

Original paper
UDC 821.163.42-822(082)
821.124(497.5)-822(082)
821.124-822(082)

DUBROVNIK IN THE CORPUS OF EASTERN ADRIATIC HUMANIST *LAUDATIONES URBIUM*

NEVEN JOVANOVIĆ

ABSTRACT: A digital text collection *Laudationes urbium Dalmaticarum* gathers and makes freely accessible and searchable 69 Latin texts by 53 authors that praised the cities of the Eastern Adriatic coast in the period 1268-1608. 'Praise of cities' is any description or mention of an Eastern Adriatic city or region, in a literary text written in Latin, that can be interpreted as a compliment (or its antithesis, a criticism). The following cities and regions are praised (listed in geographical order, from North to South): Trieste, Istria, Kopar, Dalmatia, Zadar, Šibenik, Trogir, Split, Brač, Hvar, Korčula, Ston, Dubrovnik, Kotor, and Shkodër. Most often praised is the city of Dubrovnik, with 32 texts in its honour. Next comes Split (10 texts). Dalmatia as a region is praised in seven texts, Istria in three. We examine the authors' relationship to the cities praised and the genres of the texts, with a short discussion of the three criticisms (all directed to Dubrovnik). Finally, we show (on the example of Dalmatia, Istria, Dubrovnik, Hvar, and Split) how a simple collocation analysis reveals the key terms pointing to universally accepted ideas about the identities of the places of the Eastern Adriatic.

Key words: civic praise, Dalmatia, digital collection, Dubrovnik, Neo-Latin literature, occasional poetry, Renaissance city, Split

Aiming to improve our knowledge of how Renaissance civic communities were represented and imagined, in 2010 a digital collection was put together; freely available online under the title *Laudationes urbium Dalmaticarum*,¹ the

¹ It is a subset of the digital collection *Croatiae auctores Latini*, ed. Neven Jovanović et al., Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, www.ffzg.unizg.hr/klafil/croala. The texts, some digitized from older and not easily accessible editions, others in new scholarly editions, are encoded according to TEI XML standard, and deployed by PhiloLogic, a full-text search, retrieval and analysis system.

Neven Jovanović, lecturer at the Department of Classical Philology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Address: Lučićeva 3, HR-10000 Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: neven.jovanovic@ffzg.hr Neven Jovanović

collection contains Latin texts which praise the cities of the Eastern Adriatic coast. At the moment there are 69 such documents written by 53 authors spanning over three and a half centuries (1268-1608). Here we briefly present the collection and sketch the prominent place occupied in it by the city-state of Dubrovnik, demonstrating at the same time the lines of research possible with a significant number of standardised digital texts at our disposal.

Introducing the collection

The histories of Croatian literature and culture usually qualify eight texts as “praise of Dalmatian cities” in Latin.² These best-known *laudationes* will be our entry points to the collection. They are, in chronological order:

1. Filippo Diversi (Lucca, c. 1390 - Venice, after 1455), *Situs aedificiorum, politiae et laudabilium consuetudinum inclitae civitatis Ragusii* (1440)³
2. Juraj Šižgorić (Šibenik, c. 1445-1509?), *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici* (1487)⁴
3. Michele Marullo Tarcaniota (Greece, 1461? - near Volterra, 1500), a lyric poem *De laudibus Rhacusae* (before 1489)⁵

² For a standard overview of Dalmatian humanism see Il'ja Golenishchev-Kutuzov, *Il Rinascimento italiano e le letterature slave dei secoli XV e XVI*. Milano: Vita e pensiero, 1973. There are praises in Croatian and Italian as well. The most famous *laudatio* in Croatian is the poem *U pohvalu grada Dubrovnika* (c. 1520) by Hanibal Lucić from Hvar (1485-1553). An interesting praise of Split in Italian, by Antonio Proculiano from Bar, was printed in Venice in 1567: *Oratione al clarissimo m. Giovan Battista Calbo degnissimo rettor, et alla magnifica comunita di Spalato*. Proculiano's speech follows the model of Bruni's praise of Florence.

³ »Philippi de Diversi Situs aedificiorum politiae et laudabilium consuetudinum inclitae civitatis Ragusii ad ipsius senatum descriptio«, ed. Vitaliano Brunelli, *Programma dell'I.R. Ginnasio Superiore in Zara* 23 (1879-80); Filip de Diversis, *Opis slavnoga grada Dubrovnika iz 1440. godine. (Philippi de Diversi de Quartigianis Lucensis artium doctoris eximii et oratoris Situs aedificiorum, politiae et laudabilium consuetudinum inclitae civitatis Ragusii)*, ed. Zdenka Janeković Römer. Zagreb: Dom i svijet, 2004; Zdenka Janeković-Römer, »The Orations of Philip Diversi in Honour of the Hungarian Kings Sigismund of Luxemburg and Albert of Hapsburg: Reality and Rhetoric in Humanism«. *Dubrovnik Annals* 8 (2004): pp. 43-79. Diversi's text, as well as all the others discussed in this article, is included in the *Croatiae auctores Latini* collection.

⁴ A modern edition (Latin with facing Croatian translation): Juraj Šižgorić Šibenčanin, *O smještaju Ilirije i o gradu Šibeniku*, ed. Veljko Gortan. Šibenik: Muzej grada Šibenika, 1981.

⁵ Marullo, Michele, *Michaelis Marulli Carmina*, ed. Alessandro Perosa. Turici: in aedibus Thesauri mundi, 1951; Carol Kidwell, *Marullus. Soldier Poet of the Renaissance*. London: Duckworth, 1989; Karl Enenkel, *Die Erfindung des Menschen: Die Autobiographik des frühneuzeitlichen Humanismus von Petrarca bis Lipsius*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008: pp. 368-428.

4. Ilija Crijević (Dubrovnik, 1434-1520), a lyric poem *Ocelle mi, Ragusa...* (1495) and the epic *De Epidaurō* (c. 1505)⁶
5. Palladio Fosco (Padova, c. 1450 - Koper, 1520), *De situ orae Illyrici* (before 1509, published in Rome 1540)⁷
6. Vinko Pribojević (Hvar, d. after 1532), *Oratio de origine successibusque Slavorum* (1522, published in Venice 1525)⁸
7. Ivan Bolica (Kotor, c. 1520-1572), an epic poem *Descriptio Ascriviensis urbis* (c. 1538-1551)
8. Didacus Pyrrhus (Ebora, 1517 - Dubrovnik, 1599), *De illustribus familiis quae hodie Rhacusae exstant ad amplissimum Senatū elegia* (published in Krakow and Venice 1582)⁹

Four of these writings (1, 2, 5, 6) are prose chorographies, descriptions of regions. The description of Dubrovnik by Diversi is rich and detailed (and much used by modern historians). Texts by Šižgorić and Pribojević present their respective home towns, Šibenik and Hvar, as parts of a broader picture; for Šižgorić it is Dalmatia, for Pribojević the whole Slavic world. The five poetic texts include Marullo's lyric contrast of the peace in Dubrovnik with the revolutions in Naples, and a jambic ode on Dubrovnik by Crijević, an intertextual dialogue with Marullo's poem.¹⁰ Crijević left also an unfinished epic *De Epidaurō* (573 hexameters), where a description of the city and its surroundings is combined with a story of the mythical origins of Dubrovnik.

⁶ Recent critical edition of Crijević's Latin poems: Darko Novaković, »Autografi Ilije Crijevića (I): Vat. lat. 1678.« *Hrvatska književna baština* 3 (2004): pp. 9-22.

⁷ Cf. Salvatore Sabbadini, »Palladio Fosco e il suo *De situ orae Illyrici*«. *Archeografo triestino*, ser. 3, 12 (1926): pp. 176-208; text with Croatian translation: Paladije Fusko, *Opis obale Ilirika*, ed. Bruna Kuntić-Makvić, Zagreb: Latina et Graeca, 1990.

⁸ Latin with Croatian translation: Vinko Pribojević, *O podrijetlu i zgodama Slavena = De origine successibusque Slavorum*, ed. Grga Novak and Veljko Gortan. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1951; cf. Domagoj Madunić, »Strategies Of Distinction In The Work Of Vinko Pribojević«, in: *Whose love of which country? Composite states, national histories and patriotic discourses in early modern East Central Europe*, ed. Balázs Trencsényi and Márton Zászkaliczky. Leiden-Boston, Mass.: Brill, 2010, 177-202.

⁹ On Didacus Pyrrhus cf. George Hugo Tucker, »Didacus Pyrrhus Lusitanus (1517-99), poet of exile« *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 41 (1992): pp. 175-198; Darko Novaković, »Didacus Pyrrhus as *luser amorum*«. *Euphrosyne*, n. s., 26 (1998): pp. 399-408.

¹⁰ Didacus Pyrrhus, composing his *Ad Paulum* in 1563, will also mention Marullo's ode: *Decantata boni numeris Racusa Marulli*.

The same themes were tackled in an elegy by Didacus Pyrrhus, a Portuguese Jew living in Dubrovnik. Finally, Bolica wrote a descriptive hexameter topography of the Bay of Kotor and the city of Kotor itself.

The short list of *laudationes urbium* presented above called to be expanded: there are more cities on the Eastern Adriatic coast (where are Split, Trogir, Zadar?). Moreover, a working definition was also needed: what exactly do we mean by *laudatio urbis*?

Presenting the collection

For our research, a *laudatio* is any description or mention of an Eastern Adriatic city or region, in a literary text written in Latin, that can be interpreted as a compliment—or its antithesis, a criticism. Respective text can be long or short, whole or fragmentary. We include works which are literary only in a wider sense, such as topographies, e.g. the one of Istria by Flavio Biondo in *Italia illustrata* (1448), or the passage on Dubrovnik by Giacomo Filippo Foresti da Bergamo in the *Supplementum chronicharum* (1483). On the other hand, we leave out official and notarial documents, praise of civic patron saints,¹¹ as well as Croatian or Italian writings, and non-verbal material.¹²

The majority of the texts in the collection (62 of 69) was created between 1435 and 1608. The Latin praise of Eastern Adriatic cities seems to be at its height well after the period 1409-1420; that is, after most of the coastal cities (except for Dubrovnik) became part of the Venetian *Stato da Mar*, and after the first Ottoman-Venetian War (1423-1430). Furthermore, a significant number of texts (32) were written between 1460 and 1525. It is useful to remember that 1526 is the year of the Hungarian defeat by the Ottoman forces in the Battle of Mohács, and that in 1527 Dubrovnik achieved its definitive independence from the Hungarian and Croatian king. An eighteen-year gap, during which there were no praises that we know of, falls in 1582-1600. These are the years of relative peace in the Mediterranean, the years when the drama of ‘big history’ shifts elsewhere.

¹¹ The borderline case here is the hendecasyllabic *Ad sanctum Blasium pro Rhacusa* by Ilija Crijević. We decided to include the poem because of the impressive list of Dubrovnik’s sources of wealth recommended for St Blaise’s protection: *Rhacusam, Genitor, solo marique / Deuotam tibi sospitem tuere, / Agros, oppida, rura, templa, classem, / Vectigalia nostra, lucra, merces / Quae uectantur ab ultimis Britannis, / Quas Bizantia missitat Propontis, / Quas septemgemini fluenta Nili, / Europa atque Asia, Affricumque litus / Diuerso procul orbe sumministrant* (Crijević, c. 3, 5, 10-18).

¹² The non-verbal material would comprise visual symbols such as communal seals, coats of arms, paintings; also music, social rituals, etc.

In geographical order, from North to South, the following cities and regions are praised: Trieste, Istria, Kopar, Dalmatia, Zadar, Šibenik, Trogir, Split, Brač, Hvar, Korčula, Ston, Dubrovnik, Kotor, and Shkodër. Most often praised is the city of Dubrovnik, with 32 texts in its honour. Next comes Split, object of praise in ten texts. Dalmatia as a region is celebrated in seven texts, Istria in three. The island cities of Brač, Hvar, and Korčula have a single praise each, as well as Shkodër, an unhappy city in the Venetian Albania, taken by the Ottomans in 1479.

Authors

As said before, there are 53 authors in the collection. By their origin and residence, they fall into four groups. Twenty-eight of them are native citizens of the Eastern Adriatic cities, from medieval authors such as Thomas the Archdeacon of Split (c. 1200-1268)¹³ to late Renaissance versifiers Nikola Tihić (*Nicolaus Tranquillus*) and Ivan Krstitelj Divnić (*Iohannes Baptista Diphnicus*) from Šibenik (both writing in 1608). This group comprises also people from Eastern Adriatic shore who celebrated not only their home towns, but other cities; they are therefore simultaneously locals and strangers, insiders and outsiders. One of these is Thomas the Archdeacon, whose history includes passages on Zadar and Dubrovnik. Around 1464 Raffaele Zovenzoni from Trieste, who taught at Koper, addressed an epigram to Jacopo Antonio Marcello, praising there the city of Split—precisely, its *sacellum* / *Quod tenet Aspalatum delitiisque fovet*, which Zovenzoni considers to be more important than all the world's architectural wonders.¹⁴ In 1469 Zovenzoni's friend from Šibenik, Juraj Šižgorić, honoured Trieste. In 1475 Dubrovnik is admired by Koriolan Cipiko from Trogir, in his *Petri Mocenici imperatoris gestorum libri III*,¹⁵ Cipiko's qualification of difference between the aristocracy and the commoners of Dubrovnik, *Patricii soli rem publicam administrant, plebs tantum suis rebus studet: de publicis minime curiosa est*, will be included almost literally in the later accounts by Foresti and Barleti. An expatriate, Marin Barleti, who left his native Shkodër for Venice, presented praise of Dubrovnik in a speech of a character in his life of Skanderbeg (1508). Thirty years later, in 1538, Dubrovnik

¹³ Archdeacon Thomas of Split, *History of the bishops of Salona and Split*, ed. Olga Perić, Damir Karbić, Mirjana Matijević-Sokol and James Ross Sweeney. Budapest-New York: Central European University Press, 2006.

¹⁴ Baccio Ziliotto, *Raffaele Zovenzoni. La vita, i carmi*. Trieste: Comune di Trieste, 1950.

¹⁵ Cipiko's text: *Per la memorialistica veneziana in latino del Quattrocento: Filippo da Rimini, Francesco Contarini, Coriolano Cippico*, ed. Renata Fabbri. Padova: Antenore, 1988.

was admired by Nikola Petrović from Korčula; coming to Dubrovnik to serve as a *rector scholarum* in the years 1538-1550, Petrović saw the city as a republic flourishing under the rule of best possible laws.¹⁶ After the middle of the century, in 1567, Ilija Tolimerić from Šibenik celebrated Split in an elegy directed to its *senatus populusque*, and another elegy, praising Trogir and its famous sons, was written around 1604 by Ivan Pridojević from Skradin.

The second group consists of foreigners employed in Adriatic cities. There are ten such authors. Regularly they taught in public schools or otherwise. Besides Diversi, there were the Franciscan Juraj Dragišić, active in Dubrovnik both as a preacher and a private teacher 1495-1500;¹⁷ Palladio Fosco from Padova, writing in 1504-1509, taught in Trogir, Zadar, and Koper; Nardino Celinese from Maniago in Friuli, *magister publicus* in Zadar c. 1508-1521; Nascimbene Nascimbeni from Ferrara, rector of the Dubrovnik public school in the 1560s.¹⁸ Otherwise employed were Perceval of Fermo, *podestà* of Split and codifier of its statute in 1312; Giovanni Conversini of Ravenna, chief notary in Dubrovnik 1384-87; Leonardo Montagna, in 1461-1467 an associate of the archbishop of Split Lorenzo Zane; Lodovico Beccadelli, the archbishop of Dubrovnik 1555-1560, and his secretary Antonio Giganti from Fossombrone (1535-1598). By origin, most foreign authors were Italians—except for Dragišić and the Portuguese Jew Didacus Pyrrhus.

The third group includes fourteen foreigners not professionally engaged on the Eastern Adriatic coast. Some were travellers, like Ciriaco d'Ancona, who visited Zadar, Korčula, and Dubrovnik during his epigraphic expeditions in 1435-1436.¹⁹

¹⁶ Nicolai Petrei oratio saluatoria Ad Rhagusinum senatum cum primum se ad illorum Urbem contulit (1538; MS Perugia, Biblioteca comunale Augustea, G 99, ff 5a-8a): *Ex quibus facilis conjectura resultat, hanc Urbem uestram sanctissimis iustissimisque legibus fulciri: ob idque foelicem iuxta illud Biantis esse, qui optimam illam rempublicam asseruit in qua omnes leges ipsas ut Tyrannum pertimescunt.*

¹⁷ Cesare Vasoli, »Notizie su Giorgio Benigno Salviati«, in: *Studi storici in onore di Gabriele Pepe*. Bari: Dedalo Libri, 1969 [i. e. 1970]: pp. 429-498; Ferdinand Stipe Čavar, *Giorgio Benigno Salviati, OFMConv: Profilo bio-bibliografico*. Roma: Tipografia "La Roccia", 1977; Erna Banić-Pajnić, »Croatian Philosophers II: Juraj Dragišić -Georgius Benignus de Salviatis (ca. 1445-1520)«. *Prolegomena: časopis za filozofiju* 3/2 (2004): pp. 179-197.

¹⁸ Lorenzo Calvelli, »L'opera letteraria di Nardino Celinese. Storia di un codice ritrovato«. *Aquileia Nostra* 74 (2003): pp. 557-584; Relja Seferović, »Foreign Teacher and Humanist: Nascimbene Nascimbeni on Rhetoric in Dubrovnik«. *Dubrovnik Annals* 14 (2010): pp. 99-141.

¹⁹ Stanko Kokole, »Cyracus of Ancona and the revival of two forgotten ancient personifications in the Rector's palace of Dubrovnik«. *Renaissance Quarterly* 49/2 (1996): pp. 225-267; Mariarosia Cortesi, »La 'Caesarea Laus' di Ciriaco d'Ancona«. *Gli umanesimi medievali*, ed. Claudio Leonardi. Firenze: SISMEL-Edizioni del Galuzzo, 1998: pp. 37-65; Hester Schadee, »Caesarea Laus: Ciriaco d'Ancona praising Caesar to Leonardo Bruni«. *Renaissance Studies* 22/4 (2008): pp. 435-449.

Others never visited Dalmatia: Flavio Biondo, Francesco Filelfo and his eldest son Giovanni Mario, Aldo Manuzio and his son Aldo Manuzio il Giovane, the French political philosopher Jean Bodin, the Dutch classical scholar Justus Lipsius. It must be noted that, with the exception of Ciriaco, non-residents praise exclusively Dubrovnik.

Genres

There are 32 texts in verse. Poetic genres represented are those often encountered in humanist literary communication, mostly epigrams and elegies.²⁰ There are a couple of verse epistles, such as Nardino Celinesè's *De situ Jadre Carmen ad Marium vatem celeberrimum studiis Bartholomei Aluiani ducis Venetorum* (1508), and Didacus Pyrrhus *Ad Paulum*, in hexameter (1563). Two additional shorter hexameter poems are the *Ad Georgium Bizantium: Ascrivium* by Ludovik Paskalić (before 1551), qualified as a *silva*, and a *Laudatio Spalati* by Ilija Tolimerić (before 1567). Remarkably few poems—the odes by Marullo and Crijević, as well as two further Crijević's texts²¹—are in lyric metres.

There are four epic poems. Three of them are about Dubrovnik, two of which were composed by Giovanni Mario Filelfo, who, in 1470, seems to have improvised his own myth of the city's origin, in prose and poetry of the *Ragusaeis*,²² based very loosely on Miletius' history and the *Chronicles of the Priest of Doclea*. Later, in 1476, bearing a grudge (apparently the *Ragusaeis* was not received in Dubrovnik as warmly as the author hoped), Filelfo sketched an ominous and slightly vindictive picture of the city menaced by the Ottomans:

²⁰ Four epigrams, all connected with Dubrovnik, praise lesser parts of the city-state: its important fort Ston (Crijević, 1, 20-22 *De Stagno oppido Ragusaeo*, c. 1495), and Lopud (*In suam patriam encomiasticon* written by Petar Palikuća before 1601).

²¹ Both in hendecasyllable: the *Ad sanctum Blasium pro Rhacusa* (c. 3, 5) that we mentioned already, and *Rhacusam furis Aeliumque uatem...* (4, 20), which informs us about another praise of Dubrovnik, written by someone from Trogir: *Hinc me Phocidos autumas parentem / Rhacusam, Illyrici decus, canisque / Turres aereas, superba cultu / Et Cyclopea saxa ductibusque / Riuos marmoreis scaturientes, / Quales Martia uirgo uix recuset, / Et miracula fontium recenses / Rhacusae et proceres diu togatos. / Nec liberrima iura conticescis, / Molles delicias, amoena Tempe...* (Crijević, c. 4, 20, 9-18).

²² Nestore Pelicelli, »Due opere inedite di G. M. Filelfo: La Raguseide e Storia di Ragusa«. *Rivista Dalmatica* 5/1-2 (1902-1903): pp. 5-33, 139-176.

Quotidie ad factos magno molimine muros
 Conveniunt Parthi, pariterque rebellibus usi
 His tanquam nullumque modum nullumque tuentur
 Urbe decus tanta. Nec enim quod forte sequatur
 Hic refero. Quod si gens Dalmatina meretur,
 Ob varias causas, quas hic siluisse iuvat me,
 Quando Ragusa meos penitus commoverit ausus
 Atque animum turbarit, eas expressero cunctas.²³

It is possible that Ilija Crijević offered his *De Epidaurō* to his fellow citizens in 1505 (stating modestly in the introduction *proderit me hoc uobis emendandi operis gratia priusquam publicetur recitasse*) with the intention to outdo Filelfo.

A prominent prose genre for praising cities is a dedicatory letter, a preface to a book. The earliest example of such praise are the dedications to three of Aldo Manuzio's editions from 1498, *editiones principes* of Aristophanes, early Christian poets, and Demosthenes. The dedicatory letters are addressed to Daniele Clario from Parma, who was at the time employed as school teacher in Dubrovnik; at appropriate places Manuzio referred to *inchyta ista urbs alumna virorum nobilium Epidaurus, cui nunc Rhacusae est nomen*. In a slightly different vein, and almost seventy years later (in 1564), Nascimbene Nascimbeni dedicated his own commentary on Cicero's *De inventione* explicitly to the Senate of Dubrovnik, citing respectfully the city's virtues: *splendor nobilitatis uestrae fulgentissimus, antiquitas gentis, celebritas reipublicae, res a uobis praeclarissime terra marique gestae, demum plurimae nobilium familiae*.

In the tradition of Thucydides' Pericles and Leonardo Bruni's *Laudatio Florentinae urbis*, a classical occasion for praising a city is a funerary oration. Speaking at the funeral of Ivan Gučetić, Ilija Crijević reminds the citizens of the glory of Dubrovnik and Illyria: *nam patria est caput Illuriae in sinu Adriatico secunda (Venetis enim semper primas partes tribuo)*. In the same speech Crijević discusses legendary origins of the city: *Hoc tamen ex nostris annalibus et vetustatis memoria eruimus Epidaurō a Vandalis eversa huc illos cives migrasse; mox etiam Romanos ad Illuriam recuperandam Bellum regem secutos*.²⁴

²³ Giovanni Mario Filelfo, *Amyris*, ed. Aldo Manetti. Bologna: Pàtron editore, 1978: Book 4, vv. 1471-1478.

²⁴ For a repertoire of Crijević's funerary motives see Z. Janeković Römer, »The Orations«: pp. 57-59.

Ten texts belong to historiography or biography. In three of them, praise of cities is part of a monograph about a person (Skanderbeg, Mocenigo, Marulić), and one is an autobiography (by Giovanni Conversini from Ravenna). Two texts describe sieges (of Shkodër and Korčula). Three texts are histories on a larger scale. Only one text is an essay on the *origo urbis* (Ludovik Crijević Tubero's *Commentariolus de origine et incremento urbis Rhacusanae*, based on a chapter from his *Commentarii de temporibus suis*).²⁵ Eight texts are chorographies, either of Dalmatia or of Istria; only the earliest one is concerned with a single island (Brač, as described by Dujam Hranković in 1405).

A special medium for praising cities is an inscription. Ciriaco d'Ancona drafted two classicizing inscriptions for public works in Dubrovnik c. 1436, and—in a similar vein—styled a trade agreement between Dubrovnik and Ancona as a *sanctio* from Roman times, using the formulaic language of ancient inscriptions.²⁶ Moreover, Marko Marulić decided to include a description of Diocletian's palace in his antiquarian collection *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius* (1503-1510).

Finally, two prose texts are internationally influential praises because of their authors. When Jean Bodin described Dubrovnik in his *Les Six livres de la République* (1576, with a revised and expanded Latin translation by the author in 1586), qualifying the city-state as small, but successful, he added considerably to its repute.²⁷ A letter sent in 1601 by Justus Lipsius to Franciscus Maria Sagri in Dubrovnik, in a gesture of courtesy towards a person Lipsius did not know personally, contained an informed praise of his addressee's home: *Ragusia... nobilis Respublica, et quae Barbariam a nobis dividit; legibus et moribus polita*. When the letter was included in the *Opera omnia* of the Dutch scholar, this private praise became public.

²⁵ Cf. Ludovicus Cervarius Tubero, *Komentari o mojem vremenu* = *Commentarii de temporibus suis*, ed. Vladimir Rezar. Zagreb: Hrvatski institut za povijest, 2001 (Latin text with Croatian translation).

²⁶ Cf. Giuseppe Praga, »Ciriaco de Pizziccolli e Marino de Resti«. *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia* 7/13 (1932): pp. 262-280.

²⁷ *Ragusia, ciuitatum fere omnium quae sunt in Europa minima... Certe quidem haec Respublica, omnium quas accepimus, purissimam et ab omni populari temperatione remotissimam Aristocratiam colit*. On the role of Bodin in "promoting the myth regarding Ragusan achievements" see Susan Mosher Stuard, *A state of deference: Ragusa/Dubrovnik in the medieval centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992: pp. 212-213. Mosher Stuard quotes Bodin in contemporary English translation; she usually disregards Latin texts.

Criticisms

Dubrovnik, the most praised of the Eastern Adriatic cities, was also the only one to attract *vituperationes*, criticisms. The first one was written by Giovanni Conversini, who c. 1384 found the city intellectually unstimulating: *et litterarum usus nullus et ingenia non elimata studiis... Nulla hic ingenii subtilioris officina... Ventri uiuunt, tegi et pasci summum est.*²⁸

The second *vituperatio*, written by a local author, was deliberately ambiguous; furthermore, thanks to repeated modern editorial misinterpretations, it was not recognized as a criticism until recently. It is the famous ode by Ilija Crijević *Ocelle mi, Ragusa, ocelle mi, patria* (7, 1), sung from the *febriculosa arx*, “fever-ridden fort” of Ston, where the city-state “allows [the author] to wither and not to die”, “by its singular good-will restoring Ilija to itself and to himself”.²⁹ Earlier understood as an expression of sincere patriotism, the ode has lately been persuasively read as “an ironic reaction of a cosmopolitan intellectual to a tedious military duty forced upon him by his home town”³⁰ (c. 1495 a thirty-year-old Crijević, back from his studies in Italy, had to serve as a commander of the fort in the malaria-infested Ston).

Another noble Crijević from Dubrovnik, the Benedictine Ludovik Crijević Tubero (d. after 1532), composed around 1520 a *Commentariolus de origine et incremento urbis Rhacusanae*. There he hit sharply at the very source of self-esteem among Dubrovnik aristocracy: *Nec equidem aut fabulas ab aliis confictas sequar aut ipse nouas componam per studium huius urbis clariore origine nobilitandae - quum nulla prorsus ciuitati a re militari abhorrenti solique mercaturae deditae dari possit nobilitas - uerum omnia uel ex uero hausta, uel quam simillima ueri in medium proferam.*³¹

²⁸ “They have no use for scholarship, they do not educate their minds... Here there is no place for exercising a more refined talent... They live for their stomachs, the main thing is to be covered and fed.”

²⁹ *Quod interire me, nec emori sinis [...] Tibique reddis Aelium, et sibi, unico / Fauore...*

³⁰ Novaković, »Autografi Ilije Crijevića, I«: p. 16. Crijević himself knew how to play down the irony, citing only first four verses of his ode in the funeral oration for his uncle Junius de Sorgo (i. e. Sorkočević, d. 1509).

³¹ “I do not wish to follow stories made up by others, nor will I myself make new ones to help ennoble this town by more illustrious origins; absolutely no nobility can be provided for a city which shuns war, which is devoted exclusively to commerce. No, I will make known everything as it either truly is, or can be truthfully approximated”. This is somewhat similar to Conversini’s earlier judgement *nobilem esse atque locupletem, hic loci modice differt*, “here there is not much difference between being noble and being rich”.

Collocating the praise

Any collection, and especially a digital one, invites synthesis more than analysis. What do the texts gathered there have in common, can trends be discerned? Here we will illustrate the synthetic approach by a simple search for collocations, finding which words tend to collocate with the names of the cities.³²

First let us give some information on the names; details can be found in Table 3. There are 353 occurrences for Dalmatia, 331 for Istria. Among the cities, the outlier is Dubrovnik. Under all its names (*Ragusa*, *Ragusium*, *Ragusion*, *Epidaurus*, *Dubraunia*, *Dubrovnik*), as well as in respective orthographical variants, adjective derivatives, and toponymics, it is mentioned no less than 964 times. After Dubrovnik there follow Hvar (*Pharus*, *Pharia*, *Lesina*), mentioned 118 times (but the names can signify both the island and the city), then Split (*Spalatum*, *Spaletum*, *Aspalatum*, *Aspalatum*), whose names occur 91 times, and Šibenik (*Sibenicum*, *Sicum*), occurring 63 times. The dominance of Dubrovnik does not surprise if we remember that 32 texts are dedicated to it; still, compared to other two most frequently named placenames, the frequency ratio of over 9:1 is impressive.

Table 1: The number of times the objects of praise are named in the collection

<i>City or region</i>	<i>Occurrences</i>
Dubrovnik	964
Dalmatia	353
Istria	331
Hvar	118
Split	91
Šibenik	63
Kotor	47
Zadar	46
Trogir	44
Skadar	41
Pula	40
Kopar	35
Korčula	33
Trst	32
Brač	29

³² In each case the search system counted co-occurrences within five words on either side of the queried term; the results were later lemmatized. Searches and results are documented and made replicable on the following internet address: www.ffzg.unizg.hr/klafil/dokuwiki/doku.php/z:croala-laudationes.

Comparison of collocations for Dalmatia and Istria turns up one significant difference. Accompanying the names of Istria we find seven times *urbs* and *urbes*, and only four times *civitates*, while close to the names of Dalmatia *civitas* is encountered 25 times, *urbs* 21 times. This seems an echo of the humanists' debate on *urbs* and *civitas*, when, at the beginning of the *Quattrocento*, Leonardo Bruni translated Greek *polis* with Latin *civitas*, understanding it as a city created from the political partnership entered into consensually between free citizens, while an *urbs* consists of buildings encircled by walls. There are more *civitates* in Dalmatia than in Istria.³³

Regarding cities, the treatment of names of Dubrovnik, Hvar, and Split reveals significant differences in the perception and presentation of these places (lists of collocations are in tables 2-4). Such differences may be well known from previous research, but now we are able to confirm, in hitherto unexplored scope, that they were present and formulated (already) in the Latin praises in the period 1268-1608.

The glory of Split and Hvar rests on ancient roots of the settlements. Hvar is strongly connected with its ruler Demetrius of Pharos (the *rex* from late 3rd century BC), Split with the Roman colony Salona, its destruction, and the emperor's palace (but the name of Diocletian himself does *not* occur near the name of Split).³⁴ Claims to ancient glory are supported by quotations from ancient sources; this explains frequent occurrences of *verba dicendi* (*dicere, inquit, vocare, nuncupari, dictio* in the meaning of "vocabulary entry"; the relative *quemadmodum* - 35) and names of Strabo, Pliny, Polybius. Both Split and Hvar are named near the forms of *nobilis*, which is the *epitheton ornans* in praising a city. However, Split occurs near the forms of *civitas* 27 times, and Hvar never—though we find its names five times near *urbs*, four times near *munitissima* "well fortified", and 18 times near *insula*.

Dubrovnik, on the other hand, is celebrated for its politics. It is clearly an autonomous republic: in proximity to its names *senatus* occurs 49 times (elsewhere in the collection it is used mainly in collocation with the names of Venice)³⁶,

³³ For Bruni on *urbs* and *civitas* cf. Philip Jacks, *The Antiquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origins of Rome in Renaissance Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993: pp. 74-124.

³⁴ The fact that a term does not occur, or occurs less frequently, within five words of the query, does not mean that the connection was not made. Most authors writing about Split knew well that the palace belonged to Diocletian. But the *relationship* between Split and Diocletian was of such nature that it cannot have been easily explained within the five-words range; it was not seen as self-evident.

³⁵ *Quemadmodum* in introducing quotations is an almost exclusive feature of Vinko Pribojević's oration; while Pribojević uses it 65 times, in eight other authors that have it the relative occurs just 15 times.

³⁶ In this light, the already mentioned elegy of Tolimerić from Šibenik *ad senatum populumque Spalatensem encomium* (1567) must seem especially conspicuous.

principatus 19 times (always in de Diversi's text, as his idiosyncratic technical term), *auctoritas* and *res publica* seven times, *patres*, *praetores* and *tyrannus* six times each (*tyrannus* is an antithesis to Dubrovnik's *libera res publica*). The city's names are collocated with *civitas* (43 times), *urbs* (31) and *cives* (16), as well as with words describing supremacy and domination (*dictio*, *imperium*, *domini*)—and with *mercatura* and *moenia*. Though we encounter Dubrovnik also near the words for antiquity (*antiquus*, *vetus* and *origo*), names co-occurring with it suggest more modern setting: *Dalmatia* (11 times), *Veneti* (9), *Slavini* (7).

If these findings seem to be commonplace and somewhat bland, it is so because they were meant to be. First, we follow the cities of the Eastern Adriatic coast through a period when they are trying to use literature—in our case, Latin literature—to fashion their civic identities, but from our point of view this process is completed, the notions have already entered the collective memory, they already are self-evident. Second, our collocation analysis tried to identify a common ground, the consensus, a set of universally acceptable ideas about a city's identity; what has necessarily been left out of the analysis is the individual, both as a single text which can have significant influence (cf. the wide reach and reception of a single ode on Dubrovnik by Michele Marullo), and as a work of art which transforms universally accepted ideas in a unique way (cf. again Marullo's ode, where the peaceful prosperity of Dubrovnik is achieved through the Scylla and Charybdis of the Turks and the Venetians, contrary to a tumultuous Naples,³⁷ or Crijević's web of intertextual and mythological ambiguities in the ode *Ocelle mi, Ragusa*). But the space for richer and more complex interpretations of the unique opens only once we have surveyed and understood the ground *shared* by authors who praised the Eastern Adriatic cities.

³⁷ Marullo, vv. 38-44: *Cum morem et urbis sepe animo sacra / Tot iura mecum cogito, cum decus / Pulchramque libertatem auorum / Perpetua serie retentam // Interque Thurcas et Venetum asperum / Et inquietae regna Neapolis / Vix qualis Aetneo profundo / Vnda freti natat aestuosi?* "... as often as I think about morals and about all the sacred laws of the city, about the splendor and the beautiful liberty of its forefathers, the liberty which was kept continually, between the Turks, the Venetian's harshness, the restless rule of Naples, nothing less than a tidal wave flowing from the deep below the Etna".

Table 2: Selected collocations with the names of Hvar

<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Occurrences</i>	<i>Motive</i>
Demetrius	9	ancient history
rex	6	ancient history
dicere, inquit, vocare, dictio	30	quoting sources
quemadmodum	7	quoting sources
uulgo	6	Etymological explanation
Strabo, Plinius, Polybius	15	ancient sources
insula	18	geography
nobilis	5	<i>epitheton ornans</i>
urbs	5	civic praise
munitissima	4	fortifications

Table 3: Selected collocations with the names of Split

<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Occurrences</i>	<i>Motive</i>
civitas, cives, oppidum	34	civic praise
nobilis, nobilitas	15	<i>epitheton ornans</i>
dicere, nuncupari	12	quoting sources
Salona	18	history
eversio, destructio	4	history
palatium, colonia	11	history, etymology
laetus	6	<i>epitheton ornans</i> , etymology

Table 4: Selected collocations with the names of Dubrovnik

<i>Collocation</i>	<i>Occurrences</i>	<i>Motive</i>
civitas, cives	59	civic praise
urbs	31	civic praise
nobilis	35	<i>epitheton ornans</i>
auctoritas, ditio, imperium, domini	30	domination
patres, praetores, senatus	61	political institutions
principatus	19	institutions, technical term
Slauini, Dalmatia, Veneti	27	political context
lingua, litterae	16	cultural context
mercatura	6	characteristic
moenia	6	characteristic
antiquus, vetus, origo	21	antiquity