

Considerations regarding Antonio Morosini's Chronicle*

Șerban V. Marin

Keywords: *Venetian Chronicles; Venetian Historical Writing; Manuscripts; Codicology; Historiography; 15th-Century Venice*

In one of his studies, Agostino Pertusi noted in a certain moment that “*nel periodo che intercorre fra la morte del de Monacis ed i primi anni della seconda metà del '400, non vi furono storici che scrissero di cose veneziane. Molto probabilmente la situazione locale in aspro clima di guerra guerreggiata, prima contro i Carraresi ed i Genovesi, poi contro Francesco Sforza, non permise lo sviluppo di una storiografia.*”¹ In my opinion, the explanation given by the Italian historian includes two inaccuracies. First, the reference to the war period does not represent an evidence, since there are many cases when the periods of political crisis could not stop the historical writing: it is enough to refer in this sense to the moment when Doge Andrea Dandolo wrote his *Chronica per extensium descripta*, and this example is far of being singular. Secondly, A. Pertusi, having perhaps in mind the historical work of Flavio Biondo and regarding it as subsequent stage for Lorenzo de' Monaci's history, leaves completely aside the so-called “*cronache di consultazione*”, which continued to be compiled in the period taken into account. I refer here both to the chronicles ascribable to certain authors – such as Antonio Morosini, Fantino Pisani or Giorgio Delfino –, and to the numerous anonymous chronicles written in the 15th century. All of them developed to a large extent in the same time with the more or less ‘official’ Venetian histories (Lorenzo de' Monaci, Flavio Biondo, Marcantonio Coccio Sabellico)². In this article, I intend to focus upon one

* The Romanian version of this article was published as *Considerații asupra cronicii venețianului Antonio Morosini*, “*Studii și Materiale de Istorie Medie*” 28 (2010), p. 169-191. It is necessary to underline that when this study has been written, I was not aware of the new edition of Andrea Morosini's work, *Il Codice Morosini. Il mondo visto da Venezia (1094-1433)* (ed. by Andrea Nanetti), 4 volumes, Spoleto 2010.

The present version had been initially intended to be published in “*Annuario. Istituto Romeno di cultura e ricerca umanistica di Venezia*”, where it was sent since 2016. However, since this latter periodical seems to cease its appearance due to unexplained reasons, I took the decision to include it in this issue of “*Revista Arhivelor. Archives Review*”.

¹ Agostino PERTUSI, *Gli inizi della storiografia umanistica nel quattrocento*, in *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XVI. Aspetti e problemi* (ed. by A. Pertusi), Florence 1970, p. 269-332 (289).

² For the difference between the “*cronache di consultazione*” and those regarded as official, see Dorit Raines, *Alle origini dell'archivio politico del patriziato: la cronaca «di*

particular “*cronaca di consultazione*”, that is the one worked out by Antonio Morosini.

Manuscripts:

The autograph manuscript of Antonio Morosini's chronicle³ is to be found nowadays at *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* in Vienna, being part of the Foscarini collection and taken into possession by the Austrian Imperial library in 1801⁴. It was on that occasion that it was split into two volumes – completely arbitrarily⁵ –, having inventories CCXXXIV n. 6586 and CCXXXV n. 6587⁶. The narration of the second volume begins by referring to events during

consultazione» veneziana nei secoli XIV-XV, “*Archivio Veneto*”, 5th series, 150 (1998), p. 5-57.

³ The only possible doubts regarding Morosini's autography has been noted by Vittorio Lazzarini, *Marino Faliero. Avanti il Dogado – La Congiura*, Florence 1963 [1897], p. 101 n. 4, who spoke about “*il supposto originale [emphasis mine]*”, and by Christiane Neerfeld, «*Historia per forma di Diaria*». *La cronachistica veneziana contemporanea a cavallo tra il Quattro e il Cinquecento*, Venice 2006, p. 24 n. 47, who considers the manuscript as “*una copia contemporanea della cronaca di Morosini*”. Beside these cases, those that have examined the two Viennese codices have considered this manuscript as being the original.

⁴ Freddy Thiriet, *Les chroniques vénitiennes de la Marcienne et leur importance pour l'histoire de la Romanie gréco-vénitienne*, “*Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire, publiés par l'École Française de Rome*”, 1954, p. 241-292 (244); John R. Melville-Jones, in Antonio Morosini, *The Morosini Codex* (ed. by Michele Pietro Ghezzi & J. R. Melville-Jones & Andrea Rizzi), I, Padua, 1999, p. ix; J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex*, “*Annuario. Istituto Romeno di cultura e ricerca umanistica di Venezia*” 4 (2002), p. 177-183 (178).

⁵ According to J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex*, I, p. ix.

⁶ Tommaso Gar, *I codici storici della collezione Foscarini conservata nella Imperiale Biblioteca di Vienna*, “*Archivio Storico Italiano*” 5 (1843), p. 281-430 (304, 306); F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273; Idem, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen age. Le développement de l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII^e-XV^e siècles)*, Paris 1959, p. 17; V. Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 101 n. 4; Antonio Carile, *La cronachistica veneziana (secoli XIII-XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*, Florence 1969, p. 55; Silvana Ozoeze Collodo, *Attila e le origini di Venezia nella cultura veneta tardomedioevale*, “*Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti*” 131 (1972-73), p. 531-567 (559 n. 106 – a typo refers to inventories 6486-6587); E. Ashtor, *Levantine Weights and Standard Parcels: A Contribution to the Metrology of the Later Middle Ages*, “*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*” 45 (1982), 3, p. 471-488 (483, where the inventories' number is absent); Reinhold C. Mueller, *The Venetian Money Market. Banks, Panics, and the Public Debt, 1300-1500*, Baltimore 1997, *passim*; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* *cit.*, p. 178 n. 4. For a detailed presentation of the manuscript, see also http://www.stejeannedarc.net/chroniques/chronique_morosini.php.

1416⁷. According to the detailed narrative provided almost 180 years ago by Tommaso Gar, the deciphering of the two codices was difficult, but they were in a good state of conservation⁸. The scholars that have relied upon these two codices have counted either 320 and 330 leaves respectively⁹, or 319 and 293 respectively¹⁰, or a total amount of 561 leaves¹¹. As the same T. Gar recorded, Marco Foscarini had come into possession of the codex only a few years after publishing his work, the famous *Della Letteratura Veneziana* issued in 1752, this being the reason why Foscarini had not referred to the Morosinian chronicle at all¹².

As far back as in the 19th century, August Prost noticed the lack of the first pages of the Viennese manuscript, covering the period previous to year 1192¹³. However, the French historian did not notice the existence of a short excerpt referring to years 1094-1108, which was included on the first leaf of the codex, detached from the remaining chronicle¹⁴. Anyway, the first 48 leaves were missing¹⁵, while the chronicle's incipit (p. 48a, according to the original numbering) is as follows: "*Quel luogo fo meso in prima mente*"¹⁶ and refers to the dogeship of Vitale Micheli I (1096-1102), more exactly to year 1095¹⁷.

In connection to this codex, it is also known that, previous to its coming into Marco Foscarini's property, it had been possessed by Annibale degli Abati Olivieri from Pesaro¹⁸. Before that moment (year 1756), there had been no

⁷ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁸ T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 304, respectively p. 306; R. F[ulin], *Saggio del catalogo dei codici di Emmanuele A. Cicogna*, "Archivio Veneto" 4 (1872), part I, p. 59-132, 337-398 (347).

¹⁰ F. Thiriet, *Les chroniques vénitiennes* cit., p. 273, who still confessed that was not able to consult the manuscripts at Vienna.

¹¹ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. ix.

¹² T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

¹³ Aug. Prost, *Les chroniques vénitiennes*, "Revue des questions historiques" 31 (1882), p. 512-555 and 34 (1883), p. 199-224 (547).

¹⁴ Germain Lefèvre-Pontalis, *Étude sur Antonio Morosini et son oeuvre. Annexes et tables*, in *Chronique d'Antonio Morosini. Extraits relatifs a l'histoire de France* (introd. by G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, transl. by Léon Dorez), IV, Paris 1902, p. 41.

¹⁵ Silvana Collodo, *Temi e caratteri della cronachistica veneziana in volgare del Tre-Quattrocento (Enrico Dandolo)*, "Studi Veneziani" 9 (1967), p. 127-151 (129 n. 9); A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; S. Ozoeze Collodo, *Attila e le origini* cit., p. 559 n. 107; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. xx; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 177 n. 2.

¹⁶ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹⁷ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

¹⁸ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55; J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178 n. 4. Annibale Giordani Olivieri degli Abati (1708-1789), originating from Pesaro, is the author of a work entitled *Memorie del porto di Pesaro*, Pesaro 1774.

mention regarding the codex' history¹⁹, and its achievement by Foscarini was too late so that he including A. Morosini in his impressive work about the Venetian literature²⁰. The donation towards M. Foscarini is certified by the context of some leaves inserted in the Viennese manuscript, containing a frontpage and an introductory essay, perhaps drafted by M. Foscarini himself²¹, which certifies that the codex had been written by A. Morosini. Whether these details belong indeed to Foscarini, then it results that the split of the codex into two distinct volumes, mentioned in the introduction, had been already done previously to its passing to Vienna, thus confuting what John Melville-Jones suggests²².

The codex in Vienna comes to an end when narrating events in 1433²³. The end is finished extremely suddenly, in the middle of an assembly of the Venetian Senate occurred on November 20, 1433, referring to the Council of Basel, with the following words: “[...] *e tute le cose fate in pezudixio dele raxion e di ocasion de quele lor legitimamente non citade, ne legitima*” (p. 611a)²⁴. This detail allowed the natural conclusion that the last leaves of the manuscript were lost²⁵.

As J. Melville-Jones demonstrates, the study of the Viennese manuscript suggests a continuous handwriting for the period by the events in 1413-1414, after which the text is written in shorter passages. The paper seems to come from the same parcel to p. 479b (narrating events from 1428), after which the variety of it being used by the end²⁶. These conclusions convict the Australian editor to conclude that the first part of the chronicle was mainly mechanically copied from another chronicle(s)²⁷.

¹⁹ Idem, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178 n. 4.

²⁰ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. xi.

²¹ Its text, in T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304-305; in English translation, in J. R. Melville-Jones, in *loc. cit.*, I, p. xvii-xviii; also mentioned by A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

²² See above, n. 5.

²³ T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304, 306; R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, 347; A. Prost, *op. cit.*, 547; G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 66, 172, 188-189; F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55, 56; Maria Maddalena Sarnataro, *La rivolta di Candia del 1363-65 nelle fonti veneziane*, “Studi Veneziani”, new series, 31 (1996), p. 127-153 (127 n. 3); practically, I do not understand on which basis S. Collodo, *Note sulla cronachistica veneziana. A proposito di un recente volume*, “Archivio Veneto”, 5th series, 91 (1970), p. 13-30 (15 n. 2) proposed year 1434 as the end of the chronicle, criticising the notes of Lefèvre-Pontalis, Thiriet and Carile and persisting in this opinion in S. Ozoeze Collodo, *Attila e le origini* cit., p. 559 n. 106, since the manuscript is completely clear in this sense.

²⁴ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

²⁵ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. xx; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 179 and n. 8.

²⁶ Idem, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. xi.

²⁷ *Ibidem*.

The catalogue provided in the 19th century by A. Prost also refers to another codex. Relying upon the information offered by E. A. Cicogna²⁸, this is incomplete, including only the narration of the period between 1290 and 1422). However, I am not able to identify which codex is taken into consideration. On his turn, J. Melville-Jones mentions another copy, also incomplete and ending with year 1418, but the editor himself notes that “its present location is unknown”²⁹. Unfortunately, I have not had at hand the article of L. C. O. Vangensten, who supposed the existence of a Morosinian codex at *Archivio di Stato* of Venice³⁰.

A trustworthy and also reliable copy of the Viennese manuscript is at *Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana*, inventoried as It. VII, 2048-2049 (8331-8332), acquired in 1889. “Ital. VII.” catalogue at Marciana presented it as “*Morosini Antonio. Cronaca Veneta dall'origine della città fino all'anno 1443, divisa in due parti*” (adding that “*E' copia dell'originale che apparteneva alla Biblioteca Foscarini*”), while the other former catalogue, “*Soggetti Veneti*”, named it as “*Cronaca Morosini fino al 1433*”. Nowadays, it could be consulted only as microfilm: Pos. Marc. 135 and 138 (for It. VII, 2048), Pos. Marc. 118 and 150 (for It. VII, 2049) respectively. On the frontpage, there is a very good-looking and adorned inscription, saying: “*CRONICA / del N(obel) U(omo) / ANTONIO MOROSINI / q(uondam) Marco*”.

It has been emphasized that this copy faithfully preserves the content in the autograph³¹. The same is the case with the split in two volumes, numbering this time 1042 and 1579 pages respectively³². The copy was accomplished in 1887-1888 by Giuseppe Gallovich, archivist at *Archivio di Stato di Venezia*, under the guidance of the director of the Venetian archives at that time, Bartolomeo Cecchetti³³. Underlined by J. Melville-Jones in his edition, the errors are only minor, referring to the use of the capital letters and to punctuation marks. Therefore, the copy fulfilled by G. Gallovich provoked the Australian editor's appreciation³⁴. Much more legible than in the case of the codex in

²⁸ A. Prost, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

²⁹ J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. ix.

³⁰ Cf. L. C. O. Vangensten, *Erik af Pommern i Venedig 1424. Antonio Morosini Krønike og Akstykker fra Archivio di Stato ai Frari, Venedig*, “*Danske Magasin*” 6 (1913), I, p. 72-88, apud Mladen Ibler, *Count Ivan Anž [sic!] Frankopan, the Royal Steward of the Estate in Sweden 1426-1434* [= <http://www.croatianhistory.net/etf/ibler.doc>].

³¹ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178.

³² F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

³³ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178; see also F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, 56, both scholars regarding B. Cecchetti as copyist.

³⁴ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178.

Vienna, the handwriting of this copy made this manuscript to be preferred by many scholars dealing with the Morosinian chronicle³⁵, in comparison with those that have used the Viennese one³⁶.

An introduction is inserted before the chronicle. Being not signed, it could belong either to G. Gallovich, or to B. Cecchetti. It is extended on two leaves and provides interesting data regarding the Morosinian chronicle, in an excellent handwriting: “*La presente Cronaca, così chiamata dal suo Autore, che come si legge a carte 604 di essa, fu ANTONIO MOROSINI q(uonda)m Marco, è mancante di cinquanta carte nel principio. Si vede però, che seguendo la pratica degli altri Cronisti, ha scritto succintamente, seguitando egli ancora la serie, o sia Cronologia de Dogi. In fatti nelle cinquanta carte mancanti nel principio si continua l'istoria della Città di Venezia dalla sua fondazione sino al 1192 in cui fu eletto Doge Errico Dandolo. Quanto più però se avvicina al tempo, in cui cominciò a scrivere, tanto più si va diffondendo nelle notizie. L'anno, in cui l'ha principiata può supporre probabilmente il 1374 ma certamente non dopo il 1380 ed arriva sino a parte del 1433, non potendosi sapere il tempo preciso, in cui l'ha terminata, per mancanza di molte carte nel fine.*

Il pregio di questa Cronaca, che per altro dal detto anno 1374 può dirsi un esattissimo Diario, è inestimabile. In essa si leggono le più minute cose, ed i fatti più considerabili della Repubblica; le guerre che ha intraprese, sia per offesa, che per difesa, così sola, che co' suoi collegati, tanto contro alcuna particolare Potenza, quanto contro altri Principi uniti; le deliberazioni del Consiglio de' Pregadi, tacendo quelle, che doveano rimaner segrete; [...].

Questa Cronaca, o sia Diario, è scritta in lingua Veneziana, con parole semplici, alcune delle quali non sono al presente più in uso. Spicca nell'Autore la verità, semplicità, e imparzialità: cose tutte, che da pochi degli Scrittori vengono osservate; e finalmente vi si leggono i più veri sentimenti di un Cittadino amoroso verso la Patria, [...].

Fu donata nel 1756 a S[ua] E[ccellenza] il Signor Cavalier, e Procurator Marco Foscarini dal Signor Annibale degli Abati Olivieri di Pesaro, soggetto illustre per nascita, e per letteratura, e rilegata per maggior comodo in due tomi, col titolo di Parte prima a Parte seconda.”

³⁵ Léopold Delisle, *La cronique d'Antonio Morosini*, “Journal des Savants”, 1895, p. 511-518 apud V. Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 101 n. 4; Camillo Manfroni, *La marina veneziana alla difesa di Salonico*, “Nuovo Archivio Veneto”, new series, 20 (1910), p. 1-70; F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 273-277; S. Collodo, *Temi e caratteri* cit., p. 128 n. 6; Frederic C. Lane, *Pepper Prices Before Da Gama*, “Journal of Economic History” 28 (1968), 4, p. 590-597 (591 note 30); M. M. Sarnataro, *op. cit.*, p. 127 n. 3.

³⁶ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, *passim*; A. Carile, *Note di cronachistica veneziana: Piero Giustinian e Nicolò Trevisan*, “Studi Veneziani” 9 (1967), p. 103-125 (121 n. 52); Idem, *La cronachistica veneziana* cit., *passim*; Raymond-J. Loenertz O. P., *Les Ghisi dynastes vénitiens dans l'archipel 1207-1390*, Florence 1975, p. 318 n.

As it is in this copy, the text provides a numbering of the leaves due to the subsequent librarians, along with other two original ones.

Dating the chronicle:

Immediately after presenting a Venetian-Genoese military confrontation in 1403-1404, the chronicle's text is clearly transformed in a diary, as G. Lefèvre-Pontalis noted³⁷. Henceforth, one could also propose that period between 1404 and 1433 as interval in which Antonio Morosini wrote his chronicle. The conclusion is approached to the one advanced by J. Melville-Jones: circa 1400-1433³⁸ and makes acceptable the possibility for the chronicle to be contemporary to Lorenzo de' Monaci's work (1421-1429)³⁹. On his turn, Fr. Thiriet also noted that the diary becomes more and more detailed in data after referring to year 1414⁴⁰.

On the other hand, the information – probably of M. Foscarini – attached at the beginning of the manuscript in Vienna and copied in the codex at Marciana supposes that the chronicle began to be written in 1374-1380⁴¹. After affirming that “*il periodo di composizione va collocato evidentemente nella prima metà del '400*”⁴², A. Carile rejects the period 1374-1380, showing that “*assegnare un arco di cinquant'anni alla composizione di una cronaca sembra eccessivo*”. He also proposes “*un anno non molto lontano da quello in cui scrive egli stesso, attorno al 1430*”⁴³. Nevertheless, Carile's counter-argument is not convincing, for the simple reason that there is no standard speed in writing a chronicle, while the possibility for Morosini to dedicate an extensive time to his chronicle should not be repudiated *ab initio*. Actually, Carile's proposal, supposing year 1430 as

³⁷ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 55-56, 138, 167, 171; F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, 274; Hans Baron, *A forgotten Chronicle of early Fifteenth-Century Venice. The copy in Newberry Manuscript F 87.1*”, in idem, *From Petrarch to Leonardo Bruni. Studies in Humanistic and Political Literature*, Chicago-London 1968 [first edition, in H. Baron, *Essays in history and literature presented by fellows of the Newberry Library to Stanley Pargellis*, Chicago 1965, p. 19-36], p. 175. On another occasion, F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne* cit., p. 16 considered that the part previous to year 1410 would have been copied from the previous chroniclers. On the other side, Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, 25 p. regards period 1415-1433 as the one that corresponds to the diary. In any case, according to S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 128, “*la cronaca di Antonio Morosini [...] è il primo esempio riuscito di diaristica storica in volgare*”.

³⁸ J. R. Melville-Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

³⁹ John W. Barker, review of *The Morosini Codex*, *Renaissance Quarterly* 54 (2001), 4, p. 1582-1586 (1582-1583) (1583).

⁴⁰ F. Thiriet, *Les chroniques vénitienes* cit., p. 274; J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. xi.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, I, p. xvii; see also T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

⁴² A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁴³ *Ibidem*.

moment when Morosini began to work, along with M. Foscarini's, are nothing but simple suppositions. In additions, there is the proof that Morosini's chronicles was already known in 1418, even if in a completely unfavourable context for it, since on that occasion the removal of some pages was recommended⁴⁴. This detail leaves no ambiguity that Carile's proposal is erroneous this time. Henceforth, I consider the fairness of what G. Lefèvre-Pontalis regards. This conclusion is not only from the perspective that the French editor's viewpoint appears to be as intermediary version between the other two hypotheses, but it takes into account what the same Pontalis noted: according to him, the chronicle turns indeed into diary and proves Morosini's participation as eyewitness of the events.

As for the manuscript in Vienna, in a first instance A. Carile's study places it at the middle of the 15th century⁴⁵, although later, when presenting the derivation diagram, the chronicle is dated towards the end of the century⁴⁶. As for Fr. Pall, he considered the chronicler as being contemporary to the crusade at Nicopolis⁴⁷, while B. Kedar hesitates between the possibility for Morosini to write his chronicle around 1400⁴⁸ and the beginning of the 15th century⁴⁹. On their turn, O. Cristea and H. Hurlburt place the chronicle in the first decades of the century⁵⁰.

Paternity:

Through Antonio Morosini's work, the modern scholars are in front of the first "*cronaca di consultazione*" that has a clearly defined author, since the chronicler himself becomes character of his own chronicle. Examining the last part of the text, one could note Morosini's self-unveiling as author on three occasions:

1. when narrating the events between April and June 1430, recounting the sack of Thessalonica, held by the Venetians, as a result of a Turkish

⁴⁴ See below.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 55.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 63.

⁴⁷ Francisc Pall, *Considerazioni sulla partecipazione veneziana alla crociata antiottomana di Nicopoli (1396)*, "Revue des études sud-est européennes" 7 (1969), 1, p. 187-197 (188-189).

⁴⁸ Benjamin Z. Kedar, *Merchants in Crisis. Genoese and Venetian Men of Affairs and the Fourteenth-Century Depression*, New Haven-London 1976, p. 40.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 76.

⁵⁰ Ovidiu Cristea, *Rivalitatea venețiano-genoveză în Marea Neagră: campaniile lui Giustiniano Giustiniani (1323, 1328)*, "Revista Istorică", new series, 15 (2004), 1-2, p. 89-106 (92); Holly S. Hurlburt, *The Dogaresa of Venice, 1200-1500: Wife and Icon*, New York 2006.

incursion, occurred in March of the same year⁵¹. When commenting the disaster suffered by the Republic, Morosini says: “*E io Ant^o M^o o vezudo e scrivo de mia man cusy sia la veritade*” (p. 520b in the manuscript of Vienna⁵²). Thus, he proves himself as eye-witness of the event. However, one could have no definite certitude yet over the author's name, and it is because of the abbreviation. While the first name Antonio is clear, the family name could very well be Morosini (*Morexini*, *Morexin*), but also Mocenigo (*Mozenigo*), Martinacio (*Martinazzo*), Moro, Marcello, Martenigo (*Martinengo*), all these names being inserted among the patrician houses, and it could also be about a simple commoner's last name;

2. during July 1433, when registering the news coming from Pola (Istria) and referring to the convoys of merchandise originating in Alexandria and Beirut: “*Noto fazo mi Ant^o Morexin, fo de miser Marcho, aver vezudo molte letere vegnude da nostry da Puola de le oto galie de marchado, IIII d'Alexandria e IIII per Baruto ...*” (p. 604a in the manuscript of Vienna). This time, the chronicler does not participate directly, but refers to the testimony of a letter. Nevertheless, the detail is doubtless: the chronicles transcribes his family name clearly. Moreover, he also presents his father, that is Marco Morosini⁵³;

3. not much later, also on July 1433, Morosini notes: “*Trovandome mi Ant^o M^o in la gliexia de Sancta Trinità preso la Celestria da mattina e avanti terza, aparse uno malissimo tempo con uno fulgaro ...*” (p. 630a of the codex at

⁵¹ For the Ottoman incursion against Thessalonica and the fall of the city in 1430, see, among others, C. Manfroni, *op. cit.*; Paul Lemerle, *La domination vénitienne à Thessalonique*, in *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati*, III = *Fontes Ambrosiani* 27 (1951), p. 219-225; F. Thiriet, *Les Vénitiens à Thessalonique dans la première moitié du XIV siècle*, “*Byzantion*” 22 (1952), p. 323-332; Apostolos E. Vakalopoulos, *A History of Thessaloniki* (transl. by T. F. Carney), Thessalonica 1972, p. 63-73; Kenneth M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204-1571)*, 1: *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1976, p. 19-30; George T. Dennis, *The Second Turkish Capture of Thessalonica, 1391, 1394, or 1430?*, “*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*” 57 (1964), p. 53-61 [reprinted in *Idem, Byzantium and the Franks, 1350-1420*, London 1982, V]; Speros Vryonis Jr., *The Ottoman Conquest of Thessaloniki in 1430*, in *Continuity and Change in Late Byzantine and Early Ottoman Society* (ed. by Anthony Bryer & Heath W. Lowry), Birmingham-Washington, D. C. 1986, p. 281-321; Donald M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice. A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge 1988, p. 360-363, 367-371; *Idem, The Last Centuries of Byzantium, 1261-1453*, second edition, Cambridge 1993, p. 334-336, 347-350. For the state of mind, see also Manuela Dobre, *Les Vénitiens dans les sources de Thessalonique du XVe siècle*, in *XX^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines: Pré-Actes, I: Séances plénières*, Paris 2001, p. 271-278.

⁵² G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 103; J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 177 n. 3; also mentioned in R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 347.

⁵³ The first who noticed this passage was T. Gar, *op. cit.*, p. 304, 305, then retaken by G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 104 and mentioned by R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 347.

Vienna⁵⁴). The information offers the same data as the first case. In additions, Morosini certifies that he was in Venice at that moment.

As for Fr. Thiriet⁵⁵, followed then by A. Carile⁵⁶, the references are only to the first two among the three passages emphasized by G. Lefèvre-Pontalis. On his turn, J. Melville-Jones only refers to the first information⁵⁷.

At any rate, when G. Lefèvre-Pontalis expressed his hope for the complete edition of the chronicles, he also hoped for other possible clues in indicating the author⁵⁸.

About Antonio Morosini's life:

When examining other chronicles with well defined Venetian chronicler, one could identify situations when, by referring to various documents and memoirs, details about his life could be necessary reconstituted. It is especially available for those chroniclers that were well known characters of their times, either policitally or culturally: Andrea Dandolo, Lorenzo de' Monaci, Flavio Biondo, Marcantonio Sabellico, Marino Sanudo, Giovanni Giacomo Caroldo, and so on. However, there are some other cases when the chronicler is known exclusively from the perspective of his own work (the case of Martino da Canal, for instance). As for A. Morosini, he is somehow at the middle of the distance. Being not a first rank character (although member of a patrician family), his case allows the moder scholar to detect short passages from his life⁵⁹.

Thus, his father Marco Morosini dictated his will on October 1, 1368⁶⁰, and Antonio's mother, Catterina, already a widow, did the same on May 29, 1377⁶¹. In addition, Antonio's will itself certifies that Marco Morosini had

⁵⁴ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 104-105.

⁵⁵ F. Thiriet, *Les chroniques vénitiennes* cit., p. 274-275.

⁵⁶ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁵⁷ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. xviii; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 177 n. 3. Despite all these evidences, E. Ashtor, *Profits from Trade with the Levant in the Fifteenth Century*, "Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London" 38 (1975), 2, p. 250-275 (270) uses the expression of "the author of the *Cronaca Morosini*", thus suggesting a certain doubt regarding Antonio Morosini's paternity.

⁵⁸ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁵⁹ I regard as superficial the manner in which Jean-Claude Colrat, *A Study of Jeanne d'Arc's Standard* [= <http://www.stjoan-center.com/j-cc/>] refers to Morosini, that is that it is about an "Italian merchant", probably originating from the stereotypy to establish a ceaseless congruency between a character coming from Venice and the position of merchant.

⁶⁰ Archivio di Stato di Venezia [hereafter, ASV], Sezione *Notarile*, notary *Giacomo Gezzo*, busta 562.

⁶¹ ASV, Sezione *Notarile*, notary *Marino*, busta 115.

already been deceased in the first month of 1377⁶² (therefore on March, according to *more veneto*). In connection to Antonio's father, J. Melville-Jones also affirms that he was Doge Michele Morosini (1382)'s brother⁶³, but the Australian editor does not refer to any bibliographical reference. Some brief information about family's other members could result from the chronicle itself: thus, one could find out that Antonio had a sister, married to Francesco Cornaro of Santa Fosca (p. 515a⁶⁴), and a brother, Giusto, father of two sons, Benedetto and Lorenzo, and who in 1431 was *sopracomito* on the galley destined to Coron (p. 566a⁶⁵).

As for Antonio Morosini's year of birth, it has been affirmed that it was "probably [...] about 1365"⁶⁶, "during the five years before December 4th 1368"⁶⁷, "1365/68"⁶⁸ or "*circa il 1368*"⁶⁹. His death has been placed "*abbia di poco oltrepassato l'anno 1433*"⁷⁰ or after 1434⁷¹. However, all these data have no documentary basis, as it is the case with the information that he was married ("but is not known to have had any children"⁷²) or that he became member of the Great Council on December 4, 1388⁷³. He has also been regarded generally as chronicler-merchant or diarist-merchant by B. Z. Kedar⁷⁴, once again without having documents at hand. On the contrary, his will is certitude⁷⁵, being written

⁶² Apud G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 115; see also J. R. Melville-Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 178; for more details about Marco Morosini, not all to be taken as certitudes, since he was not the only one to have this name in the last quarter of the 14th century, see G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 113-115.

⁶³ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. ix; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 177.

⁶⁴ Apud idem, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. xviii.

⁶⁵ Apud A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55-56; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. xviii.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, I, p. ix; see also J. W. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 1582; Guillaume Saint-Guillain, *Les conquérants de l'Archipel. L'empire latin de Constantinople, Venise et les premiers seigneurs des Cyclades*, in *Quarta crociata. Venezia-Bisanzio-Impero latino* (ed. by Gherardo Ortalli & Giorgio Ravegnani & Peter Schreiner), I, Venice 2006, p. 125-237 (169).

⁶⁷ J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 178.

⁶⁸ Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁶⁹ R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 348, relying upon the information – that I was not able to verify – according to which Morosini had been admitted in the Great Council on December 4, 1388; see also A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 155 n. 8.

⁷⁰ R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 348; see also A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 155 n. 8.

⁷¹ G. Saint-Guillain, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

⁷² J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. ix.

⁷³ See above, n. 69, but also J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 177.

⁷⁴ B. Z. Kedar, *op. cit.*, p. 40, 76.

⁷⁵ According to ASV, Sezione Notarile, notary Giacomo Ghezzi, busta 562 apud J. R. Melville-Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 177 n. 3.

at an early age, that is in 1377, immediately after his father's death, and renewed in 1384⁷⁶.

As mentioned above, the chronicle itself informs that Antonio was present in Thessalonica in 1430, helpless in front of the Turkish plundering, and that in July 1433 he was in Venice.

The documents preserved in the State Archives of Venice divulge one more detail about Morosini and his chronicle, that is the fact that he was working on it. Probably consequent to a denunciation, it was on July 7, 1418, when a motion presented by Bulgaro Vitturi, Francesco Pisani and Lorenzo Veniero was unanimously approved and led to an inquiry over A. Morosini's chronicle, the reason being "*aliqua inducentia scandalum*"⁷⁷. Henceforth, the endeavour to burn certain pages of the book was taken⁷⁸.

Practically, this latter episode represents the only reference to the chronicle itself that survived in the official documents, the lack of richer information leading J. Melville-Jones to the conclusion that Morosini had not been a prominent character in the political life⁷⁹. It is not known which pages were in the watchful sight of the Council of Ten. According to Melville-Jones, it could not be about the first 48 leaves at the beginning, for the simple reason that they represented nothing more than a simple copy of other chronicles⁸⁰. It could not also be about the final pages, which deal with the events in May-June 1433, therefore after the authorities' decision⁸¹. Whether this latter explanation of Melville-Jones is indeed veridical, we could only suppose that the beginning of Morosini's work was identical with the codices in 'B family' of chronicles. Although it sounds possible, one should not exclude another possibility, that is that those first leaves to include, beside the city's origins and the first centuries of Venetian history presented as in 'B family', the so-called "matters causing scandal".

Sources:

⁷⁶ J. R. Melville-Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁷⁷ Apud idem, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. xix.

⁷⁸ According to ASV, *Cons. dei X, Misti* 52, p. 184a and 187°. For the English version of the two decisions' text, see J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. xix; about the same episode, see also V. Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 101; Giorgio Cracco, *Società e Stato nel medioevo veneziano (secoli XII-XIV)*, Florence 1967, p. 452; Gino Benzoni, *Scritti storico-politici, in Storia di Venezia. Dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima, IV: Il Rinascimento. Politica e cultura* (ed. by Alberto Tenenti & Ugo Tucci), Rome 1996, p. 757-788 (759).

⁷⁹ J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 177.

⁸⁰ It is about those identified by A. Carile as affiliated to "B family" of chronicles.

⁸¹ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. xx.

The affiliation of the Morosinian chronicle to “B family”⁸² relies upon so clear similarities that has been concluded that it would not be any problem in reconstituting those lost leaves through the other codices in this family⁸³. The faithfulness towards codex It. VII, 102 from Marciana (ascribed to Enrico Dandolo) is even clearer than in the case of other “B” codices (It. VII, 89, It. VII, 559⁸⁴). It has also been regarded that “*la versione originale del Dandolo* [emphasis mine: “Enrico Dandolo”] *si conserverebbe proprio nella cronaca del Morosini*”⁸⁵, although in other situations one could note the absence in the chronicles of so-called “Enrico Dandolo” of a passage referring to Doge Giovanni Delfino, while it is present in Morosini’s chronicle⁸⁶. It has also been noted the different viewpoint on the man’s position in the world, which was optimistic for “Enrico Dandolo” and completely different for Morosini, who emphasizes the unavoidable fate’s part⁸⁷. In exchange, G. Saint-Guillain proposes a comparative text of our chronicle with manuscript H 85 inf at *Biblioteca Ambrosiana* in Milan and with anonymous It. VII, 798 at Marciana, when referring to the conquest of the Aegean islands by the Venetians⁸⁸. The French scholar makes thus an attempt to demonstrate “Enrico Dandolo’s” influence upon the other two codices⁸⁹. This dependence is also noted by Chr. Neerfeld⁹⁰, but without specifying the manuscripts taken into account.

Anyway, relying upon the affiliation to “B family”, comparisons with the chronicle ascribed to Enrico Dandolo have been proposed, since this latter has been regarded as the starting point for this category of chronicles. The comparisons have referred to Giacomo Delfino’s campaign in Romània in 1262⁹¹. On the other hand, the connection with “Enrico Dandolo” has been extended to the continuation that this chronicle excerpted from the chronicle of Raffaino Caresini⁹². It is somehow strange, since Caresini had been regarded as

⁸² A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55, 56, 199.

⁸³ S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 129 n. 9, 134, 145 n. 78; Idem, *Attila e le origini* cit., p. 559.

⁸⁴ Idem, *Temi e caratteri* cit., p. 134; for the relationship with “Enrico Dandolo”, see also D. Raines, *op. cit.*, p. 33 n. 97; J. R. Melville-Jones, *op. cit.*, I, p. x; II, Padua, 2000, p. vii, viii; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 179.

⁸⁵ S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 145 n. 78.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 145.

⁸⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 149 n. 108.

⁸⁸ G. Saint-Guillain, *op. cit.*, p. 169-171.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 137, 169, 172, 186 n. 148.

⁹⁰ Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 24: “*la cronaca di Enrico Dandolo esercitò una grande influenza sulle opere posteriori e in modo particolare sulla cronaca di Antonio Morosini [...], la cui prima parte è una semplice copia del testo del Dandolo*”.

⁹¹ R.-J. Loenertz, *op. cit.*, p. 317 n.

⁹² A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55 n. 4; R.-J. Loenertz, *op. cit.*, p. 318 n.

direct source for Morosini⁹³ for the period between the election of Doge Lorenzo Celsi (1361) and year 1383, especially Caresini's version in vulgar translation⁹⁴. Because of this, G. Lefèvre-Pontalis offered comparative text between Caresini and Morosini⁹⁵.

Antonio Carile's classifications place codex Foscarini CCXXXIV (6586) in "B category", centered around the supposed chronicler "Enrico Dandolo"⁹⁶. R.-J. Loenertz put the question in the same sense, by placing the Morosinian chronicle in "B1 family", along with codices Ambros. H 85 inf, Ci 2831, Ci 2832, It. VII, 102, Vienna 6580, It. VII, 559, Co 589, Co 873 and Gradenigo 53⁹⁷. From my viewpoint, I grouped the chronicle of Morosini in "category 4", together with It. VII, 102 and It. VII, 559, taking into consideration the following episodes: election of Tommaso Morosini as the first Latin patriarch of Constantinople⁹⁸; the Venetian campaign on the Balkan coast of the Adriatic Sea (Ragusa, Durazzo and Corfù)⁹⁹; election of Baldwin I as emperor of the Latin Empire¹⁰⁰; the achievement of the title of *Dominus* by Doge Enrico Dandolo and his supposed return to Veneția¹⁰¹; the fall of Constantinople in 1261¹⁰². I have also noted that the episode, so largely developed by the chronicle ascribed to Patriarch Daniele Barbaro, of the supposed intention of Doge Pietro Ziani to displace the state institutions towards Constantinople is also present in a more succinct presentation in the Morosinian chronicle, like in "Agostini-Tiepolo", pseudo-Savina, It. VII, 551, It. VII, 1800 and It. VII, 71¹⁰³.

⁹³ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 156-167; F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 274; S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 134; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, 56; J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. x; II, p. vii; Idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 179.

⁹⁴ *La Cronaca di Raffaino Caresini tradotta in volgare veneziano nel secolo XIV* (ed. by R. Fulin), Venice 1876.

⁹⁵ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 159 (about the Crete's revolt), 161-164 (the Chioggian War), 165-166 (the achievement of Argos and Nauplion in 1388).

⁹⁶ A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 55-56. For the derivation diagram, see idem, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

⁹⁷ Idem, p. 214. For "B family", see idem, p. 213-215.

⁹⁸ Șerban Marin, *The First Venetian on the Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople. The Representation of Tommaso Morosini in the Venetian Chronicles*, "Quaderni della Casa Romena" 2 (2002), p. 49-90 (64-65).

⁹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 78-79.

¹⁰⁰ Idem, *The Venetian 'Empire'. The Imperial Elections in Constantinople on 1204 in the Representation of the Venetian Chronicles*, "Annuario. Istituto Romeno di cultura e ricerca umanistica di Venezia" 5 (2003), p. 185-245 (218-219).

¹⁰¹ Idem, *Dominus quartae partis et dimidia totius Imperii Romaniae. The Fourth Crusade and the Dogal Title in the Venetian Chronicles' Representation*, "Quaderni della Casa Romena" 3 (2004), p. 119-150 (130-131, 140).

¹⁰² Idem, *Veneția și căderea unui imperiu. Reprezentarea momentului 1261 în cronicistica venețiană*, "Revista Istorică", new series, 14 (2003), 3-4, p. 211-254 (218-219).

¹⁰³ Idem, *The Venetian Community – between civitas and imperium. A Project of the Capital's Transfer from Venice to Constantinople, According to the Chronicle of Daniele*

It has been for a long time when Nicolò Trevisano has been regarded as chronicler. Under these circumstances, Trevisano's existence and activity as *procurator* of San Marco and *provveditore* in Candia during the Cretan insurrection in 1363 have led to the opinion that the chronicle ascribed to him should have been dated in the second half of the 14th century. Since it presents some similarities with Antonio Morosini's work, it has been concluded that Trevisano's would have been its source, even at least for the period previous to the death of Doge Giovanni Delfino (1356-1361), although the chronicles regarded as being written by Trevisano continued the narration to year 1367. At least, this is the view embraced by G. Lefèvre-Pontalis¹⁰⁴, who also offered some comparative texts¹⁰⁵. Several similarities in the chronological or dialectal errors have also been pointed out¹⁰⁶. However, as Silvana Collodo rightly noted, it is more probable that the author who wrote the chronicle ascribed to N. Trevisano to rely upon A. Morosini's work, if not even the so-called "Enrico Dandolo"¹⁰⁷.

In time, some other Venetian chronicles have been regarded as being possible sources for Morosini: Martino da Canal¹⁰⁸, Andrea Dandolo¹⁰⁹, *Venetiarum Historia*¹¹⁰, Raffaino Caresini¹¹¹, Lorenzo de Monacis¹¹², but these connections have not been developed.

However, when referring to the passages of the period between 1388 and 1404, the chronicle's editor G. Lefèvre-Pontalis confessed that one could not identify the sources for Morosini's text¹¹³, and thus regarded it as being original¹¹⁴.

Barbaro, "European Review of History / Revue européenne d'histoire" 10 (2003), 1, p. 81-102 (90-91 and n. 29-34 – for Morosini, n. 29).

¹⁰⁴ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 142-155; see also F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 274; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; B. Z. Kedar, *op. cit.*, p. 182 n. 54; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. x; idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 179; J. W. Barker, *op. cit.* p. 1583; Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, 25 (for the period before 1400).

¹⁰⁵ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 145 (referring to the Morosini's first leaf that is detached from the remainder of the text, dealing with the dogeships of V. Falier, V. Michiel I and O. Falier), 146-150 (about the Fourth Crusade), 150-152 (about the war against Genua in 1350), 152-155 (the military confrontation at Portolongo).

¹⁰⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 146.

¹⁰⁷ S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

¹⁰⁸ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. x; idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 179; J. W. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 1583.

¹⁰⁹ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 274; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. x; J. W. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 1583.

¹¹⁰ S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, 134.

¹¹¹ M. M. Sarnataro, *op. cit.*, p. 146 n. 120; Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 25 (for the period before 1400).

¹¹² J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. x; idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 179; J. W. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 1583.

¹¹³ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

¹¹⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 167-168.

Indeed, for the period contemporary to the chronicler, one could note his originality and the use of official documents¹¹⁵. On the other side, as Fr. Thiriet rightly put out, this should not led to the conclusion that Morosini had a privileged access to the Republic's archives, but one could take into account the possibility that the respective documents had become public in the meantime¹¹⁶. Morosini mentions stories of any kind, including rumours; in any case, some of the data noted by him could not be related to any official document, so that they would not survive without his chronicle¹¹⁷. In addition, he inserted the Latin version of several documents (for instance, the instructions for the Venetian colonists in Crete or the doges' epitaphs); this fact was regarded by his Australian editor J. Melville-Jones as "an unfortunate decision, since his understanding of Latin was not good"¹¹⁸. Among others, Morosini also transcribed in his chronicle Pietro Loredano's report referring to the victory over the Turks at Gallipoli in 1416¹¹⁹.

As a real diarist for the second part of his work, Antonio Morosini also relied mainly upon information taken directly from his familiars¹²⁰.

Influences:

Although "*plus bref et moins coloré*" than Morosini¹²¹, the chronicle ascribed to Zorzi Dolfìn (Giorgio Delfino) has been regarded among those that could use Antonio Morosini's work. This conclusion has come as a result of the same method of composition and the fact that this chronicle scrupulously retakes

¹¹⁵ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 275, 276; J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. x; idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex cit.*, p. 179; Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹¹⁶ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

¹¹⁷ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex cit.*, I, p. x.

¹¹⁸ *Ibidem*; see also *ibidem*, II, p. viii.

¹¹⁹ A. Carile, *Note di cronachistica veneziana cit.*, p. 120; idem, *La cronachistica veneziana cit.*, p. 140; for this relationship, see also Sophie Antoniadis, *Le récit du combat naval de Gallipoli chez Zancaruolo en comparaison avec le texte d'Antoine Morosini et les historiens grecs du XV^e siècle*, in *Venezia e l'Oriente fra tardo Medioevo e Rinascimento* (ed. by Agostino Pertusi), Florence 1965, p. 267-281 (271). For the event, see S. Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, 10 volumes, Venice 1853-1861, IV, p. 70-74; C. Manfroni, *La battaglia di Gallipoli e la politica veneto-turca (1381-1420)*, "Ateneo veneto" 25/2 (1902), 1, p. 3-34 and 2, p. 129-169; İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, 4 volumes, Ankara 1982-1983 [1943-1959], p. 349-359; Franz Babinger, *Le vicende veneziane nella lotta contro i turchi durante il secolo XV*, in *Aufsätze und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Suedosteuropas und der Levante*, I, Munich 1962, p. 240-253 (240-242); Joseph von Hammer[-Purgstall], *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, I, Graz 1963, p. 368-371; S. Antoniadis, *op. cit.*; Colin Imber, *The Ottoman Empire 1300-1481*, Istanbul 1990, p. 77-82.

¹²⁰ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

¹²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 288.

the indications of Morosini¹²², a fact illustrated by the comparison regarding the episode of the Genuan ambassadors to Venice in 1413¹²³. This kind of dependancy is somehow diminished by H. Baron, who considers that Morosini's chronicle would have only been consulted by Z. Dolfin¹²⁴, the same relationship being also available for chronicle It. VII, 2034¹²⁵, whose anonymous author being yet a kind of "counterpart" for his quasi-contemporary Morosini, for he focused more on the economic and commercial events¹²⁶.

As G. Lefèvre-Pontalis noted, Antonio Morosini "*achevait ses jours au moment où Pietro Delfino entrait dans la vie*"¹²⁷. Therefore, Pietro Delfino's chronicle has been regarded as taking over many information from Morosini. The analogies between these two chronicles are striking and continuous¹²⁸, so that the temptation of comparisons between them could not be avoided¹²⁹. The first who brought into discussion this paralellism was definitely Em. A. Cicogna, who mentioned that "*una Cronaca veneziana, la quale corre sotto il nome di un suo autore, Antonio Morosini, non è, per quanto mi pare, che la Cronaca Dolfina estessa, non abbreviata, [...]*"¹³⁰. However, Cicogna restrained afterwards the "great similarity" to the period consequent to year 1290¹³¹. Closer to nowadays, H. Baron¹³² refers to the end of the 14th century and the beginning of the 15th in order to show the almost *ad litteram* reproduction of Morosini's work by P. Delfino. After considering Morosini's chronicle as a simple transcription of "Dolfina"¹³³, E. Cicogna had some doubts about the relation between the two chronicles, when he noted that "*non potrei veramente con sicurezza dire se Antonio Morosini abbia copiata la cronaca di Pietro Dolfin o se il Dolfin abbia*

¹²² *Ibidem*; see also G[ino] L[uzzatti], review of F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, in "Archivio Veneto", 84, 5th series, 89-90, LIV-LV (1954), p. 126-128 (128).

¹²³ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

¹²⁴ H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

¹²⁵ Fr. C. Lane, *Andrea Barbarigo, Merchant of Venice*, Baltimore 1944, p. 151; H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 176, 178.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 177; in the same sense, see also F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

¹²⁷ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

¹²⁸ *Ibidem*; for this derivation, see also R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 348 ff; G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, 172; Roberto Cessi, *Introduzione*, in *Petri Delphini Annalium Venetorum Pars quarta* (ed. by R. Cessi & Paolo Sambin), Venice 1943, p. xxvii, xxviii, xxix; V. Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 102; H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 176, 177, 191; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 155 and n. 8; Eric Cochrane, *Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance*, Chicago-London 1981, p. 63; J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. xi.

¹²⁹ R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 349-350 (for events in 1290, 1330, 1347, 1350, 1354, 1405 and 1410); G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, 176 (about the earthquake in 1348), 176-177 (about the storm in 1410).

¹³⁰ R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 347.

¹³¹ *Ibidem*, p. 348; see also A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

¹³² H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹³³ R. F[ulin], *op. cit.*, p. 342.

dal Morosini copiato"¹³⁴, but in the end he accepted that Morosini would have been the basis for the other chronicle because of chronological reasons¹³⁵. Henceforth, Morosini's work was regarded as "*prototype et source perpétuelle de la Cronica Dolfina*."¹³⁶

Morosini's influence upon Pietro Delfino led to the indirect one upon Marino Sanudo's *Vite de' dogi*¹³⁷. It is known that Sanudo's chronicle makes repeatedly references to *Cronaca Dolfina*, for which reason it has been considered that "*Marino Sanuto, chaque fois qu'il déclare utiliser l'œuvre de Pietro Delfino, s'inspire en réalité, à travers ce dernier texte [emphasis Lefèvre-Pontalis], de l'œuvre d'Antonio Morosini, [...]*"¹³⁸. Passages between Morosini and Sanudo have been compared, referring to the achievement of Argos and Nauplion¹³⁹, the coming of the remainder of Albania under Venetian domination in 1394¹⁴⁰, the debates in the Venetian Senate around the decisions taken at the Council of Basel (meaning the last information provided by Morosini)¹⁴¹, and so on. Nevertheless, A. Morosini's influence upon Sanudo is still indirect, through the agency of P. Delfino, since nowhere in *Vite de' Dogi* the chronicle of Antonio Morosini is mentioned¹⁴².

It has also been noted a close dependance of the Morosinian text on the chronicle ascribed to Gasparo Zancaruolo, especially by Fr. Thiriet¹⁴³ and S. Antoniadis¹⁴⁴, although the two scholars hesitated in stating Morosini's precedence over *Zancaruola*.

Regarding N. Trevisano as source for Morosini, G. Lefèvre-Pontalis provided many data over this relationship¹⁴⁵, just that the raport should be reversed, in the sense that Morosini represented the basis for the chronicle ascribed to Trevisano¹⁴⁶.

¹³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 348.

¹³⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹³⁶ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

¹³⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 183, 187, 191; S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 128; H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 175-177, 191, 193; Fr. Pall, *op. cit.*, p. 189, 194; E. Cochrane, *op. cit.*, p. 63; Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 75 n. 146.

¹³⁸ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

¹³⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 185-186.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 186-187.

¹⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 189.

¹⁴² *Ibidem*, p. 183; H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

¹⁴³ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 260, 288.

¹⁴⁴ S. Antoniadis, *op. cit.*, p. 271.

¹⁴⁵ See above. For Trevisano as source for the period before 1400, see also Chr. Neerfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

¹⁴⁶ S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

Some other anonymous chronicles have been taken into consideration as being visibly inspired by Morosini, such as It. VII, 46¹⁴⁷, It. VII, 2448¹⁴⁸, It. VII, 51¹⁴⁹ from Marciana, or 87.1. from Newberry Library¹⁵⁰.

Editions:

As mentioned above, Antonio Morosini's chronicle was partially edited by L. Dorez and G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, under the title of *Extraits de la chronique de Morosini relatifs à l'histoire de France*. The edition is bilingual (Venetian dialect-French) and was issued in Paris, in four volumes, among which the fourth one strictly refers to Lefèvre-Pontalis' study of the work and author. Under the patronage of the Society for the History of France, the endeavour of the two editors was certainly praiseworthy, but it consisted – as the title demonstrates – in the exclusive publication of the passages dealing with (at least, tangentially) the French history. It is explainable, since Morosini provides a huge amount of information related to events dear to French history (The Hundred Years War, Joan of Arc, etc.)

Some shorter fragments has also been published in time. In parallel with the edition provided by Lefèvre-Pontalis and Dorez, Nicolae Iorga brought into light several letters excerpted from the diaristic part of Morosini's chronicle, the Venetian-Ottoman military operations in the context of the fall of Thessalonica under the Turks being published in his *Notes et extraits pour servir à l'histoire des croisades au XV^e siècle*, issued in Paris between 1899 and 1902. The same kind of intention, meaning the publishing of letters attached to the chronicle, has also been expressed by B. Z. Kedar¹⁵¹. On his turn, R.-J. Loenertz edited a short passage dealing with the expedition in 1262 led by Giacomo Delfino in România¹⁵².

In his own study about the chronicle, G. Lefèvre-Pontalis expressed his hope for the entire publication of the chronicle¹⁵³. Nevertheless, the editor was rather criticised by Fr. Thiriet for his partial edition: “*Il convient, cependant, de publier tout ce qui concerne ces périodes et non des extraits relatifs à telle ou telle affaire, à telle ou telle région. [...] [...] une publication fragmentaire ne permet pas de saisir l'unité et l'originalité du chroniqueur.*” Thiriet's conclusion was that: “*Publier seulement des extraits relatifs à l'Orient ou ceux relatifs à*

¹⁴⁷ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 256, for the period after 1375.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 260.

¹⁴⁹ A. Carile, *Note di cronachistica veneziana cit.*, p. 121; *idem*, *La cronachistica veneziana cit.*, p. 141.

¹⁵⁰ H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 180, also presenting passages referring to years 1403, 1410, 1417, 1430-1433 and concluding that there is no similarity.

¹⁵¹ B. Z. Kedar, *op. cit.*, p. 223 n. 59.

¹⁵² R.-J. Loenertz, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

¹⁵³ G. Lefèvre-Pontalis, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

l'Occident, c'est se condamner à ne pas voir quelle place tenaient dans la politique et dans l'économie vénitiennes l'Orient et l'Occident."¹⁵⁴ Generally speaking, according to J. Melville-Jones' calculations, the French edition of Lefèvre-Pontalis provided only 15% of the whole chronicle of Morosini¹⁵⁵.

The lack of an entire edition has been felt in time¹⁵⁶, with the mention that "it is amazing that such a rich source of information has never been made fully available to scholars, [...]"¹⁵⁷. Therefore, beside the partial edition of Lefèvre-Pontalis, B. Z. Kedar for instance uses also manuscript It. VII, 2048¹⁵⁸, while R. C. Mueller largely refers to the original manuscript in Vienna and neglects the printed version¹⁵⁹.

Under these circumstances, the endeavour promoted in the last years by John R. Melville-Jones, Michele Pietro Ghezzi and Andrea Rizzi under the patronage of *Archivio del Littorale Adriatico* should be regarded as a welcome completion of this lacuna. It is about a bilingual edition (Venetian dialect-English). As for the title, the editors use *The Morosini Codex*, rightly regarded as more neutral and thus 'conciliating' the chronicle and its diaristic part¹⁶⁰. The first three volumes have been issued by now, being published in 1999 (for the period previous to the end of Andrea Dandolo's dogeship in 1354), 2000 (the interval between 1354 and 1400, that is between Marino Falier's and Antonio Venier's dogeships) and 2005 (the period between 1400 and 1407, representing the first years of Michele Steno's dogeship). The Australian editor has an amount of six volumes in mind¹⁶¹.

This is the edition naturally taken into consideration by the recent studies¹⁶², while G. Lefèvre-Pontalis' partial edition becomes more and more neglected.

J. Melville-Jones also mentions the intention of an Italian edition of the chronicle, under the patronage of *Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo di*

¹⁵⁴ F. Thiriet, *op. cit.*, p. 292; in the same sense, see also *ibidem*, p. 279.

¹⁵⁵ J. R. Melville-Jones, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 177, 180.

¹⁵⁶ S. Romanin, *op. cit.*, III, p. 182; F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne* cit., p. 16; S. Collodo, *op. cit.*, p. 128 n. 6; H. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 176, 180; A. Carile, *op. cit.*, p. 56; S. Collodo, *Note sulla cronachistica veneziana* cit., p. 14; D. M. Nicol, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, [Milan] 1990 [original edition, *Byzantium and Venice. A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*, Cambridge 1988], p. 583 n. 7.

¹⁵⁷ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., I, p. x.

¹⁵⁸ B. Z. Kedar, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

¹⁵⁹ R. C. Mueller, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹⁶⁰ J. R. Melville-Jones, *loc. cit.*, I, p. x; idem, *Publishing the Morosini Codex* cit., p. 178.

¹⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶² See also J. W. Barker, *op. cit.*.

Spoleto and having Andrea Nanetti from the University of Bologna as promoter¹⁶³.

Among the around 1,000 codices representing the Venetian chronicles written between the 11th and 18th centuries, the author of this paper selected the chronicle written by Antonio Morosini. Along with other Venetian historical writings, this particular one was regarded by Freddy Thiriet as so important that it should be edited with priority. The present paper makes an examination of the two main manuscripts that include this chronicle, meaning the original preserved at the Austrian National Library in Vienna and a very late copy made towards the end of the 19th century by those that directed Marciana National Library at those times. The proofs demonstrating the paternity and the date of the chronicle are also investigated in this paper, along with the place taken by it in the ensemble of Venetian historical writing. This latter is sustained by the analysis of the sources that it relies on and of its more or less possible influences upon other chronicles. All these respects are the result of an attempt of taking into consideration as more as possible modern works dealing directly or only tangentially with the Venetian chronicles.

¹⁶³ J. R. Melville-Jones, in *The Morosini Codex* cit., III, Padua 2005, p. vii. Meanwhile, Andrea Nanetti's edition was published, see above, n. 1.