PERSONAL EXPERIENCE AND POLITICS IN VENETIAN IMPERIAL HUMANISM (1470–1482)

Monique O'Connell

UDK: 341.7(450Venezia)"14"
Original research article

Monique O'Connell
Wake Forest University
Winston Salem, NC USA
oconneme@wfu.edu

This paper looks at three humanist authors who used their personal experiences in Adriatic and Mediterranean politics to make their literary works effective on a diplomatic level as well. The Venetian patrician Paolo Morosini (1406–1482) used his experience as an ambassador in the Adriatic to demonstrate Venetian restraint in seeking new territories in his *Letter to Cicco Simonetta*. The Venetian chancellery secretary Antonio Vinciguerra (1468–1502), Venice's agent in the acquisition of Krk from its Frankapan count, produced a defense of Venice's legitimate title to the island. Coriolano Cippico (1425–1493), a noble from Trogir who commanded a warship in the Venetian fleet, composed *The Deeds of Commander Mocenigo,* including an explanation for Venice military intervention on Cyprus. These authors' personal involvement in the events they wrote about lent rhetorical weight to their explanations of Venice's actions and motivations. The paper contributes some of the immediate political context for the young Marko Marulić's now lost-oration to Doge Nicolò Marcello and, more broadly, to our picture of the intellectual world in which Marulić lived and worked.

Keywords: Venice, humanism, diplomacy, Krk, Cyprus, Paolo Morosini, Antonio Vinciguerra, Coriolano Cippico

The 1470s were a turning point in the intellectual and political currents of the Adriatic. The decade opened with three significant changes in the political and diplomatic landscape. In the summer of 1470, the Venetian ruled island of

Negroponte fell to a protracted Ottoman siege, one of Venice's most serious territorial losses in its long war with the Ottomans for control of the Eastern Mediterranean from 1463–1479.[1] The following year, both Pope Paul II and the Venetian Doge Cristoforo Moro died; the two men had led the anti-Ottoman alliance that also included Hungary and the Burgundians. In 1471 a new pope, Sixtus IV, ascended to the see in Rome, while Niccolo Tron became the new doge in Venice. Meanwhile, Ferrante, King of Naples, showed heightened interest in the Adriatic political scene, committing his forces to the anti-Ottoman crusade under Sixtus IV and negotiating a series of marriage alliances with Croatian magnates.[2] The evolving communicative practices of diplomatic exchange in the Mediterranean mean that Venetian justifications for dominion had to reach multiple audiences, many of them skeptical of Venetian apologies for its actions.

The political events of the 1470s were intertwined with changes in the intellectual realm: the rise of print technology offered new platforms for humanists to display their erudition and for diplomats to circulate persuasive prose that forwarded their political goals. As Margaret Meserve has shown, the fall of Negroponte coincided with the introduction of the printing press in Italy, and Italian humanists leaped at the chance to publish their Latin epics, political speeches, and consolatory epistles describing and commenting on the news of the event.[3] The new technology of print also combined with the opportunity for public speaking offered by the rituals surrounding the election of a new pope and three new Venetian doges in three years. By the 1470s, it was a regular part of diplomatic practice for cities and states to send delegations to congratulate newly elected popes and doges and to give the cultural gift of a humanist oration, and beginning in 1471 many of these orations were put into print.[4] Marko Marulić's lost 1474 oration to Doge Niccolo Marcello, which was praised by his friend and fellow humanist and

---

[1] Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204–1571*, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, 1976, v. 2, 298-313.

[2] Alan Ryder, »Ferdinando I d'Aragona, Re de Napoli,« *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Internet, October 3, 2024); Luka Špoljarić, »Zov partenopejskih princeza: Kosače i Frankapani u bračnim pregovorima s napuljskim kraljem Ferranteom [The Call of Parthenopean Princesses: The Kosače and the Frankapani in Marriage Negotiations with Ferrante King of Naples],« *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu* 52, no. 3 (2020), 121–88.

[3] Margaret Meserve, »News from Negroponte,« *Renaissance Quarterly* 59, no. 2 (2006), 440–80.

[4] For the idea of oration as a cultural gift, see Brian Jeffrey Maxson, *The Humanist World of Renaissance Florence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014, 91-106; for the practice of printing these orations, see Monique O'Connell, »Orating the News: Printed Diplomatic Orations, Political Communication, and the Roots of Public Diplomacy in Renaissance Italy 1470–1513,« *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 53, no. 3 (2022), 72–42.

poet Frane Božićević, was part of this practice.[5] As Luka Špoljarić and others have noted, communal orators often delivered these speeches during the delegations that were seeking to resolve practical matters and to petition Venetian councils for answers to particular governing issues, complaints and questions.[6] They thus represent a mix of humanist and diplomatic perspectives.

This paper looks at three Venetian contemporaries of Marulić active in the 1470s: Paolo Morosini, Antonio Vinciguerra, and Coriolano Cippico.[7] The three authors—one a Venetian patrician, one a secretary in Venetian service, and one a noble from Trogir—all were part of one of the trends that shaped the Adriatic intellectual environment in the last decades of the fifteenth century: Venetian imperial humanism. The contours of this movement have recently been outlined by Luka Špoljarić and Clémence Revest, who locate the classically inspired idea of Venice as a »Second Rome« not only in the city itself, but as something that was developed and diffused in Venice's empire, involving both Venetian writers and politicians and provincial elites.[8] The central ideas of Venetian imperial humanism elaborated on what scholars have referred to as the »myth of Venice,« which held that Venice was a model of political stability and a divinely favored republic that flourished because of the excellence of its patriciate.[9] In an imperial context, the legitimacy of Venice's territorial expansion increasingly came to rest on the idea

---

[5] Bratislav Lučin, *Iter Marulianum: od Splita do Venecije tragovima Marka Marulića = da Spalato a Venezia sulle tracce di Marko Marulić*, Viella, Rome, 2008, 132–36.

[6] Luka Špoljarić, »Power and subversion in the Ducal Palace: Dalmatian patrician humanists and congratulatory orations to newly elected doges,« in *Croatian and Tyrolean Neo-Latin in Comparative Perspective: Challenges, Prospects and Case Studies*, ed. Neven Jovanović *et al*., Böhlau Verlag, Vienna, 2018, 81–106.

[7] Margaret L. King, *Venetian Humanism in an Age of Patrician Dominance*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1986, 412–413 and 443–444; Gino Benzoni, »Morosini, Paolo,« *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Internet, April 18, 2024); Massimiliano Malavasi, »Vinciguerra, Antonio,« *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (Internet, October 21, 2024); Bruno Beffa, *Antonio Vinciguerra cronico, segretario della Serenissima e letterato*, Herbert Lang, Bern, 1975; Kiril Petkov, »Introduction: Coriolano Cippico, His Work and his Times,« in *The Deeds of Commander Pietro Mocenigo in Three Books*, Italica Press, New York, 2014, xiii–xviii.

[8] Luka Špoljarić and Clémence Revest, »Introduction: Renaissance Humanism and the Venetian Empire,« in *Renaissance Humanism and the Venetian Empire*, ed. Clémence Revest and Luka Špoljarić. Special Issue of *Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* (forthcoming).

[9] There is now a large literature devoted to analyzing, upholding, and debunking the myth; for an overview and further citations, see David Rosand, *Myths of Venice: The Figuration of a State*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC, 2001; James Grubb, »When Myths Lose Power: Four Decades of Venetian Historiography,« *Journal of Modern History* 58 (1986), 43–94; on the myth's articulation by Venetian humanists, see King, *op. cit.* (7).

of »voluntary submission.« Venetian imperial humanists used both diplomatic and literary means to popularize the idea that Venice had built its empire through voluntary submissions. Much of the material for this myth of universal voluntary submission came from the early fifteenth century, when Venice first expanded onto the mainland and in the maritime realm. I have argued elsewhere that by the 1460s the idea that Venice's empire was entirely formed through subject communities asking to come under Venice's virtuous rule had become the dominant model for explaining Venetian expansion, pushing out or rewriting instances of less than voluntary subjection.[10] In this contribution, I would like to build on that work by looking at three moments of Venetian empire-building in the Adriatic and Eastern Mediterranean in the 1470s, considering how works by Morosini, Vinciguerra, and Cippico relied on ideas of popular acclaim and legal legitimation for Venetian rule as they participated in diplomatic and political endeavors to build and defend the Venetian state.

An interconnected group of diplomats, politicians, secretaries and provincial elites circulated pro-Venetian narratives in printed orations and manuscript reports and histories. Morosini was among a network of politically active patricians with humanist training who made a coordinated effort in Venetian councils, in diplomatic postings, and in literary works to forward their aim of war with the Ottoman Turks; the group also included Lodovico Foscarini, Bernardo Giustinian, Lauro Querini, and Niccolò da Canal.[11] In 1471, Foscarini facilitated an innovative use of Nicholas Jenson's press to turn spoken words into printed texts testifying to the importance of Venice's fight against the Ottomans.[12] At the same time that these humanist orations were circulating in the new technology of print, diplomats were developing a new and inventive political language; Isabella Lazzarini has argued that in the 1470s, »a specific group of political actors and regimes started to formalize and spread [a] common set of tools [and…] sought to restrict and police access to the negotiating arena.«[13] One of the tools she is referring to here is a style of communicating experience in diplomatic correspondence, with the author relating what he had seen, done, and, toward the end of the century, what he had felt.[14] Morosini held multiple ambassadorial postings during this period and also composed the vernacular *Letter to Cicco Simonetta*, the Milanese

---

[10] Monique O'Connell, »Voluntary Submission and the Ideology of Venetian Empire from History to Myth,« *I Tatti Studies in the Italian Renaissance* 20, no. 1 (2017): 9–39.

[11] Seth Parry, »Fifty Years of Failed Plans: Venice, Humanism, and the Turks (1453–1503),« Ph.D., CUNY, 2008.

[12] Martin Lowry, »Diplomacy and the spread of printing,« in *Bibliography and the Study of 15th-Century Civilisation*, ed. Lotte Hellinga and John Goldfinch, British Library, London, 1987, 131.

[13] Isabella Lazzarini, *Communication and Conflict. Italian Diplomacy in the Early Renaissance, 1350–1520*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2015, 46.

[14] Lazzarini, *op. cit.* (13), 224–238.

chancellor, which it is possible to tentatively date to 1470.[15] In an environment full of diplomatic gossip and critique of Venetian ambition, Morosini's work was intended to respond to accusations against Venice's expansionist policies, as Morosini makes clear in the beginning of the work, saying »[News] has arrived here from some liars and malevolent ones, who, without shame, say and affirm that your lord [Galeazzo Maria Sforza] speaks about my government.« Morosini goes on to say that the anti-Venetian gossip is that »[Venice] is of such ambition that it not only wants its own state, it will only be contented with the monarchy of all of Italy.«[16] Morosini's response drew on many of the same points that other Venetian diplomats were articulating: Venice acted only to protect liberty and had refused many offers of territory from polities wishing to come under Venetian rule.

While Morosini can be seen as representative of the patrician politicians spreading positive visions of Venetian empire, Antonio Vinciguerra was among the chancellery secretaries who wrote on Venice's behalf. Secretaries like Vinciguerra, Niccolò and Antonio Sagundino, and Filippo da Rimini did not usually hold formal ambassadorial appointments but these men were all active in diplomacy and produced important writings praising the Venetian state.[17] Vinciguerra was a secretary to the Council of Ten known for his diplomatic skill. He was also the lead actor in the Venetian takeover of Krk (Veglia) in 1480.[18] The island of Krk was part of the holdings of the Frankapan family, and from 1452 it had been ruled by Ivan VII, who had the right to fly the banners of San Marco, indicating that he was under the protection of Venice but that the republic did not rule the island directly. Vinciguerra's assignment included a year-long stint as governor of the island, a highly unusual case of a non-patrician holding a territorial office. Vinciguerra's *Giurisdizione antica di Veglia* is an account of his own actions as well as a document designed to prove the legitimacy of Venetian rule on Krk.[19] While Vinciguerra's work was entitled a *Relazione* by its nineteenth century

---

[15] Giuseppe Dalla Santa, »Due lettere di umanisti veneziani,« *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, 19.1 (1900), 92–96.

[16] Biblioteca Marciana (BMV), It VII 762 (7668), f. 1r; for critiques of Venetian ambition, see Nicolai Rubenstein, »Italian reactions to terraferma expansion in the fifteenth century,« in *Renaissance Venice*, ed. J. R Hale, Faber and Faber, London, 1973, 197–217.

[17] King, *op. cit.* (7) 76–90; Mary Frances Neff, »Chancellery Secretaries in Venetian Politics and Society, 1480–1533.« PhD Thesis, UCLA, 1985; Monique O'Connell, »Legitimating Venetian Expansion: patricians and secretaries in the fifteenth century,« in *Venice and the Veneto during the Renaissance. The Legacy of Benjamin Kohl*, ed. Michael Knapton, John E Law, and Alison Smith, Firenze University Press, Florence, 2014, 71–86.

[18] Malvasi, *op. cit.* (7).

[19] Vinciguerra's work is edited under the title »Giurisdizione antica di Veglia, 1481. Relazione di Antonio Vinciguerra,« in Šime Ljubić, *Commissiones et Relationes Venetae*, vol. I. *Monumenta Spectantia Historiam Slavorum Meridionalium* 6, Sumptibus Academiae scientiarum et artium, Zagreb, 1876, 29–101.

editor, it is useful to bear in mind Filippo de Vivo's reminders that the genre of ambassadorial *relazioni* went through several stages, from oral presentations to multiple manuscript copies.[20] Vinciguerra begins his work by explaining that the Venetian doge commanded him to »set down in writing, in detail and order, all that I had reported orally in the previous days.«[21] He goes on to state the purpose of the work: »it will be manifestly demonstrated, without any doubt, that [Krk] legally belongs to Your Serenity, who now possesses and governs it with the highest justice and honesty.«[22]

The third author under consideration, Coriolano Cippico, was a noble from Trogir with impeccable humanist credentials.[23] After the fall of Negroponte, the Venetian Senate gave the Venetian patrician Pietro Mocenigo command of a fleet and in that fleet Cippico commanded the galley from Trogir. The naval force spent four years, 1470–1474, harrying the Anatolian coast and protecting Venetian interests in the Eastern Mediterranean, and at the end of the campaign Cippico composed an account entitled *The Deeds of Commander Pietro Mocenigo*.[24] Cippico's work, dedicated to the Venetian humanist and ambassador Marcantonio Morosini, offered a detailed history of the fleet's actions and celebrated Mocenigo's election as doge in 1474; it appeared in print for the first time in 1477 and enjoyed a wide circulation.[25] His literary work places Cippico in a cohort of local elites in Venetian-ruled territories whose humanist interests drew them into a network of correspondence and intellectual exchange that spanned the Adriatic sea. In Gian Maria Varanini's influential formulation, humanist culture was a fertile meeting ground for Venetian and local elites, and recent research in both the mainland and maritime realms continues to explore these connections.[26] Cippico, whose

---

[20] Filippo De Vivo, »How to Read Venetian 'Relazioni,'« *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* 34 (2011), 25–59.

[21] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 33.

[22] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 33.

[23] Petkov, *op. cit.* (7), xv–xvii; Marko Špikić, »Razmjene spoznaja o antici u poslanicama hrvatskog humanizma 15. stoljeća [Exchange of Knowledge about Antiquity in the epistles of Croatian humanism in the 15th century],« CM XVIII (2009), 63–79; Renata Fabbri, *Per la memorialistica veneziana in latino del Quattrocento: Filippo da Rimini, Francesco Contarini, Coriolano Cippico*, Antenore, Padova, 1988, 139–44.

[24] I have used the English translation edited in Petkov, *op. cit.* (7), 1–91; the Latin text is edited in Fabbri, *op. cit.* (23), 165–230.

[25] Coriolano Cippico, *Petri Mocenici imperatoris gesta*, Bernhard Maler *et al.*, Venice, 1477; see Universal Short Title Catalog no. 996107 for the extant copies (Internet, Nov 2, 2024).

[26] Gian Maria Varanini,»La terraferma veneta del Quattrocento e le tendenze recenti della storiografia,« *Ateneo Veneto* 197 (2010): 50–53; for an example of recent investigations into local elites' participation in Venetian humanist culture, see Luka Špoljarić, »The 1435 Caesar–Scipio debate in Venetian Zadar and the political horizons

first marriage was to the Venetian woman Giacobina Lodi and who corresponded with Marcantonio Sabellico, was among a group of Dalmatian humanists with connections on a local and trans-Adriatic level.

All three authors produced their texts after active engagement in the project of building and defending Venice's territory overseas, and all three works include elements of voluntary submission to Venetian rule through popular acclaim, a ruler ceding his rights over territory, or a combination of both. Morosini's *Letter* is an explanation of how Venice obtained its empire that uses a set of examples from the fourteenth and fifteenth century to show Venice's restraint in seeking new territories and its fundamental benevolence as a ruler once it was forced by circumstance or the pleas of the inhabitants to intervene in the cause of liberty.[27] One section of the narrative is grounded in Morosini's own personal experience in 1461, when he was elected as ambassador to Stjepan Vukčić Kosača, the Duke of St Sava, to relieve tension with the new king of Bosnia Stjepan Tomašević.[28] In July 1461 the Ottomans had just conquered the Morea from the Despots, and Venice was about to embark on the 1463 attempt to take back Greece.[29] Morosini incorporates his experience as an ambassador to »prove« to Cicco Simonetta that the Senate, acting on his own advice, refused the Morea when it was freely offered by the inhabitants.[30] In addition to highlighting a moment of popular desire to come under Venetian rule, Morosini also uses the moment to respond to Venice's critics, saying »our adversaries say that we have moved to war with the Turks to make ourselves the lords of the Morea,« a point Pius II made in his *Commentaries*.[31] Morosini refutes that assertion with multiple arguments, including that Venice could have had the Morea already via the repeated spontaneous offers of the inhabitants themselves. Morosini concludes that anyone who understood the might and power of the Turks and the grave danger they posed would »think anyone who took on such a war out of ambition was mad.«[32] By referring to his

---

of the first Dalmatian humanists,« in *Renaissance Humanism and the Venetian Empire*, ed. Clémence Revest and Luka Špoljarić. Special Issue of *Renaissance Studies: Journal of the Society for Renaissance Studies* (forthcoming).

[27] King, *op. cit.* (7), 139; Sandra Toffolo, *Describing the City, Describing the State: Representations of Venice and the Venetian Terraferma in the Renaissance*, Brill, Leiden, 2020, 198–202.

[28] Benzoni, *op. cit.* (7); Senate records include references to the Venetian representatives to Duke Stefano of St. Sava but do not include the names of the ambassadors: Archivio di Stato di Venezia (ASVe), Senato, Secreti, reg 21, f. 56r, 1461 Aug 20.

[29] Setton, *op. cit.* (1), II, 237–250.

[30] BMV, MS It 762 (7668), fol. 17v. I have not found a reference in the Senate records of this offer.

[31] Pius II, *The Commentaries*, Florence Alden Gragg (trans.) and Leona C. Gabel (ed.), Department of History of Smith College, Northampton, MA (1957), vol. 5, 776.

[32] BMV, MS It 762 (7668), fol. 24r.

personal experience as an ambassador, Morosini crosses from recounting historical examples to real-time reporting, creating the impression of a continuous stream of communities asking to come under Venetian rule and thus refuting claims that Venice was angling to expand its territory.

Morosini's discussion of the Morea was one of the most recent examples in a text that is largely devoted to justifying Venetian acquisitions of the early fifteenth century. Vinciguerra's *Giurisdizione* also uses personal narration in the style of diplomatic correspondence to create a narrative denying Venetian ambition and giving legitimacy to Venetian actions in real time. In 1480, Frankapan rule on Krk ended and Venice began to rule the island directly; several Venetian histories give an account of these events, including Marc'Antonio Sabellico's official history of Venice and Marino Sanudo's *Vite dei Dogi*.[33] Vinciguerra's account is the most direct testimony of what occurred during the Venice's imposition of direct rule on the island, since he was the sole representative of the Venetian state on Krk from 1480–81. The circumstances that led Vinciguerra and the Venetian fleet to the island included pressure from aggressive Hungarian forces and an unhappy island populace.[34] At the key moment, when Vinciguerra is on Krk and pondering an imminent threat from Hungarian forces, he deploys highly emotional language to describe his own thoughts: since he had recently come from Venice, he could speak with »great confidence and freedom« about Venice's intention to defend the island, and when he considered the possibility of a weather delay to Venetian reinforcements, he recounted that »an even greater and more pestilent disease was gnawing at my mind, which I could recount with great bitterness of spirit.«[35] Vinciguerra reported that »I did not know any other solution for our well-being than to act in some wise and dexterous way to persuade the people« that Venetian rule was in their best interest and also to persuade Frankapan to freely renounce

---

[33] Sabellico's history, alternately titled *Rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita libri XXXIII* and *Decades rerum Venetarum,* was first published in 1487, by de Asola, Venice. Sabellico's history was translated into Italian twice, first by Mattio Vesconte under the title *Chroniche che tractano de la origine de Veneti e del principio de la cita e de tutte le guerre da mare e terra facte in Italia: Dalmatia: Grecia e contra tuti li infedeli,* Gottardo da Ponte, Milan, 1508; a second translation, by Lodovico Dolce, appeared under the title *Le Historie Vinitiane*, Venice 1544, 1554. My citations here are to that second translation, as it is generally considered to be more accurate: Ruggerio Bersi, »Le fonti della prima *Decade* delle *Historiae rerum Venetarum*,« *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* n. s. 19, Parte II (1910), 422–60. For the relevant section of Sabellico's work: *Historie vinitiane*, 228–229. Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 156–161. Sanudo's account is not a chronological narration of events as he first recounts that Frankapan fled to Germany where he died (156) and then recounts the struggle between Venetians and Hungarians for the island (160–161).

[34] Špoljarić, *op. cit.* (22), 134.

[35] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 55.

his rule over the island to Venice.[36] Frankapan is convinced, and the people of the island gather at the palace. Vinciguerra included Frankapan's resignation speech as a direct report, narrating that Frankapan told the gathered crowd: »My brothers, I am a son and servant of the illustrious Signoria of Venice, and our illustrious ancestors had this state from [them]; knowing that my forces are not enough to defend against the danger of this [Hungarian] army […] and in the presence of you all I renounce this domain to the illustrious Signoria in the person of the *provveditore*, dictating that you are all now subjects and vassals of San Marco.«[37] Vinciguerra then reported that the people were happy to pledge their loyalty to Venice and started shouting »Marco, Marco!«[38]

It is not unusual to see Venetian accounts of territorial acquisition that emphasize popular acclamation at the moment Venetian troops and representatives raise the banner of San Marco. Both Sanudo and Vinciguerra's accounts mention that Frankapan had ruled tyrannically, and both report his resignation speech, although only Vinciguerra reports the speech directly.[39] Sanudo's description of events also presented the island's population as key actors in Frankapan's ouster, saying Frankapan »did many tyrannical actions against his subjects, so that the people decided that no longer wanted him as a Lord, and sent representatives to our government to say that it should take the island as its rightful possessor.«[40] Vinciguerra's account of his rule on Krk after Frankapan's departure continues to use the language of emotion to describe the actions of the people: when judges and tax collectors appointed by Frankapan attempted to continue their duties, »immediately the people rose in tumult.« Vinciguerra recognized that »the whole island had been for some time burning in a rage of irrepressible passion, and loathed the name of [Count Ivan] more than the appearance of those bitten by rabid dogs.«[41] Finally, when the Venetian ambassador to Hungary returned to Krk with news that the King of Hungary had accepted Venice's claim to the island, Vinciguerra related that the people of the island »gathered as on Palm Sunday and shouted 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord,'« greeting the ambassador »with no less joy that that of the Holy Fathers in Limbo who saw the coming of the Messiah.«[42]

---

[36] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 55.

[37] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 56.

[38] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 56.

[39] Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 161.

[40] Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 155–56.

[41] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 67.

[42] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 72. This language echoes the 1414 plea of envoys from Kotor to Venice, who declared they »awaited the arrival of Venice with the eagerness of the ancient patriarchs who in Limbo awaited the descent of Christ,« edited in Šime Ljubić, *Listine o odnošajih izmedju južnoga Slavenstva i mletačke republike*, vol. 7, *Monumenta spectantia historiam Slavorum Meridionalium* 12, sumptibus Academiae scientiarum et artium, Zagreb, 1882, 152.

Vinciguerra concluded his work by enumerating the various cruelties and outrages Count Ivan had perpetuated against the island's people, building a strong case for Venetian legitimacy that included the points that Frankapan had voluntarily handed over the island to a Venetian representative, his actions rendered him a tyrant and Venice, at the request of the populace, had provided just and orderly rule.

Count Ivan returned to Venice with his family after his resignation and was offered an annual payment as recompense for the island, which he refused to accept, fleeing to pursue his claims from abroad.[43] Frankapan was married to Elisabetta Morosini, Paolo Morosini's daughter.[44] The Venetian government was able to use Frankapan's marriage into the Venetian elite as a counterbalance to his defection. The Senate decided that even though Frankapan rejected their offer of payment in return for the office of governor, »the honor and dignity of our dominion« required that his wife receive 400 ducats a year and that they have no other monetary obligations to anyone.[45] Frankapan's daughter Catarina's marriages were carefully managed by her maternal uncles Piero and Marco Morosini. Catarina married first a grandson of the Doge and remarried another member of the Venetian patriciate, Andrea Foscolo; the fact that Sanudo specifies that she died »without heirs« suggests that there was some concern over the possibility that a child might claim their grandfather's rights over Krk.[46] After Frankapan's 1486 death, Vinciguerra further strengthened Venice's claim to legitimate possession of the island by producing the count's will, which left Krk to Venice if the count died without male heirs.[47] Vinciguerra claimed to have found the will in the island's chancellery in 1481, but explained the five year delay in handing over the document by citing safety concerns, saying that he wanted to wait until after Frankapan's death to reveal it.[48]

Vinciguerra's account was perfectly crafted to fit with Venetian interests and aims in 1479–80, when Venice was attempting to balance some of its losses in the recently concluded war with the Ottomans. The most important acquisition in this period was the island of Cyprus. From 1477 to 1479, immediately before Venice took Krk under its direct control, the Venetian Senate was considering Marco Corner's proposal to colonize Cyprus »so it would be a Venetian colony like

---

[43] Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 156.

[44] The marriage is attested in Marc'Antonio Barbaro's *Libro de nozze patrizie*, Biblioteca Marciana, It VII 156 (8492), f. 326r and also mentioned in Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 155; Luka Špoljarić, »Illyrian Trojans in a Turkish Storm: Croatian Renaissance Lords and the Politics of Dynastic Origin Myths,« in *Portraying the Prince in the Renaissance: The Humanist Depictions of Rulers in Historiographical and Biographical Texts*, ed. Patrick Baker, De Gruyter, Berlin, 2016, 134.

[45] ASVe, Senato, Mar, reg 11, f. 110r–113v, 12 April 1481 and f. 115r, 25 May 1481.

[46] Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 156.

[47] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 98–101.

[48] Vinciguerra, *op. cit.* (19), 97.

Crete.«[49] The plan failed, likely derailed by Corner's death, but the fact remains that during the same period that the Senate was considering Frankapan's status on Krk, it was talking about Venice's role on Cyprus as well. In the Cypriot case, Caterina Corner, adopted daughter of the Venetian republic, married James II, king of Cyprus. After her husband's death in 1473, first her male relatives, then the Venetian state stepped in to take over, very much against her will.[50] Charlotte Lusignan, half sister of Caterina's husband James, lived in Rome and leveled many accusations against James, Caterina, and Venice, even participating in a failed coup attempt with a group of Catalans in 1473.[51]

Cippico was directly involved in these events, as Mocenigo's fleet visited Cyprus when they heard that King James was gravely ill and again after his death to end the Catalan conspiracy to take over the island. In his account of the first visit, Cippico includes a deathbed speech from King James saying that in the case of his apparently imminent death, »I commend my spouse and my kingdom to the Venetian Senate,« and asking Mocenigo to swear that Venice would defend the island, which Mocenigo did.[52] After James' death, his half-sister Charlotte sent envoys to Mocenigo asking him to turn Cyprus over to her, which she claimed by right of her legitimate birth. According to Cippico, Mocenigo responded that »kingdoms do not pass under the rule of kings through legal formulas or contested litigation but through arms and bravery.«[53] When he heard the news that the Catalan conspirators had seized control of the capital and the Queen, the commander gathered his forces and »decided to proceed to Cyprus with the entire force: first to liberate the kingdom from the oppression of the tyrants, and second to demonstrate to everyone how swiftly the power of Venice could be deployed when necessary.«[54] Cippico's version of the Venetian intervention on Cyprus presents a clear example of Venice defending liberty and defeating tyranny. Because Cippico was personally involved in the events he described and because his text began circulating within a few years after the events, Cippico's *Deeds* can be seen as another example of almost real-time creation of Venice's expansionist ideology.

In conclusion, these examples add to our picture of the intellectual currents that flowed through the cultural space of the Adriatic sea, waters that Marulić also swam in. They illustrate how the myth of voluntary submission to Venetian rule was actively shaped and crafted as events unfolded. The *Letter*, the *Giurisdizione*,

---

[49] Sanudo, *op. cit.* (33), 93.

[50] Holly S. Hurlburt, *Daughter of Venice: Caterina Corner, Queen of Cyprus and Woman of the Renaissance*, Yale University Press, New Haven: 2015, 46–72.

[51] Giovanna Magnante, »L'acquisto dell'isola di Cipro da parte della repubblica di Venezia,« *Archivio Veneto* ser. V, 5 (1929), 117–133.

[52] Petkov, *op. cit.* (7), 51.

[53] Petkov, *op. cit.* (7), 55.

[54] Petkov, *op. cit.* (7), 70.

and the *Deeds* all could be used to deflect accusations of Venetian greed and ambition by creating alternative narratives of legitimation, emphasizing popular support and the voluntary transfer of titles by rulers as the foundations of Venetian domination. The political and military events that Morosini, Vinciguerra, and Cippico participated in took place in the Adriatic and the Eastern Mediterranean, but an important diplomatic and intellectual context for their writings was papal Rome. Sixtus IV's patronage of humanist authors and his enthusiasm for a new crusade meant that Venetian ambassadors in Rome were facing increasingly hostile critiques of their territorial expansion at the expense of their commitment to war against the Ottoman Turks at the same time that multiple Greek and Croatian intellectuals were recounting their own personal experiences with Ottoman warfare.[55] In subsequent decades, the attacks on Venetian actions and motivations would grow more strident and end with Venice's brief excommunication during the War of Ferrara (1482–1484).[56]

The texts under discussion here developed arguments in favor of Venetian actions that were incorporated in Marc'Antonio Sabellico's semi-official history of Venice, *Historie Vinitiane*.[57] Sabellico deployed familiar elements of the Venetian myth—its justice, piety, and good government—to evoke an idea of an exemplary empire, one which exported the virtues of Venice far beyond its borders. One of Sabellico's main contributions was his explicit and unambiguous treatment of Venice as an empire on the Roman model. Earlier writers had mentioned a parallel between Venice and Rome, but Sabellico was the first to develop the comparison fully.[58] Although there is not space in this contribution to fully discuss the sources of Sabellico's version of Venetian history and its contribution to Venetian imperial humanism, it seems appropriate to conclude with the fact that Sabellico relied on Cippico's work to craft an account of the events of Mocenigo's campaign against the Ottomans.[59] By incorporating these perspectives into his *Historie Vinitiane*, Sabellico ensured that these contemporary justifications were memorialized and solidified as part of Venice's imperial legacy, shaping its enduring image as a model of benevolent rule.

---

[55] Egmont Lee, *Sixtus IV and Men of Letters*, Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Rome, 1978; Michael B. Petrovich, »Croatian Humanists and the writing of history in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries,« *Slavic Review* 37, no. 4 (1978): 624–39.

[56] Margaret Meserve, *Papal Bull: Print, Politics, and Propaganda in Renaissance Rome*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2021, 93–127.

[57] Felix Gilbert, »Biondo, Sabellico, and the Beginnings of Venetian Official Historiography,« in *Florilegium Historiale: Essays Presented to Wallace K. Ferguson*, edited by J. G. Rowe and W. H. Stockdale, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1971, 275–93.

[58] Franco Gaeta, »Storiografia, coscienza nazionale e politica culturale nella Venezia del Rinascimento,« in *Storia della cultura veneta. Dal primo quattrocento al concilio di Trento*, Neri Pozza, Vicenza, 1980, vol. 3, 68–69.

[59] Sabellico, *op. cit.* (33), Decade III, Book 8, 242r.

Monique O'Connell

OSOBNO ISKUSTVO I POLITIKA U MLETAČKOM IMPERIJALNOM HUMANIZMU (1470–1482)

Rad razmatra tri mletačka Marulićeva suvremenika koji su djelovali u sedamdesetim godinama petnaestog stoljeća: Paola Morosinija, Antonija Vinciguerru i Koriolana Cipika. Tri autora, od kojih je jedan mletački patricij, drugi tajnik u mletačkoj službi, a treći trogirski plemić, imali su udjela u fenomenu koji je oblikovao jadransku intelektualnu sredinu tijekom posljednjih desetljeća XV. stoljeća; to je mletački imperijalni humanizam. Sva su tri autora djela sastavljala nakon svojeg aktivnog sudjelovanja u projektu stvaranja i obrane mletačkih prekomorskih posjeda, a sva tri djela uključuju motiv dobrovoljnog podvrgavanja mletačkoj vlasti. Mletački su se imperijalni humanisti koristili i diplomatskim i književnim sredstvima kako bi propagirali ideju da je Venecija carstvo izgradila zahvaljujući dobrovoljnim podvrgavanjima njezinoj vlasti. Razvoj tiska nudio je humanistima novu platformu za demonstraciju učenosti, a diplomatima novo sredstvo za širenje argumentativne proze koja je promicala političke ciljeve. U takvoj je situaciji Marko Marulić 1474. održao govor za dužda Niccoloa Marcella. Ovaj rad razmatra kako se djela Morosinija, Vinciguerre i Cipika oslanjaju na ideje širokog javnog odobravanja i pravne legitimacije mletačke vlasti, i kako su tri autora sudjelovala u diplomatskim i političkim naporima da se izgradi i obrani mletačka država. *Pismo Ciccu Simonetti* Paola Morosinija kreće od autorova osobnog diplomatskog iskustva da bi odgovorilo na kritike Venecije i iznijelo argumente kakvima su se služili drugi mletački diplomati: Venecija je djelovala samo kada je trebalo štititi slobodu, redovno je odbijala opetovane ponude teritorija koje su davale zajednice u želji da dođu pod mletačku vlast. *Giurisdizione antica di Veglia* Antonija Vinciguerre kronika je autorova djelovanja kao i dokument kojim se dokazuje zakonitost mletačke vladavine na Krku. I to djelo osobnu pripovijest stilizira kao diplomatsku prepisku kako bi stvorilo narativ koji će opovrgnuti mletačke teritorijalne ambicije i osigurati legitimnost mletačkim djelovanjima u istom času kad do njih dolazi. Koriolan Cipiko sastavio je izvještaj pod naslovom *Djela vrhovnog zapovjednika Petra Moceniga* u kojem opisuje djelovanje mletačke flote u zaštitu interesa Venecije na Cipru nakon smrti kralja Jakova II. Poput Vinciguerrina, i Cipikov izvještaj mletačke postupke tumači kao zaštitu slobode i suprotstavljanje tiraniji. Trojicu su autora oblikovali i humanistička kultura i njihove diplomatske i političke uloge, te njihovi primjeri upotpunjavaju naše predodžbe o intelektualnim strujanjima kulturnog prostora Jadrana, o vodama u kojima je plovio i Marko Marulić.

Ključne riječi: Venecija, humanizam, diplomacija, Krk, Cipar, Paolo Morosini, Antonio Vinciguerra, Koriolan Cipiko