

CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF THE RAGUSAN PRESENCE IN VENICE IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

BARIŠA KREKIĆ

ABSTRACT: This article discusses the presence in Venice in the fourteenth century of a number of patricians and commoners from Dubrovnik (Ragusa), whose activities in the city of St. Mark left traces in the *Archivio di Stato* in Venice. Information gained from Venetian archival documents is complemented by documents from the State Archives in Dubrovnik concerning the same individuals.

In her very interesting and informative article on Ragusans in Venice from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century,¹ Lovorka Čoralić has given an extensive survey of the presence and multiple activities of people from Dubrovnik (Ragusa) in Venice over the course of six hundred years. Although the article makes good use of unpublished and published sources, monographs,

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Ms Constantina Scourtis, of the University of California, Los Angeles, for her excellent work in proofreading my English.

¹ Lovorka Čoralić, »Dubrovčani u Veneciji od XIII. do XVIII. stoljeća.« *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku* 32 (1994): pp. 15-57. A somewhat abridged English version of this article has been published under the title »The Ragusans in Venice from the Thirteenth to the Eighteenth Century.« in *Dubrovnik Annals* 3 (1999): pp. 13-40. On the presence of Dalmatians in general in Venice between the 13th and 18th century see Tomislav Raukar, »Le città dalmate e il territorio adriatico: relazioni economiche e influenze sociali (XIII-XV secolo).« *Italjug* 12/3 (1982): pp. 9-18; Lovorka Čoralić, »Prisustvo doseljenika s istočne jadranske obale u Veneciji od XIII. do XVIII. stoljeća.« *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest* 26 (1993): pp. 39-79.

Bariša Krekić, Professor of History, Emeritus, University of California, Los Angeles. Address: Department of History, UCLA, Los Angeles, Ca 90095-1473, USA

articles etc. pertaining to the topic, its greatest value consists in the use of wills preserved in the *Notarile Testamenti* in the Archivio di Stato in Venice. Careful analysis of those wills has allowed Čoralić to draw important conclusions as to the presence, activities, family links and a variety of other aspects of life of the Ragusans residing in Venice or visiting that city.

Of particular interest is the list of 131 names of Ragusans whose wills Čoralić has found in Venice and which cover the period from 1389 to 1803. The bulk of the list is made up of wills from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Indeed, out of 131 testators, 70 (53.43%) belong to the fifteenth century and 50 (38.16%) to the sixteenth century, while the seventeenth century is represented by 6 names (4.58%) and the eighteenth and the very beginning of the nineteenth century (1803) by one testator each. As for the fourteenth century, there are just three names (2.29%) from that time. It is my intention to add a few names of Ragusans present in Venice in the fourteenth century, drawn from other sources in the Archivio di Stato in Venice and complemented by information on those individuals and their links with Venice existing in the State Archives in Dubrovnik.

The first two names that I found in Venetian documents are those of “Nicolaus quondam Mathei de Mençio (Menčetić) de Ragusio et Pasqua quondam Laurentii de Mençio eiusdem loci”, who acted as witnesses in a procuratorial charter in October 1311.² We know from Ragusan documents that Nicolaus performed various duties in the Ragusan administration between 1312 and 1326. In 1313 and again in 1322, he was a member of the Ragusan *Consilium rogatorum* (Senate), all of which indicates that he did not spend much time in Venice. He died at the beginning of 1323.³ Nicolaus’s cousin, Pasqualis, had an illegitimate son who became the founder of the commoner Gallo family in Dubrovnik.⁴

More interesting was the case of “Bogodanus quondam Boni de Ragusio” who was accused in Venice of having taken some things from a wine mer-

² *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 179, f. 18v (B. Sardella), Archivio di Stato, Venezia (hereafter cited as: ASV).

³ *Libri reformationum*, I, ed. J. Gelcich. Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium (hereafter cited as: MSHSM), X. Zagreb: JAZU, 1879: pp. 34, 56, 69; *Libri reformationum*, V, ed. J. Gelcich. MSHSM, XXIX. Zagreb: JAZU, 1897: pp. 151-152, 180, 193, 207. See Irmgard Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I. Beograd: SANU, 1960: pp. 332-333.

⁴ I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: p. 320; II: no. XLVII/1, where Pasqua Laurentii is mentioned only under the years 1323/1324.

chant from Fano, “fingendo se officialem dominationis”. The Venetian authorities ordered, on 6 September 1329, “quod hodie clametur in scalis de culpa ipsius Bogodani”. After that, he was to stay for three days “continue a solis ortu usque ad occasum in berlina” and to spend one year “in uno carcerum inferiorum”.⁵ As is well known, the Venetian government did not take lightly such abuses. This is visible from yet another case of a Ragusan acting under false pretenses. “Mapheus de Ragusio, calafatus S. Justine” was accused of having presented himself as “officialis de nocte” and of having thus taken during the night a sword from “Nicoletus de Clugia”, who was carrying this sword “ligatam causa eundi Clugiam”. Mapheus was sentenced on 10 May 1336, to pay “libras centum ... et stet in carcere usque ad Sanctum Petrum proximum”.⁶

Much worse was the fate of a former Ragusan, “Leonardus Pedoro, qui fuit de Raguxio, de contrata S. Simeonis de Veneciis”. Leonardus was indicted “fuisse furatus garofolos et alias species mercationum in galea ser Damiani Natalis, armatoris, ad viagium Trapesonde de anno preterito”. Convicted on 7 January 1337, by the Council of XL, Leonardus Pedoro was to have his guilt proclaimed “a Sancto Marco usque Riualtum et in scala ... et postea ducatur ad punctam S. Bene et ibi suspendatur per gulam cum una catena ferri, taliter quod moriatur ... et non possit inde moveri usque ad unum mensem”.⁷ Next year, at the end of March 1338, the Council of XL discussed whether the will “ser Marini Ragusei de Justinopoli debeat compleri et subscribi per testes ... et etiam roborari, vel non”. The Council of XL decided with 27 ballots “quod compleatur”.⁸

A puzzling case from 1342-1343 involved a man whose name sounds very much Ragusan, but the two documents related to the proceedings do not mention that he was from Dubrovnik. Indeed, on 24 April 1342, the Council of XL had to decide the fate of Marco Poča and Martinellus Grasso. They

⁵ *Avogaria di comun - Raspe*, vol. 1, f. 76 (ASV).

⁶ *Raspe*, vol. 1, f. 171.

⁷ *Raspe*, vol. 1, f. 173v. On drastic punishments in Venice see Guido Ruggiero, *Violence in Early Renaissance Venice*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1980: pp. 34, 176, 180-181.

⁸ *Raspe*, vol. 1, f. 180v. A “Marinus Raguseus” bought a vineyard in “Justinopoli” sometime before May 1343. “Ser Marinus Raguseus” was not the only Ragusan residing in that city. In the same month of May 1343, there is mention of the sons “condam Laurencii Ragusei Veneti nostri, habitatoris Iustinopoli” (*Le deliberazioni del Consiglio dei XL della Repubblica di Venezia* I, ed. A. Lombardo. Venezia: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1957: pp. 49-50).

were accused of having murdered the abbess “Sancti Petri de Lemandina, districtus Capurlarum”, but the XL exonerated them from that accusation. However, the Council ordered “quod committatur colegio superinde ordinato quod inquireat de aliis ofensis” that the two men had committed against the nuns and the monastery and against a man by the name Menegelus de Capurlis.⁹

The other offenses become clear from an act of 3 June 1343, which informs us that “ad aures dominacionis ducalis et advocatorum comunis” news had arrived that “Martinellus Grasso, marinarius de Castello a Cha de la Scopa ... simul cum Marco Poça” had gone to the monastery of Saint Peter de Lemandina districtus Capurlarum and that they had committed there “multa inhonesta et turpia, jacendo cum abatissa dicti monasterii per vim et inhoneste et cum aliis monachabus eiusdem”. In addition, they were accused of having violently stolen chickens and eaten them “tempore quadragesime” and of having stricken with a knife “cum effusione sanguinis ... Menegelum Çilberto de Capurlis ... quia volebat portare dictam abatissam in vias pro dictis iniuriis sibi factis” by Martinellus and Marcus. The Council of XL condemned on 3 June 1343 Martinellus to spend two years “in carcere forti” and one day “in berlina”. On the same day “Marcus Poça Sancti Marcilianis, olim caput unius barche forçate (?) pro comuni” was sentenced to one year “in uno carcerum inferiorum” and was prohibited from ever again being in charge of any comunal ship.¹⁰

The relatively light sentences for Martinellus and Marcus can be explained by the fact that in the meantime Matheus Furlanus, who used to be a servant of the abbess “Sancti Petri de Lemandino”, had been accused that, “dum vogaret ipsam sororem Çanam Riciam, abatissam Sancti Petri de Lamandina ... diabolico spiritu instigatus, ocidit et interfecit ipsam abatissam cum una lancea”. Furlanus was absent and the Council of XL sentenced him, should he ever be caught, “quod ducatur per canale et postmodum suspendatur per gulam taliter quod moriatur”.¹¹

The name Poça (Pucić) is that of an old distinguished Ragusan patrician family, possibly originating from Kotor (Cattaro) and present in Dubrovnik ever since the mid-thirteenth century, but there is no mention of a Marcus in

⁹ *Raspe*, vol. 2, f. 43.

¹⁰ *Raspe*, vol. 2, f. 41.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

its genealogy.¹² One could surmise that Marcus Poča mentioned above might have been an illegitimate offspring of a Poča from Dubrovnik, who had moved to Venice, with which the Poča family had lively contacts. That is why I included him in this survey. Such a link might be established at a later date but, for the time being, I cannot prove its existence.

While Marcus Poča's misbehavior might not be the sin of a Ragusan, in that same year 1343 we find in the Venetian jails a man whose Ragusan origin is beyond doubt. In fact, the man, Nucius de Ragusio, had escaped from jail and Marcus Mančafero, "olim scriba ad carceres superiores" was accused of allowing him to escape through the door of the jail "pro dolo et pro denariis". However, the XL exonerated Marcus as well as three other "custodes carcerum superiorum" and another "scriba" at the same jail.¹³

A big scandal, accompanied by lengthy judicial proceedings and drastic punishments broke out in Venice in 1361 and involved a man from Dubrovnik. "Nicoletus Marino S. Barnabe", together with "Matheus de Monte S. Marini Georgii de Marchia" and with the Genoese "Johannes de Caffa", had murdered his brother-in-law, "Jacomellus Ghezo", the owner of a "navilium disarmatum". In addition, Nicoletus had murdered a twelve-year-old Greek boy and a Venetian seaman on the same ship. The murders had taken place after the ship, loaded with oranges, hides and other merchandise, had left Brindisi for Venice, and the bodies were thrown into the sea. However, the ship made a stopover in Dubrovnik and there "Natalis de Ragusio" was hired as a crewmember for the trip to Venice. Instead, the ship went "ad Turrem Palme et in Manfredoniam, levando mercatores et stipendiarios pro eundo ad partes Marchie, et ivit ad partes Sclauonie et aplicuit ad capud Curçule ad scoleos". There, at Korčula, Nicoletus Marino and his shipmates, together with mercenaries, robbed a ship belonging to Nicoletus Bon, killing her crewmembers et "comitendo multas alias raubarías et alia homicidia et mala", and then returned "ad Turem Palme".

On 19 July 1361, Nicoletus Marino was sentenced to be brought between the two columns in the Piazzetta—the usual place of executions—and there "mactetur cum maneria cum qua mactabat illos, taliter quod moriatur". After this, his body "quartetur in quatuor quarterios" which were to be hanged with

¹² I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: pp. 365-370; II: no. LV/1, 2.

¹³ *Raspe*, vol. 2, ff. 53v-54; *Le deliberazioni del Consiglio dei XL*: pp. 11, 36.

chains “ad furchas super punctam Sancte Helene”, and were not to be removed from there. Similar punishment was inflicted upon Johannes de Caffa, who was absent at that time. The Ragusan Natalis had been accused of participating in the same crimes, but, by a vote of 28:3, the Council of XL exonerated him on 4 August 1361. However, on that same day, Mathias de Monte was condemned to be dragged, tied to a donkey’s tail and then, between the two columns, “mattetur et quartetur, mortuus vel vivus”. Parts of his body were to be hanged, the same way as those of Nicoletus. Yet another participant in the plundering of Korčula, “Laurencius quondam Felicis de Fauentia”, was condemned to be hanged near Nicoletus Marinos quartered body, and to be left there, while “Ançolus de Monteflore de Marchia” and “Nicolaus Furlanus de Redulfo de Portogruaro”, both of them mercenaries, were sentenced to spend five months “in uno carcerum inferiorum”.¹⁴

The fact that “Natalis de Ragusio” seems to have been the only one from among the accused to escape punishment may be explained by a statement in the decision of the XL to exonerate him: Nicoletus had accepted Natalis on the ship “dicendo se vele ire Venecias”, and—since obviously there were no proofs that the Ragusan had participated in the robberies at Korčula—he was able to avoid the drastic sentences of the Venetian authorities. But the whole episode shows how interconnected the two shores of the Adriatic were and how insecure navigation in that sea was at the time.

I have discussed elsewhere the role played in the 1360s in Venice by the distinguished Ragusan merchant and diplomat, “ser Martolus de Tudisio” (Tudizić).¹⁵ Certainly much less important was “Madeus de Ragusio, cimator S. Leonis”, from whom “ser Laurentius, cimator S. Apolaris” demanded a payment of 66 ducats as settlement of all their mutual debts and deals. The Ragusan admitted the truth of the demand, and on 7 April 1367, the Venetian “judices petitionum” granted Laurentius’ request.¹⁶

A much bigger and more interesting controversy, involving several prominent Ragusan citizens, broke out in Venice in 1376. Indeed, on 5 March of that year “ser Michael Nicolice de Martinusio (Martinušić) de Ragusio”, au-

¹⁴ *Raspe*, vol. 2, ff. 11-12.

¹⁵ Bariša Krekić, »Un mercante e diplomatico da Dubrovnik (Ragusa) a Venezia nel Trecento«, in: Bariša Krekić, *Dubrovnik, Italy and the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1980: V.

¹⁶ *Sentenze a giustizia - Petizion*, busta 2, f. 49v (ASV).

thorized “a Blaxio de Sorgo (Sorkočević), cive ragusino”, demanded a payment of 1120 ducats from “ser Helya de Radoano in carcere”, represented in the Venetian court by Ioaninus Çepo. The money was due “pro cambiis et argenti et denariis habitis per banchos in Veneciis et aliis denariis receptis et expensis factis in questione presenti”. Çepo did not contest Martinusius request and the judges “posuerunt in debitum suprascriptum Helyam de Radoano in carcere” for 1120 ducats.¹⁷

The Ragusan patrician, “Michael Nicolice de Martinusso” was active in Veneto-Ragusan economic relations at least since 1365, when he received in Dubrovnik 190 ducats from Nicola Marini de Mençe and promised that those ducats would be paid “per cambium in Veneciis eidem Nicole per Martolum de Tudisio” within eight days after Tudisio received Nicola’s letter.¹⁸ Michael’s dealings with “Blaxius de Sorgo” went also back at least until January 1368, when “Radosclaus Pouicha” acknowledged receiving from Sorgo a cancelled notarial act, concerning a debt of 105 ducats that Radosclaus and his son Pripus owed Sorgo, because Pripus had paid this money to Michael Nicolice de Martinusso in Venice.¹⁹ Michael was in Venice also in November, 1371, when Giuchus de Poça (Pucić) was sending to him 139 ducats “pro cambio” on behalf of Matheus de Georgio (Đurđević).²⁰ All of this indicates that Michael Nicolice de Martinusso was an important Ragusan merchant who had been spending a good deal of time in Venice, dealing mostly in financial transactions, and whose collaboration with Blasius de Sorgo started much before his involvement in the debt payment of Helya de Radoano to Blasius in 1376. Even much later, in October 1383, we find Michael and Sorgo still trading with Venice. Indeed, they had suffered losses “pro robariis factis in barcha venientes de Veneciis per Consalum piratam et suam galeam”. Michael’s loss amounted to 60 hyperpers.²¹ He died on 1 March 1388, and his will and “libretto” contain much interesting informa-

¹⁷ *Sentenze a giustizia - Petizion*, busta 4, f. 40rv.

¹⁸ *Diversa cancellariae*, ser. 25, vol. 20, f. 34, State Archives in Dubrovnik (hereafter cited as: SAD).

¹⁹ On “Radosclaus Pouicha” (Radoslav Pović), “cephalia” of Serres, see Georgij Ostrogorsky, *Serska oblast posle Dušanove smrti*. Beograd: SANU, 1965: p. 93.

²⁰ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 23, f. 75.

²¹ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 26, ff. 127, 135v.

tion on his contacts with Venice and his dealings with Blasius de Sorgo.²²

As for Helias de Radoano, his relations with Venice started at least as early as 1363. His incarceration in that city was most probably the consequence of Dubrovnik's participation in the anti-Venetian coalition which led to the war of Tenedos/Chioggia.²³ He remained over five years in Venetian jails and returned to Dubrovnik only in September 1381,²⁴ following the Peace Treaty of Turin of August 1381, which stated, among other things, that "omnes et singuli captivi, carcerati et detenti" of the two sides, should be freed "libere et sine aliqua redemptione, exactione vel impedimento ... ac restituantur pristinae libertati infra tempora et prout inter dictas partes extiterit ordinatum".²⁵ Once back in Dubrovnik, Helias resumed his active participation in city's affairs.

Among the Ragusans in Venice in the late 1380s one finds "ser Milsam de Radilo de Ragusio et ser Damianum Marini de Radino de Ragusio". In August of 1388 they gave the authorization "dominis Francisco Cornario quondam domini Ducis, de confinio S. Apostolorum, et ser Moisi Superantio de S. Angelo", especially to exact everything that they were entitled to get "a magistro Henrico fisico".²⁶ Of these two men, Damianus and his father Marinus de Radino/Radeno were by far the most interesting. As early as 1357, one finds in Venice "Marinus de Radino de Ragusio, de confinio Sancti Siluestri", and he is mentioned in that city again in 1370, 1371, 1372, 1375

²² *Testamenta notariae*, ser. 10.1, vol. 7, ff. 246-250v (SAD); *Distributiones testamentorum*, ser. 10.2, vol. 5, f. 62rv (SAD), of 21 March 1397. Michael Nicolice de Martinusso was a very prominent participant in the political and administrative life of Dubrovnik in the 1380s. Among other offices, he was elected Rector of the city in August 1379, in May 1381, in April 1382 and again in February and September 1387. *Libri reformationum* IV, ed. J. Gelcich. MSHSM, XXVIII. Zagreb: JAZU, 1896: p. 233. *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike* I, ed. M. Dinić. Beograd: SANU, 1951: p. 7; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike* II, ed. M. Dinić. Beograd: SANU, 1964: p. 3. It should be noted that there was at the same time another Michael de Martinusso in Dubrovnik, "filius Cherue". On Michael Nicolice see I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: pp. 307-308, 436; on Michael Cherue see *ibidem*, pp. 93, 305, 307.

²³ On Dubrovnik's involvement in this war see Bariša Krekić, »Dubrovnik (Ragusa) and the War of Tenedos/Chioggia (1378-1381)«, in: B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik, Italy and the Balkans*: VI.

²⁴ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 162.

²⁵ *Listine o odnošajih između Južnoga Slavenstva i Mletačke Republike* IV, ed. S. Ljubić (hereafter cited as: *Listine*). MSHSM, IV. Zagreb: JAZU, 1874: p. 123. I hope to write a separate article on Helias de Radoano.

²⁶ *Notaia - cancelleria inferiore*, busta 168, f. 33 (M. Raffanelli). "Milsa Radinouich" was engaged in trade with Venice already in 1382, and was still active in Dubrovnik in 1397 (*Praecepta rectoris*, ser. 1, vol. 4, ff. 95v, 100, SAD; *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 25, f. 120v).

and 1376.²⁷ In June 1373, Damianus testified that his father had sent, in November of 1372, a variety of Italian textiles, spices and other goods to “Petrus de Juanisio”, who was accused in Dubrovnik of having smuggled that merchandise from Venice to Hungary without paying the Ragusan customs fees, which he was supposed to do “si chomo se tu le avesi trate da Ragusa ... si chomo Raguseo nostro che ty ey”.²⁸ In 1376 “Marinus de Radeno” acted in Venice as “procurator Johannis, filii quondam Petri Salimben, speciarii de Veneciis, habitatoris Ragusii” and in August of 1378 Salimbene appointed “Damianum, filium Marini de Radeno” to the same position.²⁹ Damianus paid, in 1379, to a Venetian a debt of 30 ducats on behalf “Marini Nicolai de Dulcinio, civis Ragusini”.³⁰

As for Marinus de Radeno, he remained engaged in business dealings with Venice, but it seems that by 1379 he was in Dubrovnik. The war of Tenedos/Chioggia probably affected his activities as well. A document from October 1379, informs us that Marinus promised to take care of some financial and commercial transactions “existente pace seu concordio, quod libere homines Ragusii possint ire ad civitatem Veneciarum”.³¹ He died in Dubrovnik sometime before 13 May 1382, when he is mentioned as “Marinus de Raden, de-

²⁷ “Maroe de Radeno” seems to have been well regarded in Dubrovnik long before this time. In 1364 he was sent as Ragusan envoy “ad dominum Nicolaum Cech, banum Dalmacie” (*Libri reformationum*, IV: p. 21). Nevertheless, Maroe had been incarcerated in Venice at some point before 1371. “Paulucius speciarius” in his will, registered in Dubrovnik on 28 April 1371, instructed his heirs to demand payment of the ducats “pro quibus exigi ... Maroe (de Radeno) de carceribus Veneciarum”, but the amount is not noted (*Testamenta notariae*, vol. 6, ff. 80v, 85v). In October, 1376, “Peruola” Paulucius’ daughter and heir, appointed “ser Marinum de Radeno” her representative to collect the debt that a man owed her in Venice, based on a notarial charter of 1369 (*Diversa notariae*, ser. 26, vol. 9, f. 164, SAD). See also *Diversa notariae*, vol. 8, f. 40v; *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 22, f. 34v; vol. 23, ff. 76v, 150v, 152; vol. 24, f. 5v. An act of 26 January 1376 was written “Veneciis, in contrata Sancti Apolinaris, in domo habitationis ser Marini de Radino de Ragusio” (*Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 24, ff. 104-105).

²⁸ *Reformationes*, ser. 2, vol. 22, f. 64 (SAD); *Lamenta de foris*, ser. 52, vol. 1, f. 38 (SAD).

²⁹ *Diversa notariae*, vol. 9, ff. 159, 199v. See Ruža Ćuk, »Mletačka porodica Salimbene u Dubrovniku u poznom srednjem veku.« *Istorijski časopis* 37 (1991): pp. 27-30; Bariša Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik and Ragusans in Venice as Real Estate Owners in the Fourteenth Century«, in: Bariša Krekić, *Dubrovnik: A Mediterranean Urban Society, 1300-1600*. Aldershot: Variorum, 1997: XI, pp. 38, 41.

³⁰ *Diversa notariae*, vol. 9, f. 210v.

³¹ *Ibidem*, f. 218. He was in Dubrovnik also in May of 1380 (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 38).

functus”.³² For his part, Damianus, like his father, seems to have enjoyed considerable prestige in Dubrovnik.³³ He was in that city in 1389,³⁴ but in June 1392 we find him in Venice, where “ser Junius Trippe de Georgio” absolved Damianus “de omni ... eo quod ipse ... habuisset ad tractandum et faciendum pro dicto ser Junio in Veneciis”.³⁵ In January 1396 “ser Clemens quondam ser Clementis Marini de Goçiiis” (Gozze/Gučetić) appointed “Damianum quondam Marini de Radino de Ragusio, ad presens mercatorem Veneciis” to be his representative in that city, especially to collect the income “domorum et possessionum ipsius ser Clementis ... existentium in civitate Venetiarum et eius dyocesi” and to recover debts that persons living in Venice and in its district owed Gozze.³⁶

Another Ragusan also deserves mention, although his stay in Venice was probably short. “Matheus de Marino de Ragusio” on 3 June 1389 made a contract with “Bethinus de Pone de confinio S. Marie Noue, Johannes Pasqualigo quondam domini Aurii de confinio S. Justine, et Benziueni de Ranirolo de Forliuio de confinio S. Angeli de Veneciis”. The three companions hired Matheus’ “naveta clamada Madona S. Maria” for a trip to Sicily. Among other details, the ship was supposed to first make a stopover in Dubrovnik and unload the merchandise destined for that city. After that, she was to go to “Cotron”, unload merchandise there, and then go “in Cecilia in Sarragoxa”. There Matheus was to contact the “fator (of the company) ser Renier de Cordeli” who would provide goods to be carried to Venice. Upon arrival there, the three companions were to pay Matheus “el so nolo del dito viazo ducati duxento e setanta d oro”, within eighteen days after the ship was unloaded. The contract contained a special clause, stating that the ship must not carry—either going to Sicily and Cotrone, or returning from there—“ferro,

³² *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 223.

³³ In June of 1380, “Damianus, filius Marini de Radieno” was made “sindicus” to go to Apulia and buy salt for Dubrovnik (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: pp. 47-48). In November of the same year he is mentioned as “sindicus noster in Brundusio” with the same task, and in January 1381 he was still there (*ibidem*, pp. 85, 88, 116). By October he had returned to Dubrovnik, but in July 1382, he was again sent as “sindicus nostri comunis pro eundo ad querendum de sale pro nostro comuni”, a mission from which he seems to have returned by October of the same year (*ibidem*, pp. 168, 236, 258).

³⁴ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 565.

³⁵ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 30, f. 116a.

³⁶ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 184v; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 38.

piombo, stagno, rame, ligname, chouelli e suri, perzio che de questo semo mercadanti de ogniuna dele dicte cose”.³⁷

Among Ragusan commoners engaged in trade in Venice in 1389, “Paxius (Pasio) quondam Johannis de Ragusio, habitator Venetiarum in confinio S. Moisi” on 3 July 1389 made an agreement with “Marcus Lambardo quondam domini Nicolai de confinio S. Barnabe” by which Marcus gave to Paxius 50 ducats and “unam barcham capacitatis anforarum decem, furnitam velo et aliis necessariis” for the value of another 50 ducats. For his part, Paxius invested also 50 ducats “et personam meam”. The company was to last four months and profits or losses were to be evenly divided. Two men from Senj and one from Milan, all of them living in Venice, acted as guarantors and two days later “Nicoletus Cotanto quondam ser Nicolai de Candida, habitator Veneciarum in confinio S. Canciani, cum suis heredibus” joined the guarantors.³⁸ Let me also mention, from that same year “Nicolaum de Ragusio, quondam Radiseni” who acted in Venice as witness for an act of 9 July 1389.³⁹

However, the year 1389 brings also information on the activities of two Ragusan patricians in Venice. Thus, on 27 January, “ser Pasqualis de Resta” (Restić) de Ragusio gave the authorization “domino Francisco Cornario quondam domini Ducis, et ser Georgio Cornario, nepoti suo”, to represent him in all business enterprises.⁴⁰ One year later, in January of 1390, ser Pasqua de Resti produced in Dubrovnik a notarial act of 6 June 1388, written “Venetiis in Riuoalto ad stationem Marchi de Raphanellis”, the well-known notary, which showed that a nobleman from Kotor had received from Resti, “cive et habitatore Ragusii”, various merchandise “et jocalia”, whose value was 250 golden ducats and which were to be taken “in Sclauoniam ad vendendum domino comiti Laçaro”. Of course, the Serbian Prince Lazar had perished in the battle of Kosovo, in June 1389; thus this charter represented a liability, rather than an asset. Resti ceded it to the Ragusan patrician “ser Helya de Saracha” (Saračić), but it seems that Saraca was not particularly eager to hold on to it either, because a marginal note says: “Cassum de voluntate partium

³⁷ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 168, f. 74 (M. Raffanelli).

³⁸ *Ibidem*, ff. 78v-79. A representative “Pacis Johannini de Venetiis” sold in October 1371 in Dubrovnik to a Ragusan patrician “unam marcilianam... portature salmarum septuaginta furmenti” for 40 ducats (*Libri dotium*, ser. 32, vol. 2, f. 57v, SAD).

³⁹ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 168, f. 55.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 51v.

quia restituta in pristinum”.⁴¹ In any case, the two documents mentioned above show that Pasqualis de Resti had spent about eight months in Venice in 1388-89, and—as we shall see—he was to reappear in that city a few years later.

The second Ragusan patrician present in Venice in 1389 was “ser Gauçe de Poça”, who, on 11 June of that year, gave assurances to the executors of the will of the late “ser Zaninus Bartholomei de Ponta”, from Giudecca, especially “de libris quatuor, grossis VI et parvis octo ad aurum” that the estate of the deceased owed him.⁴² Ser Gauçe was part of a group of Ragusan noblemen which included ser Pasqualis de Resti, among others, who developed a lively economic activity in Venice in the last decade of the fourteenth century. Thus, in January 1391, Poça, together with the other prominent Ragusan patrician in the city of St. Mark, ser Marinus de Caboga (Kabužić) was supposed to pay the freight of a Ragusan ship which was to bring goods from Dubrovnik to Venice and from there to go to Rimini, load grain and take it to Dubrovnik.⁴³

In August of 1394, ser Gauçe was in Dubrovnik, where he promised to pay within a year in Venice “Duymo de Primio de Sibinico” (Šibenik) the amount of 245 ducats to settle their accounts.⁴⁴ He is mentioned in Dubrovnik in June 1395, but apparently did not spend much time there.⁴⁵ As early as March 1396, he was appointed by a group of three patricians to be their representative in Venice, especially to try to obtain the compensation “unius balle frustaneorum” that was worth 82 ducats, and which had been “derobata ... super quadam marciliana Venetorum per quoddam brigentinum de Sibinicho”, whose captain was “Andreas Lubich” from Šibenik.⁴⁶

At the end of 1396, ser Gauçe was involved, together with ser Pasqualis de Resti and ser Michael de Bona (Bunić) in a quarrel with “Matheus

⁴¹ *Debita notariae*, ser. 36, vol. 10, f. 39rv (SAD). Resti himself was back in Dubrovnik by 21 April 1389, when he was elected one of the “advocatores comunis” (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 547).

⁴² *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 168, f. 75v. This Gauçe de Poça is certainly “Gauçe Sauini” whom I. Mahnken mentions under the years 1392/1427 (*Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: p. 369 and II: no. LV/1).

⁴³ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 29, f. 169v.

⁴⁴ *Debita notariae*, vol. 11, f. 90. Exactly one year later, ser Gauçe promised to pay the same man in Venice or in Šibenik 75 ducats within one year (*ibidem*, f. 153).

⁴⁵ *Reformationes*, vol. 30, f. 16.

⁴⁶ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 188v.

Delphyno quondam domini Michaelis, de confinio S. Canciani”, concerning a slave girl who died on a ship owned by the three Ragusans. According to Delphino, the slave “erat super dicta chocha cum aliis meis sclauabus, que ibi decessit hoc presenti anno veniendo de Tartaria”. They elected a Venetian and a merchant from Milan, living in Venice, as their arbiters.⁴⁷ At this time, at the beginning of February 1397, ser Gauçe had a controversy also with his erstwhile partner, ser Pasqualis de Resti, and on 1 February Resti and “Gauze de Poza, civis et mercator de Ragusio”, acting also as “procurator ... ser Georgii de Poza, fratris mei”, jointly appointed “ser Marinum de Caboga, civem et mercatorem de Ragusi” to be their arbiter in all conflicts that they have or may have in the future.⁴⁸ The problem regarded a ship and it involved other Ragusan patricians in Venice as well.

As for ser Gauçe, let me add only that he must have returned to Dubrovnik at some point during 1397. On 24 November of that year, the Minor Council decided that “ser Gauçe de Poça et ser Nicolaus de Todisio, olim officiales ad exigendum afflictus terrenorum comunis” should be incarcerated “in castello” and could not be released under any circumstances until they pay “comuni id quod tenentur pro dicto officio”, except to go “ad exigendum dictos afflictus”. From other documents it is visible that their violation had taken place all the way back in 1394,⁴⁹ but the Ragusan authorities had a long memory and did not allow such transgressions to go unpunished.

Returning to the Venetian documents, the year 1390 saw a Ragusan craftsman exercising his art in Venice. On 12 February, “Petrus Raguseo butarius quondam ser Georgii de confinio S. Pantaleonis” had made twenty one “caratellos de melle” for “dominus Paulus Barbo, quondam domini Nicolai de eodem confinio”. The barrels that Petrus had prepared were to be used for “melle vestrum quod ad presens mittitis (sc. Paulus) ad partes Tane”. However, the Venetian feared that he might suffer losses because of the quality of the barrels. To assuage such fears, Petrus promised that, “si ex defectu dictorum caratellorum ... dictum mel in eis ponitum vadit extra” and thus caused losses for Paulus, the Ragusan would pay all damages according to Paulus’ sworn statement.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 169 (M. Raffanelli), without pagination.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁹ *Reformationes*, vol. 31, f. 9v.

⁵⁰ *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 198, f. 108.

Two-and-a-half years later, in July 1392, “*Petrus quondam Primi de Ragusio*”, as his father’s successor, appointed “*ser Georgium Bonuexino de confinio S. Fusce et ser Nicolaum a caligis de confinio S. Seueris*” to take care of his property and his business in Venice.⁵¹ In that same year one finds the mention in Venetian documents of three Ragusan patricians whose activity in the city of St. Mark had been very significant before and would continue to be important after this time.

The first one was “*ser Lucas de Bona*”. His contacts with Venice go back at least to January of 1368,⁵² and in 1369 and 1370, he acted in Dubrovnik as procurator of the already mentioned Ragusan diplomat and merchant in Venice, *ser Martolus de Tudisio*, especially in transferring money from various Ragusans to Martolus in Venice.⁵³ In 1375, Bona was engaged in shipping to Venice large quantities of lead from the Balkan hinterland. At the end of February of that year, “*Renaldus de Stambertis*”, a prominent Ragusan citizen and merchant, sold to *ser Lucas* “*centum miliaria plumbi de Sclauonia*” for the price of 10 ducats and 15 grossi for each “*miliare*”. The lead was to be delivered in Dubrovnik by the end of April.⁵⁴ In mid-April, Bona received a quantity “*de plumbo duro*” that he sent “*Çanibono Romboldo*” in Venice, who was supposed to reimburse him “*pro nauo et pro dacio et pro omnibus aliis expensis que solvuntur in Veneciis pro dicto plumbo*”.⁵⁵

By November of 1375, Lucas de Bona was in Venice,⁵⁶ but apparently for a short time only, because in June 1376, he was back in Dubrovnik where he appointed his brother, Marinus, to be his procurator in Venice and else-

⁵¹ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

⁵² At that time *ser Lucas* promised that, when things that “*Mateus de Georgio*” was sending to Venice “*in manibus Martoli de Tudisio*” arrived in that city, Bona would “*facere securitatem eidem Mateo de una carta notarii quam ipse Martolus habet super ipsum Mateum*” in the amount of 400 ducats (*Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 21, f. 157).

⁵³ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 22, ff. 45, 59, 86, 94, 101v. Bona’s relations with Tudisio continued in 1374 (*Venditae cancellariae*, ser. 31, vol. 3, f. 12v, SAD; see also B. Krekić, »Un mercante e diplomatico«). Some of the amounts of money that Bona was sending to Martolus on behalf of third parties were quite substantial, e. g. 1300 ducats and 521 ducats in October 1370 alone (*Distributiones testamentorum*, vol. 3, ff. 81v, 83).

⁵⁴ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 24, f. 13v.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, f. 28.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 84.

where.⁵⁷ Ser Lucas continued in 1376 and 1377 his financial relations and his lead and silver trade with Venice and Venetians figured among his procurators.⁵⁸ In the early eighties of the fourteenth century Bona was in Dubrovnik, very active in political life and in a variety of commercial enterprises. Thus, in July or August of 1381, his rather distant relative “ser Michael de Bona” had sent from Ancona to Zara (Zadar) on behalf of his brother, ser Simeon de Bona, and on behalf of ser Lucas, “de pevero e altre cose le qual mando de Gara (sic!) in Ongaria” for a value of 1500 ducats.⁵⁹ Ser Lucas was elected Rector of Dubrovnik in September 1381 and in November of the same year the Rector and the judges of Dubrovnik received from ser Lucas “libras quatuor et uncias decem argenti in frustis arnensium argenti” which were to be sent to Venice on a comunal ship.⁶⁰ A little later, ser Lucas brought to Dubrovnik on two ships “granum seu frumentum” which was “positum ... ad rationem Raynaldi de Stamberti”.⁶¹

By this time, ser Lucas was one of the most influential Ragusan nobles. His multiple political engagements and economic activities continued in Dubrovnik in 1382, and so did his contacts with the Venetians. In May of that year he was one of two procurators of the prominent Ragusan merchant “Blasius de Radoano”. As such he gave on Radoano’s behalf to “Zacharias, filius Phynetti de Venetiis ... unam capsam de nuce in qua sunt peccie quatuor argenti, ponderis librarum octuagintaquinque, et unum annulum de auro in quo est ligatus unus rubinus, et unus alius in quo est unus balassus, et unus

⁵⁷ *Diversa notariae*, vol. 9, f. 156v.

⁵⁸ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 24, f. 161v; *Debita notariae*, vol. 8, ff. 11, 41; *Diversa notariae*, vol. 9, f. 195v. At the same time Bona’s wealth and reputation in financial matters were growing (*Libri reformationum*, IV: pp. 196, 228, 233, 245). A clear indication of his increasing prestige was his election into the Minor Council in September, 1379 (*Libri reformationum*, IV: pp. 243, 260; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 13).

⁵⁹ *Dogana*, ser. 35, vol. 3, f. 176v (SAD). Ser Lucas and ser Simon paid in Dubrovnik the customs fees of 3% for this operation in July of 1383 (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 335). In May of 1380, ser Lucas and “ser Jacobus de Mençe” were elected “in ambassata itura ad dominum Nicolaum de Zeech, banum Dalmacie et Crohacie et Simonem de Auria, armiratum domini nostri” (*ibidem*, pp. 40-41, 43, 47-48, 99-101). Four months later, ser Lucas de Bona elected to the Senate—yet another significant proof of his growing prestige (*ibidem*, pp. 74, 77).

⁶⁰ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 25, f. 26; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: pp. 7, 164, 166, 191.

⁶¹ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 176.

alius in quo erat unus smeraldus”.⁶² A little later in the same year, “Yuro Yçarouich de Nouaberda” promised to ser Lucas to give him “libras argenti fini septem” as soon as he arrives “ad Nouamberdam”. The Venetian “Nicolettus Trachan” was guarantor for Juro.⁶³

Bona’s business deals with Venice and with Venetians continued throughout the 1380s. In May of 1383, his relative ser Simon de Bona promised to give to ser Lucas the amount of 1213 ducats by the end of January 1384. The money was to be paid to Lucas “hic in Ragusio vel in Veneciis, ubi ego (sc. Simon) eligero de dictis duobus locis”.⁶⁴ I have discussed elsewhere Lucas’ and his wife Anna’s operations in real estate in Venice at this time and shall not detail them again here.⁶⁵ However, despite his involvement in those and other deals, ser Lucas seems to have spent most of his time in Dubrovnik.⁶⁶ In April of 1388, he was one of three “tutores” appointed by the Minor Council to the formerly mentioned distinguished Ragusan merchant and diplomat, ser Martolus de Tudisio, who had gone insane.⁶⁷

⁶² *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 25, f. 105. In that same month, ser Lucas became one of the “procuratores Sanctae Mariae” (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 287). He was also engaged throughout this period in numerous committees preparing instructions for Ragusan diplomats abroad, but it does not seem that he himself participated in embassies, except for two cases: in September of 1383, when he and two other patricians were elected as ambassadors “ad dominum regem Bosne et Rascie”, Tvrtko I, and in October of the same year when he was part of the embassy sent to Zadar to greet the two queens of Hungary and Croatia, Mary and Elisabeth (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: pp. 382-383, 386-387). See Nada Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata u razvijenom srednjem vijeku*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1976: pp. 654-656; Tomislav Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1997: p. 85.

⁶³ *Debita notariae*, vol. 9, f. 138. In September of 1382, ser Lucas was elected “advocatus maioris curie” and a senator (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: pp. 248, 250).

⁶⁴ *Debita notariae*, vol. 9, f. 190. In 1383, ser Lucas had suffered “robariam factam in Rodio” (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 344). In September of that year, he was elected “iudex curie maioris” and senator (*ibidem*, pp. 350-351, 384). He was proposed several times for the office of Rector, but was not elected.

⁶⁵ B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: pp. 39-40; *Venditae cancellariae*, vol. 4, f. 3v.

⁶⁶ In July and in October of 1386, he is mentioned as one of the tutors of the heirs of Raynaldus de Stambertis (*Praecepta rectoris*, vol. 3, ff. 13v, 57bis). In April 1387, he was appointed together with two other patricians “ad respondendum litteris Beliach et fratris ac etiam litteris ducalis domini Venetorum, atque litterarum d. Thome Petri et domini Mafioli archiepiscopi Ragusii” (*Reformationes*, vol. 27, f. 26; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 358).

⁶⁷ *Reformationes*, vol. 27, f. 54; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 466; B. Krekić, »Un mercante e diplomatico«: pp. 97-98. In April of the same year ser Lucas and another man sold their “barcium... Victori de Cauo de Venetiis” for 96 ducats (*Libri dotium*, vol. 2, f. 34rv).

Between 1386 and 1389, Bona was elected four times to the highest office in Dubrovnik, that of Rector of the city.⁶⁸ In addition to trade with Venice, he was also engaged in trade with the Levant and elsewhere, as becomes visible from an interesting document of 9 February 1390.⁶⁹ On that day, ser Lucas, his brother Marinus and three other Ragusan patricians—one of whom, Paulus de Gondola (Gundulić) we shall encounter again—on one side, and a group of four noblemen on the other, made a company for trade which ranged from sending merchants to “Sanctus Dymitrius” (Srijemska Mitrovica), to sending goods by sea to Senj, on the northern Croatian littoral. One of the companions was “ser Marinus de Caboga” who—as we shall see—played an important role among Ragusans in Venice at the time. He was supposed to send additional merchandise from Venice to Senj. From there, it was to be forwarded by a Venetian merchant to Buda, in Hungary. Things brought “de partibus Orientis” were also to be invested in the company, as well as merchandise that the companions had received from Venice, Florence and elsewhere.

Altogether, the first group, including ser Lucas de Bona, invested in the company the amount of 8,319 ducats. Two thousand ducats were to be sent to Venice to pay for the wares. The second group invested 2,130 ducats and one of its members was supposed to go to Buda to sell the goods and to invest the proceeds in other merchandise “et reducendum (eas) ad marinam”. Caboga, for his part, was supposed to buy the necessary merchandise in Venice. After the reimbursement of the capital, the first group was to receive two thirds of the profits, while the second group was to get one third. Losses were

⁶⁸ In December 1386, July 1387, November 1388 and June 1389 (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 3-4). In September 1384, ser Lucas was elected “advocatus maioris curie” and in 1385 he became “judex” and a member of the Senate, and remained in that body in 1386 (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 33, 141, 205, 292). In September of 1386 and again in 1388, Bona was made “advocatus curie petitionis” (*ibidem*, pp. 290, 421). In 1387, he became again a “judex” and stayed in the Senate (*ibidem*, pp. 326, 380). In 1389 he was one of the “procuratores Sanctae Mariae” and in July of that year he was again elected into the Senate, replacing another member of that body (*Praecepta rectoris*, vol. 3, ff. 241, 260v; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 561, 567, 569).

⁶⁹ Ser Lucas had suffered in 1383 losses at Rhodes and as late as 1391, he and ser Marinus de Bona were trying to recover, with the intervention of the Hungarian court, 28 bags of cotton that “fratres universitatis Rodi violenter predati fuerunt et abstulerunt”. See Bariša Krekić, *Dubrovnik (Raguse) et le Levant au Moyen Age*, Paris - The Hague: EPHE and Sorbonne, 1961: reg. nos. 370, 407.

to be divided: four fifths to the first, and one fifth to the second group.⁷⁰ This document confirms once again the complexity and the wide range of the Ragusan trade in the late fourteenth century, a trade in which ser Lucas de Bona was, obviously, a very active participant.

Bona, who, as already noted, was frequently engaged in Ragusan diplomatic activities, in January 1392 was in Venice and was charged, together with “ser Paulus de Gondola... ad faciendum ambassiatam comuni Venetiarum”.⁷¹ Next month, the Ragusan government wrote to the two of them and to a third Ragusan patrician in Venice, “ser Michael de Lucharis (Lukarević)... pro rebus et donis mittendis regi Bossine”, that is to say to the new Bosnian ruler, King Stjepan Dabiša. At the beginning of March, the Ragusans sent to Venice 500 ducats “pro emendo ... hensenia” for the Bosnian king.⁷² However, the ambassadors had also to take care of less pleasant business: a Ragusan “galeotta” had plundered “in partibus Sclauonie” a Venetian ship coming from Crete and, in May 1392, the Ragusan government ordered its ambassadors in Venice to see to it that Ragusan citizens in Venice reimburse all damages.⁷³ Bona’s stay in Venice was a rather long one this time. In the same month of May 1392, his brother, Marinus appointed him “suum ... procuratorem ... in civitate Venetiarum” and in July of the same year an arbiter decided a quarrel between ser Lucas and the Venetian “Çechinus Sauello ... de confinio S. Maphei de Rialto” concerning the unpaid rent for a house that Bona owned in Venice.⁷⁴

A little later, the Ragusan envoys in Venice were charged with another rather peculiar task. They had to ask, on behalf of the Ragusan monastery of St. Clara, “a domina Betta Superancio de Venetiis, unam planetam a sacerdote, unam dalmaticam a dyacono et unam strettam a subdyachono de velluto blauo, fulcitas perlis”. A late abbess of St. Clara had sent those things to Venice to Betta “ad aptandum et fulciendum perlis et aliis fulcimentis” and had bequeathed those garments to the monastery.⁷⁵ As we shall see later, the

⁷⁰ *Debita notariae*, vol. 10, ff. 47v-48v. In August 1390, Bona had suffered some losses “per Nicolam Glautum, patronum unius galee cursii” (*Reformationes*, vol. 28, f. 88v).

⁷¹ *Reformationes*, vol. 29, f. 29v.

⁷² *Ibidem*, ff. 33v, 90v.

⁷³ *Listine*, IV: p. 291.

⁷⁴ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 14; *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

⁷⁵ *Reformationes*, vol. 29, f. 132; *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 25rv.

ambassadors did not succeed in getting them back to Dubrovnik at this time.

I do not know how much longer ser Lucas stayed in Venice. Later mentions of his links to that city show him in Dubrovnik where, in 1396, he was appointing his procurators in Venice, especially “ad petendum, exigendum et recipiendum ... omnes et singulos affictus seu naulum domorum omnium dicti ser Luce” in the city of St. Mark. Bona died in 1417.⁷⁶

The two other Ragusan patricians mentioned at the time in the Venetian acts surveyed here were two members of the Gondola family. On 17 September 1392, in Venice, “ser Marinus de Gondola de Ragusio” authorized his distant relative, “ser Paulum de Gondola de Ragusio” to buy and sell goods and make other business deals on his behalf.⁷⁷ Ser Marinus’ de Gondola links with Venice started at least as early as 1376, when two brother-patricians of the Luccari family appointed him as their perocurator in Venice “ad petendum omnes affictus ... parcium nobis spectancium ... de domibus positus in Veneciis in contrata Sancti Bartholomei”.⁷⁸

In November of 1381, Gondola was one of three Ragusan noblemen in Venice whom the government of Dubrovnik instructed to immediately issue orders to all Ragusan citizens and merchants present in that city at the time and those who might come later, letting them know that they must not “vendere vel emere quicquid a forensibus in Venetiis pro abatendo id quod emerint ad ratam duc. auri XVM deputatorum et datorum nobis et reliquis Dalmatinis, secundum formam pactorum habitorum inter d. nostrum regem Vngarie ex parte una, et civitatem Venetiarum ex altera”. The three patricians were ordered to write to the government the names of all Ragusan merchants who had bought from or sold to foreigners in Venice any wares, the names of foreigners from whom they had bought or to whom they had sold those

⁷⁶ In April 1396, ser Lucas appointed a Venetian and a Ragusan patrician for this task (*Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 3rv). In July of the same year, ser Lucas’ representatives in Venice were authorized “(ad) mercandum cum prerogativis et gratiis concessis hiis qui emerunt domos in Venetiis” (*ibidem*, f. 7v; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: pp. 39-40). Lucas de Bona died in 1417 (I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, II: no. XI/3).

⁷⁷ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169. The two Gondolas were certainly Marinus Niffici (mentioned between 1363 and 1405) and Paulus Giue (mentioned from 1371 to 1416). See I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: pp. 272-276; II: no. XXXVI/2, 3.

⁷⁸ *Diversa notariae*, vol. 9, f. 156v; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 35. In the same year a man received in Dubrovnik from a patrician the amount of 229 ducats and 200 perpers “ad monetam Veneciarum ... pro cambio” that he was supposed to pay to ser Marinus in Venice (*Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 24, f. 179v).

goods, and what merchandise and how much they had sold and for what price.⁷⁹ The fact that Gondola was one of the three noblemen entrusted with such a difficult and delicate mission—no doubt connected with the conditions of the peace of Turin—certainly speaks for his remarkable standing among the Ragusans in Venice.

Continuing his stay in the city of St. Mark, in June of 1383 ser Marinus and another Ragusan patrician were supposed to help “magistrum Karolum Jacobi del Scanello de Bononia, rectorem scholarum” in Dubrovnik, to find in Venice “unum bonum hominem rasonatum, qui bene sciat tenere quaternos et rationes nostri comunis”. Should it prove impossible to find such a person in Venice, Karolus was allowed to look elsewhere.⁸⁰ Between September 1384 and May 1385, ser Marinus was in Dubrovnik, but in May of 1385 he and ser Paulus de Gondola were instructed to hire “magistrum Dyonisium, cirugicum, qui est Veneciis”. They were authorized to offer him up to 150-200 ducats per year and a house, an offer that “magister Dyonisius” accepted.⁸¹ In September of 1385, ser Marinus was still in Venice, but by September of 1386 he had returned to Dubrovnik and stayed there in subsequent years.⁸²

From a document of 1389, it is evident that ser Marinus de Gondola at the time was in Dubrovnik, but also that he was considered a Venetian citizen. Indeed, on 11 November of that year, thirteen men, described as “omnes cives Venetiarum” congregated in the Ragusan cathedral “pro electione unius consulis”. The list of thirteen names was headed by that of “ser Marinus de Gondola”. The group, which contained—among others—two goldsmiths, “ser

⁷⁹ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 177.

⁸⁰ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 332. It is interesting to note that a short time before this, in February of 1383, when they were looking for a chancellor, the Ragusans specified as qualifications that he should be “homo maturus, bone vite, condicionis et fame, habens etatem adminus annorum XXX et supra, et quod sit bonus gramaticus et dictator praticus”, but the first condition was that he could be “undecumque velit, dummodo non sit Venetus” (*ibidem*, pp. 311-312).

⁸¹ *Reformationes*, vol. 26, f. 25; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 171. The two Gondolas were first ordered to recruit “magistrum Johannem de Papia”, who had worked in Dubrovnik between 1376 and 1379 and maybe longer, but apparently they failed in that attempt, although Johannes de Papia later did return to Dubrovnik and worked there until 1415. “Magister Dionisius” came to Dubrovnik and stayed there at least until 1388 (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 170; Risto Jeremić and Jorjo Tadić, *Prilozi za istoriju zdravstvene kulture starog Dubrovnika*, II. Beograd: Biblioteka Centralnog higijenskog zavoda, 1939: pp. 16, 19).

⁸² *Sententiae cancellariae*, ser. 24, vol. 3, ff. 184-185v (SAD). In September of 1389 he was elected a senator (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 569).

Tura a clavis” and “ser Johanninum ab organis”, elected “post maturam deliberationem ... secundum ... consuetudinem civitatis Venetiarum” the goldsmith “Bartholomeus dela Donna” to be the new “consul civium Venetorum” in Dubrovnik.⁸³ It is interesting to note that ser Marinus acted here as a Venetian citizen, even though he belonged to one of the most prestigious Ragusan patrician families and had been elected into the Ragusan Senate just two months earlier.

Ser Marinus remained in Dubrovnik for quite a while. In April 1391, he received “in deposito” 110 ducats from a Venetian shipowner because of a “balla pannorum de pannis VI” which was missing and had been sent to Gondola from Venice by “ser Marinus de Chaboga”. It was stated, however, that, should it be found out that the merchandise had not been loaded on the ship or given to the shipowner in Venice, Gondola would have to return the money to the Venetian. Should it be proven that the wares had been loaded in Venice, the 110 ducats were to remain in his possession. Finally, if the “balla ... sex pannorum” was found in Dubrovnik, the informer was to be rewarded with 25 ducats.⁸⁴

By May 1392, however, ser Marinus de Gondola was back in Venice, where—together with four other Ragusan patricians—he had to deal with the above-mentioned plunder by a Ragusan ship “in partibus Sclauonie” of a Venetian vessel coming from Crete.⁸⁵ And, as earlier noted, it was in September 1392, in Venice, that ser Marinus authorized his distant cousin, “ser Paulum de Gondola”, to act on his behalf in that city. At some point between that time and December of 1395, ser Marinus had returned to Dubrovnik, but his contacts with Venice remained active. In December 1395, he appointed three Venetians as his representatives in that city: “nobilem virum dominum Benedictum domini Nicolai Contareno, Bonacursium de Veneciis, mercatorem ad ficus (sic!) et Chominum de Chominis, merchatorem in Veneciis” espe-

⁸³ *Diversa notariae*, vol. 10, f. 78. In his will of 28 September 1392, Bartholomeus mentions that “ser Marin de Gondolla” had given on his behalf to “ser Blasio Balderon”, to whom Bartholomeus owned 322 ducats, “per pegno uno zoyello de coralla in argento et coppa 1 de cristallo et doe noxe de India fornide cum argento” (*Testamenta notariae*, vol. 8, ff. 24v-25). In January of 1389, ser Marinus was proposed as one of the two ambassadors “ad dominum Ladislaum, banum Dalmacie et generalem capitaneum exercitus regii Vngarie”, but was not elected (*Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 502).

⁸⁴ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 29, f. 200.

⁸⁵ See above, n. 73.

cially to take care of problems that he had “cum Clemente aurifice de Veneciis, olim discipulo Bartholamei de la Dona, aurificis”.⁸⁶

Later documents also indicate that ser Marinus lived in Dubrovnik. Thus, on 1 January 1399 he and his brother Nicolaus appointed a Ragusan patrician as their agent in Venice.⁸⁷ Even more interesting is an act from October of the same year: “Symon Maglier de Prouencia, Judeus, habitator Taruixii, et Astrucho quondam Jacobi, dictus Bonauentura, Judeus de Chatholonia, habitator Padue” had bought from ser Marinus de Gondola “libras sexcentas tregintaunam et unzias tres chorallium” for 277 and 3/4 ducats. Ser Marinus had received immediately 50 ducats, and the rest was to be paid by 8 January 1400. Should the two merchants fail to pay, Gondola was authorized to “personaliter conveniri (eos) Ragusii, Padue, Veneciis, Taruixii, Chatllonie (sic!) et cetera”.⁸⁸ Ser Marinus’ links with Venice most probably did not cease et that point, but continued into the next century,⁸⁹ but that is outside the purview of this essay.

The other Gondola in Venice at this time, as already mentioned, was ser Marinus’ distant cousin, ser Paulus Giue de Gondola. He was in Venice as early as October 1381, when ser Martolus de Zrieua (Crijević) was sending him in Venice “libras XXX candelarum de sepo”.⁹⁰ In November of the same year ser Paulus was one of the three Ragusan patricians in Venice who were ordered by their government to enforce the observation of agreements between Venice and the Hungaro-Croatian king concerning trade with foreigners in the city of St. Mark, as noted above.⁹¹

On 27 January 1382 the Ragusan patrician, “ser Johannes de Volço” (Vlčević) was sending to Venice, on a ship owned by a man from Otranto, “ballas vigintiquinque coriorum buffalli et ballas tregintaduas coriorum bovis et ballas otto pellaminis montonini et ircini” which were to be given in Venice Paulo de Gondola. The same ship was carrying to Venice “duos panes (sic!) cere signatos suo signo, integres”, weighing 1054 “librarum ad pondus

⁸⁶ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 181.

⁸⁷ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 133v.

⁸⁸ *Libri dotium*, vol. 3, f. 25 a tergo. On “Astrucho Jacobi” in Dubrovnik at this time see Jorjo Tadić, *Jevreji u Dubrovniku do polovine XVII stoljeća*. Sarajevo: La Benevolencia, 1937: p. 18.

⁸⁹ He died in 1405 (I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, II: no. XXXVI/2).

⁹⁰ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 173.

⁹¹ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 177.

Ragusii”, that another Ragusan nobleman, ser Matheus de Georgio, was sending “ser Paulo de Gondola ibidem existenti”. Furthermore, ser Nichola de Gondola, Paulus brother, was sending to him and to ser Marinus de Gondola in Venice, on the same ship, “peçias plumbi integras centum et quinquaginta”.⁹² Ser Paulus was engaged also in financial transactions. Thus, in July of 1382, ser Jacobus de Gondola, another of Paulus brothers, received in Dubrovnik the amount of 170 ducats that ser Paulus had sent from Venice to ser Giue de Uolço.⁹³

Ser Paulus, like all other Ragusan noblemen, performed various tasks with which he was charged by the Ragusan government. Thus, in February 1385, Gondola was made by the Ragusan Minor Council “sindicus comunis” together with “ser Jacobus de Prodanello” (Prodančić). Their duty was to receive “pecunias et sacramentum a nobilibus captivis condam relassatis in civitate Venetiarum”. This refers, no doubt, to those Ragusan patricians who had been incarcerated in Venice during the war of Chioggia, as already mentioned.

Like other Ragusan noblemen that we have encountered, ser Paulus de Gondola moved with considerable ease between Dubrovnik and Venice. In June 1387, we find him in Dubrovnik, where he assigned to Lukša Desenović, from the island of Calamotta (Koločep) “milliaria quatuor plumbi ad pondus Ragusii”, which was to be taken to Brindisi and sold there. Should Lukša fail to sell the lead in Brindisi, he was to take it to Venice and sell it in that city.⁹⁵ In December of 1387, and again in January of 1389, ser Paulus was Rector of Dubrovnik.⁹⁶ Together with Lucas de Bona and other patricians, including his brother Jacobus, in February of 1390 ser Paulus was part of the company which traded all the way from the Levant to Venice and to Buda, of which we have spoken earlier. Continuing his stay in Dubrovnik, in January of 1391, ser Paulus received from “ser Johannes dictus Zambellus de Ripa de Mediolano, mercator ... petias viginti quatuor pannorum curtorum de Monza

⁹² *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 25, ff. 48v, 50.

⁹³ *Ibidem*, f. 116v.

⁹⁴ *Reformationes*, vol 26, f. 15v; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 153. We have already seen that, in May 1385, ser Paulus, together with ser Marinus de Gondola, was supposed to hire “magistrum Dyonisium cirugicum”.

⁹⁵ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 27, f. 4v, 80v; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp 3-4.

⁹⁶ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 3-4.

precio librarum trigintasex grossorum venetorum”. Ser Paulus promised to have this amount paid to Zambellus “per cambium in civitate Veneciarum” within eight days from his arrival in that city and of the presentation of Paulus’ letters, or to assign to him “in bancho in Veneciis” the money, “presentatis ipsis litteris cambii” that ser Paulus had given to Zambellus “pro ipsa pecunia ser Marino de Chaboga in Veneciis”.⁹⁷

By May 1392, ser Paulus was once again in Venice, where he participated in the already noted mission meant to appease the Venetians after the plunder of a ship of theirs by a Ragusan one “in partibus Sclauonie”. Also, together with ser Lucas de Bona and ser Marinus de Caboga, ser Paulus was charged by the Ragusan government with the task of recovering the garments for the monastery of St. Clara, as mentioned above. Finally, from September 1392, we have the Venetian document by which ser Marinus de Gondola made ser Paulus his representative in the city of St. Mark.⁹⁸

It is hard to say how long ser Paulus’ stay in Venice lasted this time. By December 1393, he was back in Dubrovnik, where he promised to provide “ad rippam ... XIII equos”, which were to be transported to Apulia on a Venetian ship,⁹⁹ but within two years ser Paulus was again in Venice, as is visible from a Ragusan act of 3 September 1395 detailing his dealings with the Florentine “Jouenchus de Bastariis” and with “dominus Zore, prot-houistiarius domini regis Bossine” concerning trade in Bosnian lead.¹⁰⁰ In March of 1397, ser Paulus de Gondola played a prominent role in the distribution to a number of people in Venice of bequests of the late ser Michael Nicole de Martinusso who had died in 1388 and of whom I have spoken earlier.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 29, f. 173v.

⁹⁸ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

⁹⁹ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 30, f. 92. Ser Paulus was in Dubrovnik in October 1394 (*Debita notariae*, vol. 11, f. 103).

¹⁰⁰ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 166v. See Bariša Krekić, »Trois fragments concernant les relations entre Dubrovnik (Raguse) et l’Italie au XIVe siècle.«, in: B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik, Italy and the Balkans*: II, pp. 29-30.

¹⁰¹ *Distributiones testamentorum*, vol. 5, f. 62rv. Among the recipients of Martinussius’ bequests were the “chamerarii comunis Venetiarum, Nicholetto Mecosso de Venetiis zimator, domina Maria, uxor quondam ser Nouelli de Çara, Marchus Johannis et Jacobus Vianar de Judaicha de Veneciis, ser Raymundinus de Magistris quondam ser Clementis de Judecha de Veneciis”.

One year later, however, he was a judge in Dubrovnik.¹⁰²

A third member of the Gondola family mentioned in Venetian documents at this time was “ser Johannes de Gondola”. In September of 1396, “ser Clemens de Cortexella, mercator de Cummis(?)” appointed two Venetians “specialiter ad petendum et exigendum a Johanne de Gondola, a Clemente de Bodaç (sic! Bodaça, Budačić) et a Michaele de Bona, mercatoribus de Ragusio” and from other persons, all the money and other goods that Cortexella was supposed to get in Venice and also to take care of his other business in that city.¹⁰³ Johannes de Gondola had been in Venice before this time. In 1394, when he was appointed as representative of “ser Clemens quondam domini Marini de Goçiiis”, he was called “nobilis juvenis” and was charged specifically to deal with Gozze’s houses and other real estate, merchandise and money “in civitate et ducatu Venetiarum”.¹⁰⁴ In March of 1396, Gozze again, “revocando omnes ... alios eius procuratores”, appointed “nobilem iuvenem Johannem, filium nobilis viri ser Jacobi de Gondulla, civitatis Ragusii” as his sole procurator in Venice, with similar tasks as before.¹⁰⁵ However, when “Marinus Goçcho quondam Clementis Clementis de Gociis” appointed Johannes as his procurator “in civitate et ducatu Venetiarum”, in April 1399, he was not called “iuvenis” any more, but his duties were very similar to earlier ones, especially concerning a house “in contrata Sancti Bartholamei” that Gozze owned together with some other Ragusan noblemen.¹⁰⁶

Of course, in addition to patricians, there is mention in Venetian acts of Ragusan commoners in Venice at this time. One such case is that of “Nicoletus de Stella, quondam ser Blasii de Ragusio, habitator Veneciarum in confinio S. Geremie”. He received, in March 1393, the amount of 100 ducats “a ser Clemente Paulo quondam domini Donati de eodem confinio ... ex causa mutui” for eight months. The agreement was repeated in more detailed form

¹⁰² *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 111. In December 1398 Paulus de Gondola had bought “pecias XXXII panni ... a ser Anthonio de Veneciis seu Signa” (Senj), which were sequestered by the authorities (*ibidem*, vol. 32, f. 207). Ser Paulus died in 1416 (I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, II: no. XXXVI/3).

¹⁰³ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹⁰⁴ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, ff. 121v-122; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 37.

¹⁰⁵ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 188rv; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 38.

¹⁰⁶ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 143rv; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 39.

two months later, when it was pointed out that Nicoletus had received those 100 ducats “ex causa mutui, profino (sic!) amore” and that he was going to keep them for eight months “pro meis utilitatibus”.¹⁰⁷

Certainly the most interesting and most important among the Ragusans in Venice in the late fourteenth century was “ser Marinus (Michaelis) de Caboga/Chaboga”. He is mentioned in a letter of 2 February 1394 of the Bosnian King Stjepan Dabiša to the Venetian Doge as “nobilis vir Marinus de Caboga, honorabilis civis et factor Ragusinus”,¹⁰⁸ but his contacts with Venice go back at least to 1382. In March of that year “ser Petrus de Saracha” received “pro cambio” in Dubrovnik 200 ducats from “ser Nicolaus de Menze” and promised “facere dari (eos) ser Marino de Chaboga ... recipienti in civitate Venetiarum”. By September of the same year Caboga was back in Dubrovnik and stayed there in subsequent years.¹⁰⁹ During that period he visited Apulia, was elected to the Senate and to the Minor Council and in March 1387, with two other noblemen, he was appointed “super exequis domine nostre domine regine Vngarie viam universe carnis ingresse, Jadre inhumate, que fuit consors domini regis Ludovici”, that is to say Queen Elisabeth, who was executed by rebellious Croatian noblemen in Novigrad near Zadar and buried in that city.¹¹⁰ In March 1389 ser Marinus was probably in Venice and in February of 1390, when he became a companion in the already-mentioned Ragusan company which traded with Venice, Buda and the Levant, he did it “per procuram”.¹¹¹

In Venice, ser Marinus was very active in financial transactions. At the beginning of March 1390, the patrician “Volčo de Babali” (Bobaljević) promised on behalf of “ser Helya de Saracha” to pay “ser Marino de Chaboga

¹⁰⁷ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169. On Nicolettus de Stella/Zvijezdić, see I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: pp. 66, 195.

¹⁰⁸ *Listine*, IV: p. 322.

¹⁰⁹ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 25, f. 71v; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 220 and passim.

¹¹⁰ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 178, 202, 205, 223, 354, 379, 381. In September of 1386, he was granted permission by the Minor Council to send “unum vas amurçe olei” to Venice (*Reformationes*, vol. 26, f. 80v; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 288). On the fate of Queen Elisabeth see N. Klaić, *Povijest Hrvata*: pp. 654-657; T. Raukar, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovlje*: p. 85.

¹¹¹ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: p. 542.

Venetiis” the amount of 398 1/4 ducats.¹¹² Three months later, Caboga was sending from Venice to “Aniça, uxor Radini Visinich” in Dubrovnik 60 ducats, that ser Marinus had received in Venice nomine ipsius Aniçe ut ei mittere deberet and in August 1390, Ostoja Nikolić received in Dubrovnik from “Collinus de Florentia” 150 ducats that he promised “assignari per cambium in Veneciis” to Marinus de Caboga. Ser Marinus, in turn, was supposed to pay this money “Marcho Mathei de Florencia” on behalf of Collinus.¹¹³

Caboga performed for Dubrovnik various other tasks, as required by the Ragusan government, whose representative in Venice he was already in 1390. Thus, in August of that year, when the Great Council was discussing the renewal of the contract, with the physician “magister Albertinus (de Chamurata, de Padua)”, it was specified that, should “ser Marinus de Chaboga, noster syndicus” in Venice hire another doctor before he received a letter from the government, magister Albertinus would be paid the salary for the time he had served and then let go.¹¹⁴ Later in the year, ser Marinus was instructed by the Minor Council to offer to “magister Petrus de Serçana” a salary of 400 ducats, rent for the house and expenses for the trip from Venice to Dubrovnik, and if Serçana refused the offer, Caboga was to negotiate with Albertinus de Chamurata, who had meanwhile left Dubrovnik. However, negotiations with Albertinus stretched into 1391 and even into 1392, and ser Marinus continued to play a key role as Ragusan representative in those contacts.¹¹⁵

I have already mentioned the case of the missing “balla pannorum” that Caboga had sent from Venice to ser Marinus de Gondola in Dubrovnik in April 1391. Continuing his role in financial matters, Caboga was involved in a transaction whose record, registered in Dubrovnik on 2 July 1391, in the presence of three Florentines, deserves to be quoted here in its entirety:

Al nome de Dio adi VIII de gungno (1391)

Pagati per questa prima a di XV vista a ser Marino de Caboga de Raugia ducati trecento setantacinque doro çoe ducati CCCLXXV,

¹¹² *Debita notariae*, vol. 10, f. 52rv.

¹¹³ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 29, ff. 107v, 126v.

¹¹⁴ *Reformationes*, vol. 28, f. 140; R. Jeremić-J. Tadić, *Prilozi za istoriju zdravstvene kulture starog Dubrovnika*, II: pp. 17-18.

¹¹⁵ *Reformationes*, vol. 29, ff. 5v, 11v, 33; R. Jeremić-J. Tadić, *Prilozi za istoriju zdravstvene kulture starog Dubrovnika*, II: p. 18.

sono per altrotanti che qua habiamo receuti da ser Andrea da Bolongna chancelier de Raugia e poni a conto di nostri de Firençe. Idio vi guardi.

Andrea de Jacobo e compagni in Raugia.

The letter was addressed “Paolo Deberto e Domenicho di Bartolameo e compagni in Vinecia”.¹¹⁶ This document shows not only the complexity of commerical networks and of credit transactions, but it also indicates that ser Marinus must have been a well-known and well-established financial operator in Venice to be granted a key role in such a multifaceted deal.

However, he did not neglect his other duties and in 1392 Caboga was one of the five Ragusan patricians who had to take care of problems created by the attack of a Ragusan ship on a Venetian one “in partibus Sclauonie” that I have already described. He was also one of three patricians who were charged to obtain the return to the monastery of St. Clara in Dubrovnik of sacerdotal garments which had been taken to Venice for repairs, as mentioned earlier.

Ser Marinus’ financial operations continued in 1393. In January a man from Ancona received from a Ragusan 50 ducats that he promised to give “Venetiis ser Marino da Chaboga in cambium” and in April, ser Nicolaus de Mençe, procurator ser Marini de Chaboga in Dubrovnik had given 481 ducats “Maro de Butro”, who promised to give the same amount to Caboga “in Venetiis per cambium”.¹¹⁷ Ser Marinus acted also as representative of distinguished foreigners in Venice—another indication of his prestige and standing in that city. Thus, on 24 September 1393, “Compagnus quondam Johannis de Florencia, merchator” appointed “ser Marinum quondam Michaelis de Chaboga de Ragusio” as his representative, especially to demand all of Compagnus’ moneys and other goods “a quibuscumque personis, universitatibus et societatibus in civitate Veneciarum”.¹¹⁸ In July of 1394, “ser Marinus quondam Michaelis de Chaboga de Ragusio” was made procurator of “Nicolaus quondam Zuzarelli de Ancona” with similar tasks.¹¹⁹

At that time, however, ser Marinus—in addition to his other activities in Venice—was involved in slave trade. Indeed on 2 December 1394 he sold

¹¹⁶ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 29, f. 224v.

¹¹⁷ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 30, ff. 11, 182v.

¹¹⁸ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 75.

¹¹⁹ *Ibidem*, f. 110v.

for 40 ducats “ser Antonio Arduino de confinio S. Petri de Castello ... unum sclavum tartarum vocatum Johannes”, about 11 years old.¹²⁰ Next month, in January 1395, the executors of the will “quondam ser Pauli Fero, olim de confinio S. Fantini” sold “ser Marino de Caboga, civi et habitatori Venetiarum, in confinio S. Tome ... unam sclavam tartaram, vocatam Bona”, about 18 years of age, for 56 ducats.¹²¹ Both these documents are, of course, of particular significance, because they show that ser Marinus was engaged in a specific kind of trade, but the second one is even more important, because in it Caboga is described not only as “habitor”, but also as “civis Venetiarum”. This is of special interest in view of his prominent role among the Ragusans in Venice and the fact that he was, as we have seen, “factor” and “sindicus” of the Ragusan government in that city, frequently called upon to perform various tasks for Dubrovnik.

Caboga’s stay and activity in Venice continued undiminished in 1395 and in the following years. From a document of 2 April 1395 in which he is again called “factor in Veneciis”, it is visible that ser Marinus had sent at the time “balle pannorum” to two Ragusan patricians.¹²² Next year, ser Marinus was for a while in Dubrovnik. On 10 June 1396, “Laurentius dictus Lauriça de Siruga de Ragusio, nunc habitator insule Laguste (Lastovo)” on his own behalf and on behalf “omnium ... suorum sotiorum de Lagusta qui recuperaverunt cum magnis laboribus et periculis aliqua coreda, res et bona unius magne navis a duabus arboribus et duobus timonis”, whose owner was “ser Petrus Caput Aurie de Veneciis, passe naufragium in mari ... circha insulam Laguste”, appointed “ser Marinum de Chaboga presentem”, (sc. in Dubrovnik) to seek and receive half of the goods that Lauriça and his companions had recovered from the ship. Those goods had been given to ser Marinus, who was “procurator ser Petri Caput Aurie et participum dicte navis”, and he was supposed to take

¹²⁰ *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹²¹ *Ibidem*. In January 1395, ser Marinus was appointed representative of the Ragusan patrician family Luccari in a controversy that they had with the Gozze family concerning a house in Venice. See B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 38, n. 193.

¹²² This operation provoked a controversy between the two patricians: ser Marinus de Bodaça was to receive six “balle”, which were “signate signo ipsius ser Marini”, but Caboga, in his letter to Bodaça, had written that he was sending him only five “balle”, and the same was contained “in polliça quam dedit ser Marinus de Caboga... scribano navis”. Since “una balla pannorum deficit” from those that Caboga had written he was sending to ser Stephanus de Luccari, the Ragusan court of justice decided that one “balla” shall be given to Luccari (*Sententiae cancellariae*, vol. 3, f. 151).

them to Venice.¹²³

Two months later, the Great Council of Dubrovnik with 56 out of 64 ballots, decided to give “ser Marino de Chaboga brigantinum unum minus”, which was in Ston (Stagno) at the time. The ship was given to him “pro eundo Venetias pro suis agendis”, but on condition that he receive on board all Ragusan merchants desiring to go with him “et totum argentum quod vellent mittere et portare”. This ship will be repaired—if necessary—and will travel at the expense of ser Marinus and the other merchants. On the way to Venice, the ship was allowed to carry only “argentum et habere et merchancias subtiles” while on the return trip all kinds of merchandise could be carried “ad rationem grossorum trium ad aurum pro singulla pecia panni de nabullo”. Should there be too many wares, beyond the ship’s capacity, “panni et fustanei” should be loaded first, “non charichando ferrum in illo”. From a marginal note we see that ser Marinus was given “brigantinum nostrum novum de banchis XVI pro eundo Venetias”.¹²⁴

In Venice, he resumed his important role among Ragusan merchants in that city. On 1 February 1397, “ser Pasqualis de Resta, civis et mercator de Ragusio” on one side, et “ser Gauze de Poza, civis et mercator de Ragusio” on the other—both of whom have been mentioned earlier—appointed Caboga to be their arbiter. On 26 February, “ser Michael de Bona quondam ser Marini, civis et mercator Ragusii”, as representative “ser Aluisii quondam domini Marini de Goziis, civis Ragusii”, joined the two compatriots in electing Caboga, adding that, at the time when Caboga had been appointed by Resti and Poça, “non fueram presens, aliis occupatus”. It was a rather complex case concerning the ownership “unius choche sive navis quadre ab uno themone, vocate Sancta Clara, Sancta Lucia et Sanctus Blasius”. Nevertheless, Caboga made his decision on the same day, 26 February 1397.

Two co-owners of the ship, brothers Gauze and Georgius de Poça had earlier loaned 500 ducats “ser Jacobello Bellegno de Veneciis”. Caboga declared that those ducats had been lent “de bonis dicte choche”. Consequently, ser Pasqualis de Resti was entitled to receive “pro XIII caratis quos habet in dicta chocha” (i. e. cca 270 ducats); Aluisius de Gozze was to receive “pro sex caratis” (cca 125 ducats) and the Poça brothers were supposed to received

¹²³ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 6v.

¹²⁴ *Reformationes*, vol. 30, ff. 131v-132.

“pro quinque caratis” (cca 105 ducats). The brothers had given “ad viagium Romanie, quando dicta chocha fuit naulizata Florentinis, butamen ad valorem ducatorum LXXX auri”. They had received this money from ser Pasqualis de Resti in Venice on his own behalf and on behalf of ser Aluisius de Gozze, co-owners of the ship. Should “ser Johannes de Gozzis” ever prove that he had given this money to the Poça brothers, they would be obliged to make the restitution to Resti and to ser Aluisius for their shares. In addition to this, “Petrellus Masi de Anchona fecerit alias unum cambium” of 200 ducats with Johannes de Gozze and with Georgius de Poça. Caboga now decided, should Petrellus at any time manage to convict “ser Georgium usque ad summam ducatorum quinquaginta auri vel circa”, that Resti, Aluisius de Gozze and the Poça brothers would have to pay to Petrellus the money in accordance with their shares of the ship, that is to say Resti 27 ducats, Aluisius 13 ducats and the Poças 10 ducats.¹²⁵

At the time when he was engaged in arbitrating this complex controversy, ser Marinus de Caboga had other dealings with ser Pasqualis de Restis. On 2 February 1397 Resti declared in Venice that Caboga had given the previous day “plezariam ad dominos iudices petitionum” for Resti, concerning an accusation that “ser Christoforus Memo(?) de Veneciis” had moved against Resti in that court. Since the case “spectaverit et spectet ad me totaliter et non ad vos”, ser Pasqualis exonerated Caboga from all damages related to this case and promised to reimburse any amounts of money that Caboga might be forced to pay.¹²⁶

From everything that was mentioned here, it seems obvious that ser Marinus Michaelis de Caboga was one of the most prominent, if not the most prominent Ragusan in Venice in the late fourteenth century. His activities continued into the fifteenth century, but that is beyond the framework of this article. Among other Ragusan patricians active in Venice at the time, ser Pasqualis de Resti—whom we have encountered in Venice already in 1388-1389—deserves special note. Although his role in Venice in the 1390s was not particularly significant and was mostly connected with activities of other Ragusan patricians in that city, ser Pasqualis was destined to become a little later one of the most distinguished Ragusan noblemen. Between 1393 and

¹²⁵ *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*. Ser Marinus de Caboga is mentioned until 1409 (I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, II: no. XV/2).

1437 he was elected senator thirty three times and Rector sixteen times. In addition, he became a “miles” of the king of Hungary and Croatia.¹²⁷

Mentions of women were much more rare, because women, as a rule, did not engage in trade and in financial operations as much as men did, although there were exceptions. Such was the case, for instance, of the famous Ragusan noble woman “Philippa de Mençe”, one of the richest persons in Dubrovnik in the second half of the fourteenth century. Phillipa had lively contacts with Venice, where she owned several houses and where her daughter was married to Lodovico Cornaro, member of one of the most prestigious Venetian patrician families.¹²⁸ Far from that level of wealth and influence was “Cristina ... filia ser Jacobi de Ragusio”, who was married to “Antonius Moresco quondam ser Philippi, de confinio SS. Apostolorum”. On 28 January 1395, her husband granted “dilecte uxori mee ... plenam securitatem ... de tota illa repromissa quam tempore nostre desponsationis et pacti matrimonii inter nos” had been made by “ser Marcus de Anselmo Sancte Marine” in the amount of 200 ducats.¹²⁹

Among the Ragusan patricians mentioned in Venetian documents in the late fourteenth century, two additional members of the Bona family must be noted, two distant cousins, “ser Michael quondam Junii de Bona” and “ser Michael Marini de Bona”. Ser Michael Junii was in Venice at least as early as 1383. In May of that year, his brother “ser Simon de Bona” was allowed by the Ragusan Minor Council to send from Dubrovnik to ser Michael in Venice “caseos septem”.¹³⁰ But in the next year, 1384, ser Michael had a very

¹²⁷ Bariša Krekić, »Influence politique et pouvoir économique à Dubrovnik (Raguse) du XIIIe au XVIe siècle«, in B. Krekić, *Dubrovnik: A Mediterranean Urban Society*: I, p. 251. See also Zdenka Janeković Römer, *Okvir slobode: Dubrovačka vlastela između srednjovjekovlja i humanizma*. Zagreb - Dubrovnik: Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku, 1999: pp. 248, 356.

¹²⁸ On Philippa de Mençe see I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: pp. 332, 335; Dušanka Dinić-Knežević, *Položaj žena u Dubrovniku u XIII i XIV veku*. Beograd: SANU, 1974: pp. 53-59; Zdenka Janeković Römer, »Noble Women in Fifteenth-Century Ragusa.« *East Central Europe - L'Europe du Centre Est* 20-23/1 (1993-96): pp. 141-170.

¹²⁹ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹³⁰ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, I: p. 328. Earlier, in April of 1381, ser Michael was in Ancona where, together with “Ostoya Crancouich”, he was supposed to stay until the end of September and “facere facta omnium Ragusinorum qui eos vel eorum aliquem requisiverint”. Penalty for breaking this order was 300 perpers (cca 120 ducats) for ser Michael and 200 perpers (cca 80 ducats) for Kranković. Their salary was to be “tantum quantum solebant habere factores Ragusini in Veneciis”. During his stay in Ancona, as “sindicus comunis” ser Michael hired “ser Andream

unpleasant experience. On the last day of that year, the Great Council was debating what to do about the situation which had arisen when “malefactores ... acceperant furtive 1 barcham de nostro portu et eundo versus Venetias raubaverunt quandam nostrorum barcham omnibus mercibus et ceperunt in captivum ser Michaelem de Bona, venientem de Venetiis”. It was proposed to send ser Michael’s brother, Simon, with an armed ship “ad recuperandum fratrem suum” and the stolen merchandise. The state was going to pay the expenses for food, because ser Michael “mixit aliam barcham suis expensis cum litteris nostris dicta de causa”. This was refused and it was decided by 45 out of 60 ballots, to send ser Simon “ad requirendum nomine comunis quod iusticia manifestetur de malefactoribus”. The state was going to pay for his food and transportation. Should those “detinentes dictos malefactores” refuse to administer justice to the criminals at ser Simon’s request, he was authorized to promise up to 300 ducats “ita quod iusticia ministretur” (initially it was written “in habendo eos et reducendo in nostris manibus”, but that was modified).

As is visible from decisions taken at the same time in the Ragusan Senate, ser Michael de Bona was not the only Ragusan patrician who had been captured by “malefactores”, and the “malefactores” seem to have been people from Kotor. The Senate decided to send someone to Venice (not to Padua as well, as originally proposed) “super consilio et iudicio rerum captarum in galea nobilium nostrorum captivorum illorum de Catharo”. Indeed, a few days later, on 11 January 1385, it was decided to send “galeatam” to Venice with the order “quod non inferat mala aliquibus, sed recte vadat viagium suum”.¹³¹

However, ser Michael and ser Simon had also a controversy with a group of French noblemen who were prisoners in Dubrovnik at this time.¹³² On 28 and 29 March, and again on 1 April 1385, the Great Council discussed “super lite nobilium (Francigenarum) et illorum de Bona”, that is to say ser Michael and his brother ser Simon. It was proposed that the Council should

olim Dominici ... pro cancellario comunis” (*ibidem*, pp. 127, 170). Ser Michael was the one who sent, in the summer of 1381 merchandise from Ancona to Zadar and from there to Hungary, on behalf of ser Lucas and ser Simon de Bona, who paid in Dubrovnik the customs fees of 3% for that operation (*ibidem*, p. 335).

¹³¹ *Reformationes*, vol. 26, ff. 13, 111v-112; *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 53, 112, 149.

¹³² On the French captives in Dubrovnik see Jorjo Tadić, *Promet putnika u starom Dubrovniku*. Dubrovnik: Turistički savez, 1939: pp. 220-224.

set up a committee of three officials to examine the case and in the meantime that the French noblemen should give guarantees in Dubrovnik “quod ipsi deponent Venetiis” the amount of money sufficient to cover the damages and expenses that ser Simon and ser Michael had suffered. This delaying proposal was rejected and the Great Council decided by 33 out of 49 ballots that “nobiles Francigene” must fully reimburse the Bona brothers.¹³³

Ser Michael de Bona continued his stay in Dubrovnik in 1385 and in 1386, but in early May of 1387 he was again in Venice. On 2 May 1387, Žore Bokšić had received 70 ducats from the Ragusan patrician ser Matheus de Georgio and had promised to deliver this money in Venice to ser Matheus or to whom-ever he ordered. In the meantime, “ser Matheus, pro dictis ducatis LXX ... dixit habere penes se circha milia novem plumbi dicti Zore”, which was supposed to be sent to Venice.¹³⁴

Indeed, two months later ser Matheus sent the lead to Venice “in manibus ser Micaelis de Bona”. One day after the deal was made between Žore Bokšić and ser Matheus de Georgio, on 3 May 1387, “magister Franciscus pavesarius” from Bologna, a longtime resident of Dubrovnik, declared that he had sent in February of the same year “ballas X coriorum et pellium ad manus ser Michaelis de Bona” in Venice, at the insistence of ser Matheus de Georgio. Should they be sold for less than 70 ducats, Franciscus would reimburse Georgio for the difference, but should they be sold for more than 70 ducats, the surplus was to belong to Franciscus.¹³⁵

However, ser Michael returned to Dubrovnik rather soon and there he was engaged in local administration in 1387, 1388 and 1389.¹³⁶ I was not able to find information about his activities in Venice until the end of September 1395. At that time, “ser Michael quondam Junii de Bona de Ragusio, habitator Veneciarum in confinio S. Thome” appointed as his representatives in Venice “ser Ambrosium de Puteo Bonello, de confinio S. Canciani, ser Blasium

¹³³ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 122-125.

¹³⁴ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 200-201, 204, 209, 222, 244; *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 26, f. 186. On Žore Bokšić see Desanka Kovačević, »Žore Bokšić, dubrovački trgovac i protovestijar bosanskih kraljeva.« *Godišnjak Društva istoričara BiH* 13 (1962): pp. 289-310.

¹³⁵ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 26, f. 186v. “Franciscus pavesarius” came to Dubrovnik in 1371 and remained there for over thirty years. See Vojislav Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*. Beograd: SANU, 1964: p. 17.

¹³⁶ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke Republike*, II: pp. 373, 380, 386, 469, 536, 568, 587.

Baldironum de confinio S. Symeonis profete et ser Bonacursum cimatorem de confinio S. Appollinaris” to take care of all his goods and his business in Venice.¹³⁷ In March of 1396 he was in Dubrovnik. Together with his brother, ser Simon and another patrician, he appointed as procurator in Venice “ser Gauççe de Poçça”. Poça was especially instructed “ad petendum ... emendam et satisfactionem unius balle frustaneorum dictorum sociorum” for the value of 82 ducats, which had been “derobata ... super quandam marcilianam Venetorum per quoddam brigentinum de Sibinicho, super quo erat patronus Andreas Georgii Lubich de Sibinicho”.¹³⁸ Next month, ser Lucas de Bona, whom we have already mentioned, appointed “ser Michaellem de Bona” and a Venetian his representatives in Venice.¹³⁹

In July of 1396, “ser Pasqualis de Rasti” made ser Michael his procurator, especially “coram iudicibus quibuscumque seu officialibus ducalis domini” in the litigation that Resti was going to have with “ser Christoforo Minio de Venetiis tamquam procuratore domini Busicaldi de Busicaldis, militis de Francia”.¹⁴⁰ Later on in the same year, ser Michael de Bona and two other Ragusan patricians in Venice were involved—as we have already seen—in a controversy with “ser Clemens de Cortexella”.¹⁴¹ It is probable that in 1397 ser Michael was at least for a while in Dubrovnik. However, by December of 1398, he was back in Venice and was charged by the Ragusan government, together with “ser Marinus de Rasti” “ut ipsi procurent cum affinibus et amicis” to hire for service in Dubrovnik “magistrum Anthonium physicum in Jadra” (Zadar). They were authorized to offer him a salary of 400 ducats a year and 12 ducats for the rent of the house, but it seems that this attempt failed.¹⁴² That is—for now at least—the last information that I have on ser Michael Junii de Bona’s presence in Venice in the late fourteenth

¹³⁷ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169. Two years later, in September of 1397, ser Michael de Bona appointed as his representatives in Venice with similar tasks the same “ser Blasium..., ser Bonacursum, cimatorem de confinio S. Mafei de Riualto et Laurentium Florauanti S. Siluestri”. Ser Blasius alone had the special authorization “ad ponendum et extrahendum denarios de bancho et argentum presentandum et vendendum” (*ibidem*).

¹³⁸ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 188v.

¹³⁹ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 3rv.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, f. 7v.

¹⁴¹ *Notaia - Cancellaria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹⁴² *Reformationes*, vol. 31, f. 40rv. See R. Jeremić-J. Tadić, *Prilozi za istoriju zdravstvene kulture starog Dubrovnika*, II: pp. 19-20.

century, but it is quite possible that his activity in that city continued into the early fifteenth century.¹⁴³

There was, however, yet another “ser Michael de Bona” in Venice in the 1390s. On 9 July 1395, “Jouenchus Philipi de Bastariis de Florencia”, whom we have earlier encountered, and “ser Aluysius quondam ser Marini de Goçiiis” made an agreement, by which the Florentine promised to Gozze “facere dari et assignari in Veneciis ser Michaeli de Bona, nomine dicti ser Aluysii” the amount of 448 ducats.¹⁴⁴ This “ser Michael de Bona” is no doubt identical with the one whom, on 3 November 1396, “ser Aluysius de Goççiiis de Ragusio” as “dominus et parcionalis pro sex karatis unius choche ... ad presens existentis ad scholium Chrome” appointed to be his procurator, with the special task of demanding money and other things that ser Aluysius was supposed to get “in civitate et ducatu Venetiarum pro naulis et pro dictis VI karatis” and who is called “ser Michael quondam Marini de Bona”.¹⁴⁵ In January of 1397, Gozze ordered Bona to sell his “sex karatos” of the said ship, “ad presens existente Veneciis”.¹⁴⁶ As we have mentioned above, ser Michael Marini de Bona was one of the Ragusan patricians in Venice, who, in February 1397, together with Pasqualis de Resti and Gauze de Poça appointed ser Marinus de Caboga as their arbiter in a complex deal concerning the ship. It is worth noting that, in November 1396, the abbess of the Ragusan monastery of St. Clara together with her nuns, appointed “ser Michaelem quondam ser Marini de Bona” to try to retrieve from the executors of the will “quondam nobilis domine Beth Superancio de Veneciis” the ecclesiastical garments that the Ragusan envoys—as we have seen—had tried to obtain from Betta herself in 1392, and obviously had failed.¹⁴⁷

One more Ragusan patrician who appeared in 1396 and 1397 mentioned in Venetian documents surveyed here was ser Clemens de Bodaça, a highly regarded nobleman who was active on the Ragusan political scene for almost

¹⁴³ Michael Junii de Bona died in 1411 (I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, II: no. XI/2).

¹⁴⁴ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 31, f. 162v.

¹⁴⁵ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 64v.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, f. 74.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, f. 67v. It is interesting to note that Irmgard Mahnken, in her fundamental study of the Ragusan patriciate in the fourteenth century, has missed “ser Michaelem Marini de Bona” who should probably be added to the children of ser Marinus, mentioned between 1363 and 1417. See I. Mahnken, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, I: p. 490; II: no. XI/1 and XI/6.

forty years and was eight times Rector of the city between 1392 and 1430. He was involved in 1397 in the controversy with “ser Clemens de Cortexella” that I have discussed earlier.¹⁴⁸ During the previous year, 1396, he had been appointed by his mother, “domina Hellena, relicta quondam Frane de Bodaça” to be her representative in Venice, especially to rent, collect income etc. from all her houses and possessions “in Venetiis et ducatu Venetiarum”.¹⁴⁹

In addition to the patricians discussed above, I shall mention three commoners from Dubrovnik whose traces I found in Venetian documents. One of them was “Marcus de Ragusio” who is called “olim misseta” in an act of October 1396.¹⁵⁰ The other is a woman, “domina Decho, relicta Michaelis de Passera de Ragusio” who, on 23 March 1397, appointed “ser Michaletum Quirino et ser Marinum Quirino, fratres de confinio S. Tome et dominam Beruziam Capello de confinio S. Pauli” to take care of all her possessions in Venice.¹⁵¹ Finally, the third is “Dimitrius marinarius quondam Dapichi de Narente de Ragusio, habitator Veneciarum in confinio S. Siluestri”, who, on 28 April 1397, granted “securitatem ... tibi Catherine, dilecte uxori mee, filie quondam Pauli de Modrussa” for the “repromissa” of 100 ducats that, at the time of their marriage, “Damianus Rodulfi de Luca” had promised to Dimitrius.¹⁵²

Of course, the Ragusans mentioned in this article constitute only a small fraction of the sizeable Ragusan presence in Venice in the fourteenth century. As stated at the beginning, far from exhausting the subject, my intention was only to add a few names found in some Venetian archival series and supplemented by documents from Dubrovnik. Still, it seems to me that some rather interesting conclusions can be drawn from the material presented here. Among the commoners, there were very few craftsmen and seamen and it would seem that the vast majority of commoners were not rich or especially active in trade. However, men such as Helyas de Radoano and Marinus de Radeno certainly did play a significant role among the Ragusans in Venice and were involved in many commercial operations. As mentioned above, the behavior of some Ragusans in Venice was less than exemplary and some

¹⁴⁸ B. Krekić, »Influence politique«: p. 251.

¹⁴⁹ *Diversa cancellariae*, vol. 33, f. 50; B. Krekić, »Venetians in Dubrovnik«: p. 33.

¹⁵⁰ *Notaia - Cancelleria inferiore*, busta 169.

¹⁵¹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁵² *Ibidem*.

of them suffered harsh punishment at the hands of Venetian authorities. It is noteworthy that all those transgressors were commoners, although the noblemen constituted a substantial portion of the Ragusans in Venice.

Indeed, over a third of the persons whose activities were surveyed here were patricians. Furthermore, many of those noblemen were engaged in Venice in joint business ventures, especially in the last decades of the fourteenth century. This confirms once again how tightly linked the Ragusan patrician class was and how closely their business networks were intertwined. At the same time, however, it seems obvious that the Ragusans were very much open to communication and business deals with their Venetian and other counterparts and that they were ready to collaborate with them whenever it appeared to be profitable.

Two other points need to be made when it comes to patricians in particular. The first is that they always remained loyal to Dubrovnik and were willing to perform any mission with which the Ragusan government charged them. This was a general characteristic of the Ragusan nobility—as it was of the Venetian one as well—but it is worth noting it here, because we are dealing with relations between two maritime republics which had a perennial “love-hate” relationship, and constantly moved between collaboration and competition. A man like ser Marinus de Caboga, in such circumstances, had certainly to display considerable diplomatic skills—in addition to his business acumen—to satisfy the requirements of his government, while avoiding damage to his other interests.

The second point is the ease with which these people, particularly the nobles, moved between Dubrovnik and Venice. They were, in fact, only a small portion of the constant movement of persons between the two cities, but one must keep in mind that many from among those same people travelled also to Southern Italy, to the Eastern and Western Mediterranean and to the Balkan hinterland. In view of the precarious means of communication and of the risks of travel, one cannot but be impressed when realizing how frequently and tirelessly they undertook such trips.

On the whole, I think that much of what was stated above confirms what Lovorka Čoralić had found and exposed in greater detail in her two articles on the Ragusans in Venice in general, especially in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Their presence and their activity already in the fourteenth century in the city of St. Mark, one of the most vibrant commercial, artistic and in-

tellectual centers of the Mediterranean world at the time,¹⁵³ no doubt contributed to the maintenance of good—thought not always particularly friendly—links between the two maritime republics in a period when their mutual relations were undergoing very important and delicate transformations.

¹⁵³ See Lovorka Čoralić, »Manje poznati dalmatinski slikarski umjetnici i majstori u Veneciji od 14. do 18. stoljeća.« *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 34 (1994): pp. 335-355. On Venice at this time see, among many other works, *La civiltà veneziana del Trecento*. Venezia: Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 1956; Manfredo Tafuri, *Venezia e il Rinascimento: religione, scienza, architettura*. Torino: G. Einaudi, 1985; Giorgio Cracco, *Un "Altro mondo": Venezia nel medioevo*. Torino: Utet, 1986: esp. pp. 113-148; Dennis Romano, *Patricians and Popolani: the Social Foundations of the Venetian Renaissance State*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1987; Stefano Piasentini, *Alla luce della luna: I furti a Venezia (1270-1403)*. Venezia: Il Cardo, 1992; *Maestri, scuole e scolari a Venezia fino al 1500*, ed. Gherardo Ortalli. Venezia: Neri Pozza, 1993; Dieter Girgensohn, *Kirche, Politik und adelige Regierung in der Republik Venedig zu Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts*, I-II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996; *Storia di Venezia dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima*, III: *La formazione dello stato patrizio*, ed. G. Arnaldi, G. Cracco and A. Tenenti. Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia italiana, 1997.