beginning of the sixteenth century, probably on account of the reputation earned by one of their members—Dobrić Dobrićević, famous incunabula printer.

¹²⁸ Dragoš Živanović, progenitor of the Dragošević, entered the Council of Twenty in 1483, on account of the “merits and loyal service to the Ragusan government”. This nomination met with the community’s strong disapproval (*Lastovski statut*, chapters LXXXVIII and XCIII).

¹²⁹ The Gišljić were actually of old noble descent, but for some unknown reason (probably genealogical discontinuity due to no male issue) lost their status and managed to restore it with the support of Dubrovnik in 1492.

¹³⁰ *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. III/1: p. 38.

¹³¹ The family was later known under the surname Ivelja.

branches of the noble clans involved in the conspiracy: Vlahojević and Sokolić (branches of the Desislavić), Čučević (Siračić branch), Sangalet (Galčić branch), Žilić (Krivatović branch), Grzelinović, Despotović and Fantela (Lukšić branch), Bogetić and Cvjetković (Rehojević branch), Karlović and Kvinta (Šapetić branch), Širunić, Škaljković and Diodati (Tolosević branch), Pavlović (Uvetić branch), and Skvrake (branch of the Veramentić noble family).

Apart from the earlier mentioned Siketić non-nobles, their loyalty to Dubrovnik being documented, of the same class status and political position were, most likely, the members of the following families: Babić, Bensajević (surnamed Šudre during the revolt), Binčola, Braić, Brajko, Bratić, Carević (Šutić at the time), Čikatić, Fanfalija, Glavočević (known as Korčulanović), Gojačić,¹³² Grijalović, Grubišić (Grubišić and Kureljčić), Ivanković,¹³³ Jurinić (during the rebellion known as Ivićević, Hropić, Cvjetanović, Ostojić, Barbić and Dundović), Kacetić (with the Rusjen branch), Kaškić, Kokošičić,¹³⁴ Kvačić, Lekšić,¹³⁵ Lodić, Ljaljić, Mikuš, Minčić, Murgić, Nikolić, Parapunja,¹³⁶ Patić (with the Glumac branch), Pirilović, Placarić, Ribica, Sandaljić, Siruga (known as Siraković, Kvestić and Kališa during the rebellion), Šarić and Vitežević (Minčinović and Čobanović during the unrest).

The social climate before the rebellion

The fact that Lastovo became part of the Dubrovnik state in the second half of the thirteenth century failed to interfere with the island's social and administrative continuity. A single and random piece of information concerning Lastovo's *župan* is more than indicative. Namely, in 1285 Bogdan, son of *župan* Desislav, was tried for having grabbed by the throat and raped Dobra, a local girl. Grdomil Siračić, defence witness, most likely perjured himself.¹³⁷ The court's ruling in this case did not conform to a custom described in Chapter XV of the Lastovo Statute of 1310, by which "all the property owned by a person committing rape is to be bestowed upon a raped girl and the rapist

¹³² The family was later known under the surname Čihoratić.

¹³³ The family was later known under the surname Grgurević.

¹³⁴ The family was later known under the surname Kokot.

¹³⁵ The family was later known under the surname Lešić.

¹³⁶ The family was later known under the surname Šešan.

¹³⁷ G. Čremošnik: »Notarske listine sa Lastova«: pp. 5, 9; J. Lučić, »Iz srednjovjekovne prošlosti otoka Lastova«. *Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest* 6 (1974): p. 39, note 157.

banished from the said island of Lastovo”.¹³⁸ Bogdan Desislavić was certainly not banished from Lastovo, but his descendants on the island were numerous and had considerable social influence. The Desislavić and the Siračić were the two most powerful Lastovo families throughout the Ragusan rule. Their participation in power, estimated on the numerical sample of persons mentioned in the Lastovo Statute, exceeds one quarter (27%).¹³⁹

It is apparent that Dubrovnik made no attempt to ‘break’ the ruling structure, but, by recognising autonomy, it maintained the continuity of the local elite. Over the next centuries, the inflow of new settlers tended to threaten the oligarchy of the powerful locals. In order to prevent the infiltration of the ‘new’, Desislavić, Siračić and some members of the old political elite decided to close the Lastovo Council. Antun Cvitanić rightly asserts that the oligarchic tendency had won a victory in 1367, when the Statute regulated the Council membership and the life term of office.¹⁴⁰ This inevitably led to a division of Lastovo’s society into two major groups: nobles and non-nobles. The latter were deprived of access to almost all of the most important offices in the local government.

Further sedimentation took place within the noble circle itself. The Desislavić and the Siračić, but also a number of other families, rose to prominence and thus gave way to intensified political grievances. The more powerful the oligarchy became, the smaller and more isolated it grew. It was only a matter of time when the noble faction excluded from decision-making, likely to be supported by the formerly deprived political group, would develop a critical mass ready to act. Lastovo thus witnessed a new social division. A powerful noble group, if modest in size, supported by an equally modest number of non-noble was on one side, while on the other was a majority consisting of a marginalized noble group and their numerous non-noble supporters.

What was the position of these two factions in relation to Dubrovnik? In the nature of things, the island oligarchy was determined to maintain control. Ragusan interference of any kind was most unwelcome, as it could affect the oligarchy’s stable position. The politically marginalised faction, however, was

¹³⁸ *Lastovski statut*, chapter XV.

¹³⁹ Nenad Vekarić, »Lastovci u Lastovskom statutu.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 44 (2006): pp. 82-84.

¹⁴⁰ Antun Cvitanić, »Lastovsko statutarno pravo«, in: *Lastovski statut*: pp. 141-142.

in search of an ally, as within the established system of local balances, cemented by the closing of the Council in 1367, it was unable to change the power positions and thus sought protection from Dubrovnik. The interest proved mutual because Dubrovnik too frowned upon the idea of having an autonomous local oligarchy over which it could easily lose control. Lastovo was not among the Republic's priorities, partly because of its remoteness, but also because of its specific economic system, atypical of the rest of the Republic. Island estates were not distributed among the Ragusan patricians, as was done with almost all the territorial acquisitions of the Republic in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. As for Lastovo, Dubrovnik had drawn up a single scenario: full sovereignty over the island. Within these frameworks, one should also view Dubrovnik's interventionism. The Republic was determined to interfere with the local autonomy only if it would threaten the sovereignty of Dubrovnik. Thus the local elite became its natural enemy and the marginalised faction ally, whose help they would need in controlling the island oligarchy.

This, in sum, was the social climate on Lastovo in the years preceding the rebellion.

Analysis of the rebel and loyal circle

Having highlighted the rebel leaders, their supporters and the families who did not participate in the revolt, the results could be summarised as follows:

- 1) Among the rebel leaders the ratio between the nobles and non-nobles is 10:0, among other rebels 11:15, and among the loyalists it could be estimated to 20:37. This clearly demonstrates that the revolt was class rooted.
- 2) Close kinship ties between the ten leaders reveal the family and clan background of the rebellion. The revolt did not involve the entire noble rank, but only a kinship-related group within it.
- 3) Five out of ten rebel leaders were the descendants of the Desislavić and Siračić nobility, the families whose power and influence had dated back to the period before the Ragusan rule.
- 4) The ringleaders were well positioned in the local hierarchy. Among them was an ex-chancellor, and a chancellor holding office during the rebellion.

- 5) Some of the leaders had a grudge against Dubrovnik, as in the case of the chancellor whom the Ragusan authorities dismissed on grounds of malpractice.
- 6) The ratio between the rebel noble families and the ones who remained loyal to Dubrovnik in favour of the latter (12:20) anticipated the rebels' failure.
- 7) Among the rebels there were no new entrants to the local nobility after 1367 (Dobrićević, Dragošević, Gišljčić). The Ragusans considered them allies since they supported their entry onto the Lastovo Council on account of "their merits and loyal service to the Dubrovnik government".¹⁴¹ Thus siding with the rebels were old noble families who defended their formerly acquired positions.
- 8) The ratio 12:20 between the rebel and loyal nobles families, along with the 12:37 ratio between the rebels and the loyalists in the non-noble ranks indicate that a considerable majority of the non-noble families resented the idea of revolt. An apparent disproportion between the rebel and loyal non-nobles (in favour of the latter) shows that the rebellion was not the product of social discontent.
- 9) The rebels' hostile attitude towards the loyal men of Lastovo, nobles (Dobrićević) or non-nobles (Siketić), confiscation of their property in the period when the island was beyond Dubrovnik's control reveals the actual depth of the Lastovo rift.

Interpretation

In the light of these facts can one assume that the Lastovo rebels actually tried to manipulate both Venice and Dubrovnik? Tonko Jurica was the first to anticipate such an assumption: "The fact that the rebellion was to be led by men with substantial annual earnings is by no means irrelevant."¹⁴² Further, "Private interests were often being hidden behind the common goals, and thus

¹⁴¹ *Lastovski statut*, chapter XCIII. Ragusan adherents were still being infiltrated into the Council after the rebellion: in 1618 Marin Lukin Vukeljčin entered the Council (*Lastovski statut*, chapter CXLII), and in 1669 by the order of the Ragusan Minor Council, Petar Fulmiz was admitted "upon special grace" and merits, yet "in conformity with... the statutory provisions, laws and customs of Lastovo's commune" (*Lastovski statut*, chapter CLXXXVII).

¹⁴² T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 122.

certain individuals, officially struggling for self-government, were de facto working to their own benefit.”¹⁴³ Jurica, however, failed to elaborate the thesis, but opted for a stereotypical interpretation of Ragusan policy which “had always persisted on the total submission” and “the island’s defiance” as a reaction.¹⁴⁴ He shared a similar view with Lucijanović before him, who wrote: “this time their hot blood drove them that far as to decide to dissolve all relations with Dubrovnik and submit to the Winged Lion, putting behind them the dreadful events experienced under Doge Orseolo II in 998.”¹⁴⁵

Seemingly an interesting territorial and political issue, Lastovo, however, was not among the top priorities on the Venetian or Ragusan agenda. This explains why the two Republics had not come into conflict over Lastovo earlier. Thanks to the Lastovo rebellion, the island became a hot spot. Were it not for the Lastovo islanders themselves and their action that the island, strategically not highly relevant, came under the spotlight of the two governments?

No doubt, Dubrovnik aimed to strengthen its rule over the area and incorporate the island into its administrative system by disintegrating Lastovo’s autarchy. In doing so, the Ragusan government resorted to a variety of methods. From legislative measures carried out through the implementation of the central government decisions to less formal methods involving lobbying and infiltration of the partisans of the Ragusan interests into the Lastovo Council, to extremely violent, if efficient, means (rebel clerics were strangled in the Dubrovnik jail, Pasko Antica was poisoned in Venice). Yet, Lastovo managed to retain a special position within the Republic of Dubrovnik, unique in its degree of autonomy among the Ragusan districts. Are the Ragusan measures to be interpreted as an attempt to limit the island’s autonomy, or were they a reaction against the power imbalance on the island itself, which, as witnessed in the events pertaining to the rebellion, would have an impact on the Veneto-Ragusan relations? Or was the goal of the Ragusan interventionism the maintenance of sovereignty and stability on the island, i.e., an attempt to foresee and prevent the establishment of the island oligarchy as a source of instability?

The plot and the events that followed clearly testify to Dubrovnik’s political misjudgment. The events took a most undesirable course: conflict with Venice. However, was the wrong step taken when, on 22 November 1601, the Senate

¹⁴³ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 122.

¹⁴⁴ T. Jurica, *Lastovo kroz stoljeća*: p. 121.

¹⁴⁵ M. Lucianović, »Lastovo u sklopu Dubrovačke Republike«: p. 262.

decided to interfere with Lastovo's autonomy, or was the decision brought too late? The likelihood is that the Ragusan government failed to foresee a long-term risk of the establishment of the island oligarchy, i.e., it lagged well behind the events to be able to make the right move.

In the light of the afforded evidence it is easier to grasp the actions of the Venetian Republic. Its reaction during the first days of the unrest ("it is not the right moment for it, and let tempers quieten down")¹⁴⁶ may be interpreted as sincere. Radovan Samardžić thus rightly asserts: "The islanders resorted to cunning... by forcing the *provisor* to receive them, threatening to submit Lastovo to the viceroy of Naples or the pope, a development Venice could not allow."¹⁴⁷ The final outcome speaks in favour of this interpretation. Although aware that "it is not the right moment" the Serenissima still took the bait.

In sum, this leads me to the following interpretation of the Lastovo rebellion and the reasons underlying it: a group of old noble families led by the descendants of *župan* Desislav rose to prominence on the local political scene through a specific form of oligarchy. They were confronted by a group of local noblemen who were supported by the central Ragusan government, which considered the oligarchy a threat to its sovereignty over Lastovo. Placed under control, the dissatisfied political elite tried to restore its positions. The rebels articulated their revolt in the form of resistance against limited autonomy, trying to arouse the allegiance of many islanders, in which they partly succeeded. Aware that the framework of the Republic of Dubrovnik offered no prospects for the restoration of its oligarchy, the group managed to involve Venice into the conflict, though seemingly uninterested at the time. Given the power constellation in Europe, the rebellion was doomed to failure. Despite military inferiority, the Republic of Dubrovnik managed to retain the island and consolidate its sovereignty over the territory. In practice, this implied the fall of Lastovo's oligarchy and the limitation of the island's autonomy.

¹⁴⁶ Š. Ljubić, »O odnošajih među republikom Mletačkom i Dubrovačkom«: p. 115.

¹⁴⁷ R. Samardžić, *Veliki vek Dubrovnika*: pp. 18-19.