BALCANICA POSNANIENSIA XXX
Poznań 2023

REBELLION ON HVAR ISLAND (1510–1514): PEOPLE'S REVOLT OR VENETIAN MANIPULATION?

PIOTR WRÓBEL

ABSTRACT. In the extensive work of the Dubrovnik-born Benedictine Lodovico Tuberon de Crieva, "Commentaria de temporibus suis" describing the events in the Mediterranean in the years 1490–1522, there is a small passage about the events on the island of Hvar (ital. *Lesina*). The island was then, together with most of the Dalmatian coast, under the rule of the Venetian Republic. On Hvar in 1510, a popular uprising against the local nobles broke out, which lasted with varying intensity until 1514. The Venetian authorities then sent considerable armed forces, which, after defeating the rebels at sea and on land, suppressed the rebellion. It is surprising, however, that Tuberon suggests in the above-mentioned passage that the outbreak of the revolt could have been provoked by the Venetians themselves, who feared the nobility allegedly favoring the King of Hungary. He also mentions the leading role of a clergyman who was supposed to encourage the plebs to act and initiate a revolt. Taking the mentioned text of Tuberon as a starting point, the author analyzes the political and social situation on the island of Hvar as well as the background and course of the events in the years 1510–1514. The author's goal is to establish what the grounds for Tuberon's presumptions were and to what extent they are true.

Author: Piotr Wróbel, Jagiellonian University, Institute of History, Gołębia 13 st., 31-007 Cracow, Poland, piotr.wrobel@uj.edu.pl, **ORCID:** https:/orcid.org/0000-0002-1332-4181

Keywords: Hvar (Lesina), rebellion, Venice, 16th century, Dalmatia

Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia, XXX, Poznań 2023, Wydawnictwo Wydziału Historii UAM, pp. 53–72, ISBN 978-83-67284-33-2, ISSN 0239-4278. English text with the summary in English.

https://doi.org/10.14746/bp.2023.30.4

The matter of the rebellion on the island of Hvar is backed by extensive literature in Croatia (and, previously, in Yugoslavia), ranging from columns in daily newspapers (and in Tito's times – party publications), through Catholic church periodicals, local publications, to serious scientific studies. Those interested are referred to extensive literature compilations on this subject prepared by Croatian historians.[1] The rebel-

[1] N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić — vojvoda Janko i stoljetna borba hvarskih pučana i plemića za politička prava*, "Arhivski vjesnik" [AV] 1977, vol. 19–20, p. 302–316; S. Antoljak, *Dosadašnji istraživački*

lion was probably first covered by Šime Ljubić in 1864, followed by extensive studies devoted to it by, among others, such outstanding researchers as Grga Novak and Nada Klaić.[2] The most extensive monograph, written by Andro Gabelić, was published in 1988 and comprises nearly 700 pages, which is impressive, considering the relatively narrow source base and the provincial nature of the matter.[3] The most interesting thing, however, is that the rebellion on Hvar still attracts the attention of Croatian historians and new, important sources are being discovered.[4] In this situation, a broader description of the events on Hvar in a short article would not make sense. It shall only refer to an interesting and puzzling, although rarely discussed by researchers, remark about the rebellion, made by the Benedictine monk from Dubrovnik, Ludovik Crijević Tuberon. This article shall try to explain it by placing it in a broader context.

In his extensive work *Writings on the Present Age*, describing the events in the Mediterranean basin from 1494 to 1523, Tuberon included the following small passage regarding events on the island of Hvar (*Lesina* in Italian):

> When the rebellion broke out, either by accident or by Venetian instigation — which is not mine to arbitrate — on the island of Hvar, which they call Lesina — the nobility was almost annihilated. The nobles were partly killed and partly driven from their homes and forefather's residences. For the plebeians of the island, under the influence of a certain clergyman of a single order, united with the peasants, and were the first among the Dalmatians to take up arms against the nobility. When this disease spread like a plague to the remaining Dalmatian areas of Venice, many nobles of Bar were killed by their people. The Kotorans, superior in numbers and strength to their opponents, easily defended themselves against the attack of the commoners with their courage. When they noticed that the plebs were gathering, they grabbed weapons and attacked them and drove them home without massacre or bloodshed, thus calming down the situation in Kotor after the unexpected confusion. In the remaining towns of Dalmatia there was more fear that some conspiracy against the Venetians would appear, than that any greater damage had been done by the people. Either the Venetians did this on purpose, so as not to make it appear that they had incited the people out of fraud, or they themselves decided that this amount of fear would be enough to keep the nobles of Dalmatia submissive.[5]

The question therefore arises: was the rebellion in Hvar a spontaneous outburst, as is most often concluded from the works of historians following the Venetian

---

radowi o pokretu Matija Ivanića i neka novonastal pitanja i problemi o njemu, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 7–26; N. Petrić, *Radovi o pučkom ustanku Matija Ivanića*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 541–550.

[2] S. Ljubić, *Pregled hrvatskie povijesti*, Zagreb 1864, p. 157–161; G. Novak, *Pučki prevrat na Hvaru 1510–1514*, Split 1918; por. seria artykułów N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić — vojvoda Janko* (1977) *i stoljetna borba hvarskih pučana i plemića za politička prava*, AV, vol. 19–20, 26, 27 (1977, 1983, 1984).

[3] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak hrvatskih pućana. Izvori-tokovi-dometi*, Split 1988.

[4] See: J. Bracanović, M. Zaninović-Rumora, *Novi izvori o hrvatskom pučkom ustanku*, "Croatia Christiana Periodica" 2020, vol. 44, no. 85, p. 51–79.

[5] Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, translation of a quote in Polish from *Pamiętniki o czasach moich*, eds. P. Wróbel, J. Bonarek, Kraków 2016, p. 302.

chroniclers (e.g. Marino Sanudo,[6] Petrus Bembo[7]), or a Venetian intrigue, as Tuberon suggests? In order to properly understand the above fragment, several issues should be discussed: 1) the geopolitical location of the island of Hvar in the 15th and 16th centuries 2) the social stratification of the island's inhabitants and the sources of conflicts between social groups 3) the course of the revolt along with the identification of its leading figures (including, especially, the clergy) 4) the international position of Venice at the beginning of the 16th century 5) the attitude of the author of the text, abbot Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, towards Venice and the events described.

Hvar (*Lesina* in Italian) is one of the larger islands located in central Dalmatia, with an area of approx. 300 km^2 — approx. 50 km from Split (near the Venetian Korčula and the Dubrovnik island of Mljet). Hvar came under the rule of Venice as a result of an agreement of 1278. Under the Treaty of Zadar in 1358 it came under the control of the Hungarian king Louis the Great.[8] After his death, during the reign of Sigismund of Luxembourg, Hungary lost its position on the Adriatic. Ladislaus of Naples sold Dalmatia to Venice in 1409 for 100,000 ducats. Despite Sigismund's counteraction, the Dalmatian communes (except for Dubrovnik) recognized the authority of *La Serenissima* in 1409–1420.[9] Interestingly, in 1413, Sigismund of Luxembourg handed over the island of Hvar along with Brač and Korčula to the Republic of Dubrovnik, but the latter was unable to upkeep the new acquisitions. The island remained with Venice, and under its control, until the fall of *La Serenissima* in 1797.[10] In the 16th century, the island of Hvar was probably inhabited by approximately 8–10 thousand people. The administrative center was the town of Hvar (*Lesina*), with approximately 3,000–3,500 inhabitants at the time, and was located on the southwestern tip of the island.[11]

---

[6] The main source for researchers of the Hvar rebellion are the extensive "Diarii", consisting of 58 volumes, written in the years 1496–1536 by the Venetian Marino Sanudo. Published in Venice between 1879 and 1903, they are available in their entirety on the Internet. Volumes 10–12, 14–16, 18–19 refer to the rebellion. Fragments of the "Diarii" concerning the southern Slavs were published by I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski in "Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslovensku" vol. 5, 6, 8, 12, Mletci (1859–1875). Of these, volume 6 (1863) refers to the uprising. For the purposes of this article, I have used bilingual Italian-Croatian fragments from the sources relating to the Hvar uprising by J. Bracanović, M. Zaninović-Rumory. For each record there is a reference to the complete Venetian edition; Marino Sanuto*, I Diarii*, vol. 1–58, Venezia 1879–1903; Marino Sanudo, *Odnošaji skupnovlade mletačke prema Južnim Slavenom*, ed. I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski, "Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku", vol. 5, 6, 8 ,12, Mletci (Venice) 1859–1875; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori o hvarskom pučkom ustanku*, Hvar 2014.

[7] Petrus Bembo, *Historiae Venetae libri XII*, Venetiis 1551, p. 144.

[8] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 43, 49.

[9] I. Poderin, *Mletacka uprava, privreda i polityka u Dalmaciji* (*1409–1797*), Dubrovnik 1990, p. 7; M. Šunjić, *Dalmacija u XV stoljeću*, Sarajevo 1967, p. 63–64.

[10] J. Tadić, *Venecija i Dalmacija u srednje veku*, "Jugoslovenski Istorijski Časopis", br. 3–4, 1968, p. 14; J. Radonić, *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. 1, no. 1, Beograd 1934, p. 221–223, 226–231, 233–234, 235–239, 242–244; V. Foretić, *Otok Korčula u srednjem vijeku do 1420 g*., Zagreb 1940, p. 188–212.

[11] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 59–62.

From the first document mentioning the city, dating back to 1205, we learn that certain municipal institutions and offices already existed in the city of Hvar. The ones mentioned include: *curia comunalis, strida* and *examinatores*. It also had its own set of laws, unwritten yet, as the record indicates: *…ut moris est civitatis.*[12] Since 1247, there was also a bishop in the city, who — as in other communes — apart from his church functions, initially played an important political role. It is confirmed that at least since the initial agreement of 1278, the entire area of the island was subordinated to the commune of the city of Hvar.[13]

The key source for us describing how Hvar is managed is the Statute of Hvar.[14] It is difficult to answer unequivocally when its first written version was created. We know that in 1329 the Venetians agreed to changes in the existing record, which resulted in the creation of the redaction in 1331 — that version has survived up to this day.[15] Originally, the statute consisted of three chapters and — as Ivo Kasandrić determined — it was largely identical to the Statute of Brač from 1305. This was due to the fact that Hvar (including Vis) and Brač formed a single administrative unit at the time, headed by a committee dictated by Venice. The statute retained its importance (although it was constantly supplemented) also in the era of Hungarian independence, when Hvar enjoyed its full autonomy. Shortly after becoming dependent on the Venetians again, in 1430, two more books were added to the three existing books of the statute. Since Brač had already received a separate commission, the articles created in Hvar then had a more original character, and some (e.g. maritime law) were even taken from the Statute of Dubrovnik. The statute in this form was printed in Venice in 1524 and, due to the loss of the original manuscript, this version is the basis for all modern editions.[16]

The executive power in Hvar was exercised by the Venetian representative under various titles: *comes, conte* or *rector* (and from 1470 bearing the title of *conte et provedador*), whose jurisdiction in the 16th century, apart from Hvar, also included Vis (approx. 2,000 inhabitants) and several smaller islands in the immediate vicinity. He

---

[12] *Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, ed. T. Smičiklas, vol. 3, Zagrabiae 1905, p. 53.

[13] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 34, 43; N. Duboković Nadalini, *Hvar u XIII stoljeću*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 1987, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 27–36.

[14] Apart from the old Venetian editions, we have two modern editions of the Hvar statute. The latest Croatian translation of A. Cvitanić, from 1991, is preceded by a very interesting study by Ivo Kasandrić. It also contains a photocopy of the Latin text of the statute from an earlier edition by S. Ljubić (1882–1883). Unfortunately, A. Cvitanić did not include the very important *Aggionta* and *Addimenta*, which were included in the earlier edition. Therefore, it is necessary to use both editions: the one from 1991 and the complete one from 1882–1883. See: *Hvarski statut. Statuta communitatis Lesinae* (*Pharae*), ed. A. Cvitanić, Split 1991; *Statuta et leges civitatis Budue, civitatis Scardonae et civitatis et insulae Lesinae*, ed. S. Ljubić, Zagrabiae 1882–1883.

[15] *Hvarski statut*, p. 41.

[16] Ibidem, p. 41–42; I. Strohal, *Statuti primorskih gradova i općina. Bibliografički nacrt*, Zagreb 1911, p. 55–57.

was elected by the Great Council of Venice and held office in Hvar for two years as its governor. He participated in Hvar's representative bodies and had the right to appeal against their decisions. He was paid by the island's inhabitants.[17]

Probably the earliest self-government body was the assembly of all the island's inhabitants (*arenga*). However, in the 14th and 16th centuries, it was already archaic and lost its importance. Rallies were called to celebrate important events or in emergency situations when universal acceptance was needed and standard mechanisms of power had failed (e.g. on 3rd of December 1418, when extraordinary legal measures had to be taken in response to a crisis threatening a social conflict).[18]

The most important self-government body of the Hvar commune was the Great Council of Nobility (*Generale Consilium Nobilium*), fulfilling numerous functions together with the comes (including legislative and judicial functions: the city officials were elected from among its members, including the most important ones — judges). Two specialized bodies were elected from among its members: the Small Council (*Curia*) performing executive and judicial duties together with the comes and the Council of the Wise (*Consilium Sapientium*), whose members prepared draft resolutions.[19] Although representatives of the most distinguished families of Hvar probably sat on the Great Council from the beginning, its composition was not originally legally defined. In 1334, a law was introduced stating that only a commune's citizen, whose father and grandfathers were already members of the Great Council, could be a member of the Great Council. This was the actual closure (*serrata*) of the Great Council, which meant that the circle of jurors was limited to representatives of 38 families, i.e. approximately 2% of the island's community. These holders of full political rights also constituted a clearly separated class of nobility (*nobiles*) of the island from then on. It should be emphasized that at least some of the nobles lived permanently in rural estates, outside the city walls. It is an open question to what extent these were descendants of the former nobility from the era of Narentines, and to what extent they were representatives of the urban elite of Hvar who decided to settle in the countryside.[20]

As in the case of other Dalmatian communes, the city's citizens (*cives*) lived in the city of Hvar. A citizen had to be a person settled in the city, free to own property there, most often his own workshop. Their private and legal status did not differ from that of the nobility. In particular, they had the same rights at their disposal concerning owning land, including that outside the walls (if they had it) and to exploit the local peasants. With minor differences, they were subject to the same procedural rules

---

17 A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 59–62.

18 *Hvarski statut*, p. 45, 166–167.

19 Ibidem, p. 43–44.

20 G. Novak, *Hvar kroz stoljeća*, Zagreb 1960, p. 63; I. Kasandrić, *Socijalna struktura hvarske komune i njen ujecaj na pucki ustanak*, "Hvarski zbrornik" 1974, vol. 2, p. 14; V. Huljić, *Pobude i poticaji hvarsko-viških pučana za ustanak i oružanu borbu 1510–1514. godine*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 106–109.

and criminal liability. However, they were not nobility, so they had no political rights: the right to participate in the Great Council (*ius suffragi*) nor the right to be elected into offices (*ius honorum*).[21] Members of this group in Hvar, following the example of other Dalmatian cities, carried out their social activity within the framework of religious brotherhoods, which were developing rapidly from the beginning of the 14th century, and in many cases, in crisis situations, they tried to reach for political power.[22] Their activities were also closely monitored by the elite.

The majority of the population of Hvar were inhabitants (*habitatores*) who did not have political or civil rights. These were small traders and craftsmen, servants, sailors, hired workers and marginal people who were prevalent in every urban settlement. In the 15th and 16th centuries, Hvar was one of the fleet bases and the center of the Venetian administrative district. The fact that Hvar was a port city with commercial and craft importance meant that there was always a group of foreigners (*forenses*) here. Part of it were the Venetians, who enjoyed a special status. As mentioned, most of the island's population, approximately ¾, lived outside the town of Hvar. These so-called *contadini* or *districtuales* were engaged in fishing or agriculture: farming or shepherding on their own land or land leased from the commune. All the above-mentioned groups inhabiting Hvar and not belonging to the nobility, despite radical differences in property and legal status, were referred to in the sources as "the people" (*popolo*), and we will further refer to them as the plebeians.[23]

From an economic point of view, Hvar experienced a period of prosperity under Venetian rule in the 15th and 16th centuries. In the opinion of, among others, J. Tadić and T. Raukar, the economic situation on the island was much better than in other areas of Venetian Dalmatia and was comparable to the situation in the independent Dubrovnik, which was experiencing a period of economic prosperity. This must be emphasized because the relative prosperity of Hvar's inhabitants had a significant impact on their aspirations, connections with partners in Venice and political horizons, which was an important factor in the uprising.[24] Vinko Pribojević reported on

---

[21] T. Raukar, *Cives, habitatore, forenses u srednjovjekovnim dalmatinskim gradovima* [in:] idem, *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku. Odabrane studije*, Split 2007, p. 43–52.

[22] Unlike the neighboring island of Brač, most of the brotherhoods' books on Hvar have been lost, which does not mean that we know nothing about their activities; N. Duboković-Nadalini, *Značenje bratovština za razvoj društvene svijesti na Hvaru U XIV, XV i XVI st*., "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 65; I. Benyovski, *Bratovštine u srednjovjekovnim dalmatinskim gradovima*, "Croatia Christiana Periodica" 1998, vol. 41, no. 85, p. 137–160; Z. Novak, *Hvarska bratovština sv. Duha u kasnom srednjem i ranom novom vijeku*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 2014, vol. 12, p. 113–138.

[23] T. Raukar, *Hvarsko društvo u doba Hannibala Lučića* [in:] idem, *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku. Odabrane studije,* Split 2007, p. 377–383; idem, *Hvarsko društvo u XVI stoljeću*, "Dani Hrvatskog kazališta" 1987, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 42–53.

[24] Croatian researchers (especially the older generation, but not only) tend to emphasize the negative effects of Venetian rule in Dalmatia and ignore the advantages that resulted from it. Particular attention is usually paid to the restrictions imposed on maritime trade, although Venetian protection is also blamed for the poor development of the crafts in Dalmatian cities. On the other hand, there is the excel-

the wealth of Hvar in his famous speech from 1525, and this is also confirmed by later Venetian reports.[25]

The key to Hvar's wealth was agricultural produce. Large amounts of wine, figs and olive oil were exported from the island. However, the inhabitants' own grain production lasted them for only two months. It was similar to animal husbandry. The rich leased larger herds to shepherds, under various contracts. All basic types of crafts existed on Hvar, but they only mainly satisfied the people's own needs. Only cooperage related to wine exports went above and beyond the local framework, as the barrels were needed to export salted fish — the island's second most important export. Nobles did not engage in fishing or fish trading, although it did bring very tangible income. The best places to fish with nets were selected publicly, and the city imposed strict regulations on the fish trade. Fishing, in turn, was related to shipbuilding, which developed in several places on the island. In 1553, the Venetians estimated the value of Hvar's trade at 70,000 ducats, which is a very large sum compared to other Dalmatian centers. It is important to highlight that that the income from wine trade was estimated at 15,000 ducats, and fish trade at 14,000.[26]

The main source of income for most of the island's inhabitants in the 16th century was land. The biggest land owner (approx. ⅔ of the island's area) was the commune itself. However, these were mostly forested or wasteland areas, good only for grazing — and thus, shared. Most of the fertile arable land further away from the town of Hvar was owned by representatives of the nobility and the Church. Citizens had small plots of land near the city, and small peasants' plots were scattered throughout the island. The owners of large estates did not use the land directly, but leased it to peasants. These agreements provided for the owner's participation in the actually harvested crops, not a fixed rental sum; de facto, the arrangement resembled that of a society (*societas*). Therefore, it was relatively advantageous for the owner.[27]

From the 15th century, population growth and an increase in demand for agricultural produce increased the pressure on the communal lands. The ban on transferring common forests and pastures into private hands was strictly enforced, but from the 15th century onwards, communal arable lands were increasingly transferred on a *de gratia* basis. Tenants took over small plots of land (usually 30 hoes, or approximately 435m^2) in exchange for ⅙ of the crops. This became a source of serious social

---

lent development of Dubrovnik in the 15th and 16th centuries, free from Venetian restrictions; J. Tadić, *O društvenoj strukturi Dubrovnika i Dalmacije u vreme renesanse*, "Zgodovinski časopis" 1952–53, vol. 6–7, p. 552–560; T. Raukar, *Venecija i ekonomski razvoj Dalmacije u XV. i XVI stoljeću*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 203–225; idem, *Srednjovjekovne ekonomije i hrvatska društva*, Zagreb 2003, p. 16–18; idem, *Komunalna društva u Dalmaciji u XV. i u prvoj polovici XVI. stoljecia* [in:] idem, *Studije o Dalmaciji*, p. 151–154, 169–188, 200–203.

[25] J. Tadić, *O društvenoj*, p. 561: A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 96–97.

[26] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 72–93; N. Bezić-Božanić, *Zanati na otocima Hvaru i Visu u XVI stoljeću*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 471–494; J. Tadić, *O društvenoj*, p. 561–563.

[27] *Hvarski statut*, p. 19–20.

tensions. The law theoretically provided residents with equal access to public land. However, the nobility not only did receive larger plots of land, but it also received them in areas that were not intended for this purpose. The Church also benefited from the special privileges that exempted it from paying fees for leased land. The *de gratia* agreements did not provide a specific deadline for the return of public land, and if the tenant was using it, it could not be taken away from them or their heirs, regardless of how many of them there were. The issue of communal land soon became the main focus of social clashes in Hvar.[28]

The provisions of the statute clearly dictate that all inhabitants of the island were personally free and — apart from the obligations arising from their lease (land, fishing spot, or, less often, pastures or animals) secured by a written contract or employment rental contract — were not subject to any other legal coercion.[29]

What is significant is that the first information about more serious tensions in Hvar concerns disputes between the nobility. In the years 1417–1418 there was a heated dispute over the selection of judges. On 18th of October 1417, king Sigismund of Luxembourg, who was the contemporary suzerain of the island, commented on this matter.[30] However, this did not end the dispute, and the nobility living outside the city tried to monopolize the judicial power. The plebeians came to the aid of the commune nobles and, as a result, the usurpers were expelled. The Great Council admitted some plebeian families into nobility, but this was quickly regretted. Finally, on 3rd of December 1418, a meeting of residents (*arenga*) was convened, where an agreement was concluded invalidating all decisions of the Great Council from the period of the dispute, and the expansion of its composition was canceled. Interestingly, the decisions unfavorable to the people were also supported by many representatives of the plebs, who were jealous that the privilege was given to only a select few people.[31]

However, disputes over the judiciary continued, and plebeians were constantly drawn into resolving them, and they proved to be a force that could not be ignored. In November 1419, the Great Council decided by a large majority (24 against 5) that its group would be expanded by additional 20 representatives of the people.[32] This rather desperate move proves the deep divisions among the Hvar elite. Ultimately, the com-

---

[28] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 106–121; *Hvarski statut*, p. 21–23.

[29] The examples mentioned by A. Cvitanić, and other Croatian researchers, of discrimination against commoners by the nobility on the island (although it is difficult to deny them) do not go beyond the widespread exploitation of the workers by the land owners at that time, in several aspects. Most importantly, they are not specific to Hvar but occurred throughout Dalmatia, including the areas of the Dubrovnik Republic; A. Cvitanić, *Diskriminacija pučana u Hvarskom statutu*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 79–91.

[30] The ruler generally condemned those responsible for the conflict and recommended that the selection of judges be identical to that of the Split commune; see: *Statuta*, p. 393.

[31] Ibidem, p. 393–396; I. Kasandrić, *Društveno-politički uzroci sukoba pučana s vlastelom na Hvaru*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 94–96.

[32] *Statuta*, p. 397–398.

position of the Great Council was not expanded that time. As the issue of the composition of the courts continued to cause arguments, a committee of four reformers (three noblemen and a representative of the Hvar clergy) was established to work out a solution.[33] What is significant is that the reform was again aimed at expanding the decision-making group to include elected plebs. The effect of the committee's work was presented at the assembly (*arenga*) on 24th of March 1420. Six plebeian families were admitted to the Great Council and the privileges of some noble families in the field of the judiciary were removed. However, apart from the majority of the nobility, among the plebeians the reforms only gained the support of people from rural areas, bribed with grants of public land.[34]

Meanwhile, the external situation has changed radically. On 30th of March 1420, the Doge of Venice, Tommaso Mocenigo, ordered the commander of the fleet, Pietro Loredan, to take over several areas on the eastern Adriatic coast that were still independent from *La Serenissima*'s rule, including Hvar. According to the document issued at that time, the inhabitants of the island were to choose the *comes* themselves, provided that he came from the lands subject to Venice.[35] In the light of the current management practice in Dalmatia, it is unlikely that the Venetians intended to uphold this condition.

The taking over of Hvar by the Venetians opened new prospects for the plebeians. They formed an alliance with an unspecified group of nobles and took their own diplomatic actions in Venice. Unlike the delegation representing the majority of the Hvar nobility, which, among many other postulates, demanded, at the beginning of 1421, that the *comes* be elected by the Great Council, the plebeians, through their own deputies, asked that the right to elect the *comes* be entrusted to: *populo et universitati ac aliquibus nobilibus* or that *La Serenissima* appointed a Venetian who would take over this office every two years. Moreover, the supplication strongly requested that Dalmatians are not be appointed as a *comes*.[36]

The movement of the plebeians (supported by some unspecified group of nobles!) was extremely beneficial to the Venetian authorities, who gained an excuse to withdraw from their previous obligations and appoint their own representative as *comes* in Hvar. The official sent from Venice (the first one was Paris Sorano, who arrived in April 1421) became a key figure in the island's administrative system. As mentioned, the *comes* exercised executive and judicial power over Hvar and Vis and sev-

---

[33] Ibidem, p. 398.

[34] The plebeians from Hvar, despite the efforts of the nobles, did not support the commission's findings because they believed that they still would not have proper political representation; ibidem, p. 398–401; I. Kasandrić, *Društveno-politički*, p. 96–97.

[35] *Statuta*, p. 401.

[36] We know the requests of both delegations from the answers provided by the Venetian delegation of *Concilium Sapientes* 13.03.1421; *Statuta*, p. 406.

eral smaller islands. The Great Council could not meet without his presence, and the laws passed (*ordines et leges*) became valid only after his approval.[37]

It is significant that in the above-mentioned supplication addressed to the Venetian authorities at the beginning of 1423, the nobles complained about the actions of some subversive people …*facientes conventiculas et alia consilia non consueta et inusitata*… and asked for a firm ban on this type of gatherings. The Venetians replied in a general and evasive manner that they hoped that the message they had sent would contribute to eliminating the scandal and discord.[38] The above-mentioned entry is very important because it indicates the genesis of the so-called *congregae*, i.e. plebeian representations on Hvar. In fact, realizing the benefits they could derive from the discord between plebeians and nobles, the Venetians did not abolish these assemblies, but over time even sanctioned their existence. They also recognized the rights of plebeians to independent political activities. This is indicated by the Venetian document of 9th–10th of June 1446, which is a response to *Capitula pro parte nobilium, et popularium separatim*, which mentions the doge's letter to the plebeians in Hvar of 6th of June 1440. He consents to their sending a separate delegation to Venice at the expense of the commune. He also mentions the plebeian *colloquii e consei*.[39] The competences of these bodies are not entirely clear, as they are not mentioned in any statutes. We know from the document mentioned above, that the *Congrega* was to meet with the consent and under the chairmanship of the *comes*, and he was to validate their decisions.

Unfortunately, information about the relations between the nobility and the plebeians in the first decades of Venetian rule is scant. It seems that the nobility, not feeling confident in the new political situation, avoided irritations and were ready to make concessions. This is indicated by the laws introduced at that time ordering nobles to travel to Venice to file a complaint at their own expense, and to participate personally in the work on the renovation of the city walls, which until then had only been the responsibility of the plebeians. The authorities also reacted positively to complaints from plebeians regarding abuses in forcing residents to guard the city walls and patrol the waters around the island to guard against pirates, from which the nobility previously was also exempt.[40] Even in the previously mentioned sensitive issue of abuses by the nobility in the leasing of communal land (*de gratia*), the nobles were ready to make concessions. Since 1466, decisions on these matters were to be made by a committee comprising two nobles and two plebeians.[41]

---

[37] The risk posed by the divergent position of the inhabitants of Hvar was brilliantly demonstrated by N. Klaić in her article, summarizing with the statement that "the Venetians made concessions to both parties in order to finally achieve what was most beneficial for them"; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1983, p. 105–107; *Hvarski statut*, p. 45.

[38] *Statuta*, p. 403–404.

[39] Ibidem, p. 411.

[40] I. Kasandrić, *Društveno-politički*, p. 97–98.

[41] *Statuta* (Aggionta XII), p. 241.

Despite these achievements, the part of the plebeians in Hvar with greater aspirations felt aggrieved at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries, as can be seen from the numerous complaints and supplications submitted to the Venetian authorities by their representatives. An issue that was very painful for the lower classes was the unequal distribution of municipal burdens and profits. Trade in many goods within the city was taxed, and tax collection was leased to private individuals at a public auction. However, only noblemen could be collectors. The leases brought them huge incomes, which were constantly growing on the economically flourishing island. How important the issue of participation in public income was in Hvar in the context of social disputes is clearly demonstrated by, for example, the *Capitula a popularibus porrecta dominio veneto*. It was filed at the beginning of 1502, where, among others, we find a statement that if this problem was not solved, the clashes between plebeians and nobles would continue.[42] The decision made by the Venetians in response, was to make a commune treasurer present their books for a public inspection. It did not alleviate the situation.[43]

The immediate cause of the outbreak of the rebellion in 1510 was a criminal act: rape committed by young noblemen on a commoner woman. The leader of the rebellion was a certain Matija Ivanić — a member of an influential plebeian family, who, together with the inhabitants of the village of Vrbanj, attacked the nobles in Stari Grad on 23rd of May 1510. Three alleged rape perpetrators were killed. Ivanić forced the intimidated nobles to approve the demands regarding the admission of plebeians into the Grand Council, and the introduction of equal public burdens and rights. Two days later, these decisions (*capitula*) were presented to the Venetian *rector* — Antonio Lippomano, who had just replaced Bernardino Zane.[44] According to the Venetian chronicler Marin Sanudo (the best source for the history of the rebellion), on 27th of May Lippomano sent a letter to Venice about the course of the rebellion.[45] At the same time, the island's rector Brač Nicolo Molina[46] also submitted a report on the events in Hvar.

The previous close relations of the Hvar plebeians with the Venetians probably meant that (as we have seen) the rebellion was dealt with surprisingly quickly on the diplomatic level. The implementation of the capitulation became the rebels' political program.[47] This is probably what Ivanić presented to the authorities in July 1510 (referred to by the chronicler as *fati sforzadi* — forced) during his stay in Venice, arguing with the Hvar nobleman, Marin Hektorovic. According to the Venetian chronicler

---

[42] Ibidem, p. 436–439.

[43] Ibidem, p. 438; *Hvarski statut*, p. 36.

[44] See: A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 207–208; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1983, p. 129–131.

[45] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 21, p. 589.

[46] Ibidem, doc. 19, p. 588–589; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 48–51.

[47] L. Dančević, *Istupanja Matija Ivanića i drugih pučkih vođa pred mletačkom vladom*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 1974, vol. 4, p. 42–44; A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 21, p. 591–592.

M. Sanudo, the cause of the plebeians in Venice was previously defended by a certain Nicolo de Lessina.[48]

However, from the very beginning of the rebellion, there were people on the Venetian side ready to take military action. The *provveditore dell' armata*, Jeronimo Contarini, standing on the coast of Hvar with the crews of four galleys on 9th of June, contacted the rector. Although Lippomano claimed that the situation had calmed down, Contarini had to land ashore with his crew and successfully persuade the groups heading to Hvar to disperse. Soon, Contarini sailed to the island of Korčula, from where he called on the *sinioria* to act decisively against the plebeians, warning that, otherwise, a rebellion would develop throughout Dalmatia. However, the authorities stalled.[49]

Meanwhile, when the intimidated majority of the nobility left Hvar, the plebeians became the lords of the island. Matija Ivanić (nicknamed "Janko Sibińanin" in honor of János Hunyady) gathered a significant force of approximately 2,000 people and 30 boats, and patrolled the surrounding waters. The rebels tried hard to win the favor of the Venetians. In March 1511, the plebeians sent a ship full of figs and gelatinized fish to *La Serenissima*, but this was not well received.[50]

Given the complicated political situation in Italy at that time, the Venetian authorities did not decide to take any radical steps, and, meanwhile, the rebellion was spreading along the eastern coast of the Adriatic (especially Bar, Kotor, Zadar and Šibenik). The Venetian *provveditori dell' armata*, Jeronimo Contarini, and the specially sent Giovanni Navagero, did not have any clear orders. There was still room for negotiations.[51] In August 1511, Matija Ivanić went to Venice again, where he presented the position of the plebeians before the expanded Council of Ten, and strongly opposed the idea of the nobles returning to Hvar for the harvest time. Meanwhile, the nobility demanded a general meeting of the people of Hvar to be called, to clarify the situation — which, again, seems to be a rather moderate demand.[52]

Meanwhile, in Venice, there was a growing readiness to solve the problem by force. In September 1511, the energetic Sebastian Giustinian was appointed as *provveditore*.[53] However, it was as late as in the summer of 1512 that he finally reached Dalmatia with a large fleet and army — with the intention of suppressing the rebellion. First, he dealt with the rebels in Zadar and Šibenik. In August 1512, the Venetian fleet entered Hvar.

---

[48] According to the Venetian chronicler M. Sanudo, the cause of the plebeians in Venice was previously defended by a certain Nikola de Lessina, who was hanged by the Venetians in 1520; A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 30, 34, p. 591–592; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 56–61.

[49] G. Novak, *Matij Lukanić i Toma Bevilaqua prvi vođe pučkog prevrata na Hvaru god. 1510–1514*, "Starine" 1978, vol. 57, p. 28; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 54–57; A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 214–217.

[50] L. Dančević, *Istupanja*, p. 45; idem, *Maritimno-političke prilike na Jadranu početkom XVI stolječa*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 187.

[51] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 220–226; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1984, p. 167–169.

[52] L. Dančević, *Istupanja*, p. 45; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 91–95.

[53] Ibidem, p. 96–97.

The proclamation threatened the rebels with cruel punishments and announced the exile from the territory of the Republic of Venice of 66 named rebels, chiefly Matija Ivanić.[54] However, the plebeians did not intend to capitulate. Contrary to the opinions of some researchers, the *provveditore*'s policy in Hvar was more complex and did not rely only on brute force. He tried to break up the plebeian camp by fighting and negotiating at the same time. Perhaps this is the cause of strange ambiguities and inconsistencies in the reports he submitted to his superiors. The military actions of the Venetians, initially conducted energetically and sometimes with cruelty (e.g. burning the village of Vrbanj), ended in defeat near the village of Jelsa. The *provveditore* was dismissed as a result. A. Gabelić pointed out that the Venetian authorities treated Giustinian with appreciation and quickly entrusted him with a different, yet honorable and responsible position. This contradicts the claims (including those of N. Klaić), based mainly on Marin Sanudo's account, that Sebastian Giustinian's actions on Hvar were considered reprehensible and the effects were poor, for which he was punished by removal from the Council of Ten.[55] With ambiguous assessments of the *provveditore*, it is worth paying attention to the entry regarding his expedition to Dalmatia made in Marcantonio Michiel's diary, in which the author writes that is was a "good undertaking" interrupted by the "hatred" of certain people from Venice.[56]

This military defeat forced the Venetians to change their policy towards the Hvar plebeians to a more conciliatory one, and to start some talks. However, the effects of the actions in the autumn of 1512 were felt on the island as well. The initial successes of the Venetians caused some of the nobility to return to the island and the city of Hvar certainly remained under the control of *La Serenissima* officials. However, the situation in other areas of the island was unclear.[57]

Meanwhile, the plebeians skillfully conducted diplomatic and propaganda activities. Already in September 1512, a group of 30 people headed by Juraj Gruminovic appeared in Venice and complained about the cruel methods of Sebastian Giustinian on Hvar.[58] In November, when the *provveditore* was reporting to the Senate (*Pregadi*) on his failed mission, Hvar plebeians organized several demonstrations against him. A few days later, on December 3, Matija Ivanić appeared in person before the authorities again and clashed with the canon, Toma Grivičić (Griffico), who defended the position of the nobility.[59]

---

[54] Ibidem, p. 127–132.

[55] Por.: A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 238–257; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1984, p. 171–185.

[56] M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 150–151.

[57] The fact that after Giustinian's withdrawal, the city of Hvar was in the hands of the Venetians, is proven by documents from 20th of May 1513 and 10th of January 1514. At that time, a Venetian commission was in the city, and there were also organs of noble self-government; A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, p. 261; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 154–155, 160–161; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1984, p. 186–187.

[58] L. Dančević, *Istupanja*, p. 45; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 154–155, 160–161.

[59] L. Dančević, *Istupanja*, p. 46.

Unfortunately, the sources say very little about the situation on Hvar from November 1512 to August 1514.[60] There was probably a lull in both diplomatic and military activities, which was related to the plague that spread in Venice, and which lasted even longer in Hvar.[61]

In the summer of 1513, tensions on the island increased. The upcoming harvest prompted nobles to return to the island and their estates. The then *comes* of Hvar, Vincenzo Donado, reported to his superiors in July that he could not carry out the *sinioria*'s order and Giustinian's proclamation of 1512 to expel certain rebels from the island, because the inhabitants did not listen to him.[62] At about the same time, another delegation of plebeians from Hvar in Venice earnestly asked for the annulment of Giustinian's proclamation. The Doge made vague promises, but the situation remained a stalemate.[63]

It seems that the *rector* of Hvar, Vincenzo Donado, was responsible for the renewal of military operations at the beginning of August 1514. This is at least clear from the later words of the *provveditore* Vincenzo Cappello recorded in the chronicle of M. Sanudo and the fact that charges were later brought against him in Venice in this matter.[64] The date of the outbreak of hostilities was not accidental, as 2nd of August was the feast day of the patron saint of Hvar, St. Stephen. The celebratory market lasted from 27th of July to 4th of August, attracting crowds from all over the island. We know the course of events from a letter of a direct witness, the *comes* of Hvar, Vincenzo Malipiero, from 8th of August 1514, whose account was included in his chronicle by M. Sanudo.[65] The events were described slightly differently in a letter to the Doge by a noblemen who had fled from Hvar to Trogir,[66] dated to 30th of August. After a seven-day siege from land and sea, the plebeians (Donado estimated their number at 6,000 people) broke the gate, entered the city and killed 24 nobles. Among the dead were: Marin Hektorović, father of the famous poet Petar, who previously, among others, defended the cause of the nobility during the trials in Venice. The mob occupied the citadel, the *rector*'s palace, and broke into private houses where the nobility were sheltering. Interestingly, Malipiero emphasized that no one was robbed. *Rector* Vincenzo Donado managed to escape, but many nobles were kidnapped by plebeians. The rebels soon realized that the explosion would bring severe vengeance from the *signoria*. Diplomacy was tried again by sending a conciliatory letter to Venice, to which the injured Hvar nobles responded with the previously mentioned letter, full of indignation and harsh accusations.[67]

---

[60] J. Bracanović, *Pučka opsada grada Hvara* (*1.–7. kolovoza 1514.*), "Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti HAZU" 2020, vol. 30, p. 223.

[61] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 93, p. 604–605.

[62] M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 156–157.

[63] Ibidem, p. 156–156.

[64] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 91, p. 607; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 172–173.

[65] Ibidem, p. 172–173.

[66] Ibidem, p. 167–171; A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 7, p. 577–578.

[67] J. Bracanović, *Pučka opsada*, p. 224–228.

This time the Venetians did not delay. The seriousness of the crimes committed was significant. The political situation in Venice (which will be discussed later) also differed from that of four years ago.[68] 15 galleys were immediately sent to Hvar under the command of *provveditore* Vincenzo Capello. After fierce fighting in August and September 1514, Capello defeated the enemy's naval forces and then — not without effort — defeated the plebeians on land. In a letter to Venice from October 17, Capello reports that he captured the leaders of the uprising, 20 were hanged, and 10 had an eye gouged out and a hand cut off. Only one, probably Matija Ivanić himself, managed to escape to Krajina.[69]

At the same time in Venice, Juraj Gominović, whose brother was on the proscription list, was making desperate diplomatic efforts to calm the *signoria*'s anger.[70] The Doge was surprisingly quick to show mercy to the beaten inhabitants of Hvar. By the act of 38th of October 1514, he freed all those previously exiled and accused, except for Ivanić, who — if he was captured — was to be hanged.[71] Perhaps severity in this case was advisable, because Matija was a threat to the Venetians also later. In September 1516, he even appeared on Hvar, where he captured a ship with wine. From 1516 he lived mainly in Italy, most often in Rome. He died at the turn of 1522–1523.[72] So much for the course of the rebellion.

In the fragment of Tuberon's chronicle mentioned at the beginning, we read that the plebeians were incited to action by "a certain clergyman". The question is who that was.

It is possible, although in my opinion unlikely, that Tuberon referred to the "miracle of the cross" known among Croatian Catholic believers, the 500th anniversary of which was celebrated with great solemnity by the church in Hvar in 2010, and because of which on 6th of February — the day of St. Dorothy — every year there is a solemn procession gathering crowds of believers.[73]

The closest account and the most interesting account of the events, from our point of view, was left by Pavel Palladini, a Hvar nobleman. According to him, on 6th of February 1510, there was an earthquake, as a result of which the roof of the Church of our Lady Nuncijata collapsed. At the same time, in the house of the port's armorer, Nikola Bevilaqua, blood appeared on a crucifix hanging on the wall.

---

[68] According to N. Klaić, the reason for the violent reaction of the Venetians was the demonstrative sea expedition of Hvar commoners to Omiš, which was under the jurisdiction of the Venetian Split, discussed in the above-mentioned letter of the escaped noblemen. The Venetians were ready to tolerate the rebellious plebeians on Hvar, but they responded with an armed force to an attempt to expand the rebellion; N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1984, p. 195.

[69] J. Bracanović, *Pučka opsada*, p. 224–228; M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 170–171.

[70] L. Dančević, *Istupanja*, p. 47.

[71] A. Gabelić, *Ustanak*, doc. 98, p. 608–609.

[72] N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1984, p. 196–199.

[73] If you are interested in the topic of the Hvar's Holy Cross, please see my article submitted this year to the "Perspektywy Kultury" magazine (*Akademia Ignatianum*, Kraków).

Father Matija Lukanić, a family friend and chaplain of the Church of our Lady Nuncijata, was called. Palladini notes that Nikola's son, Tomo Bevilaqua, who died a few months earlier as a result of an accident, and father Lukanić were "the cruelest whips against the nobility", and they conspired in the room where the miracle occurred. Former *comes* Bernardino Zane and other dignitaries were informed about the event, and the cross was moved to a cathedral. The next day, a solemn procession took place, and on Sunday, 10th of February, in front of a large gathering, father Lukanić, repentant and shocked, publicly admitted that he had previously conspired against public order and implored the people not to persecute the nobility.[74] In the following days, there were spontaneous public acts of penance by men, women and children, and flagellants appeared on the streets. Over time, father Lukanić seemed to completely lose his mind: he blasphemed and cursed, shouting that it was he who started everything and so it should end with him. The priest was to die in agony on 16th of February 1510.[75]

G. Novak (and several Croatian historians of younger generations after him) treated both Palladini's account, and other testimonies related to the case of the cross, very seriously. Apart from the issue of the miracle itself, Novak also concluded that Palladini's testimony indicates the early existence of a plebeian conspiracy led by the above-mentioned Matija Lukanić and Tomo Bevilaqua.[76] If such a point of view were to be accepted, the enigmatic priest mentioned by Tuberon could be Lukanić.

So why does this seem unlikely? Tuberon was not only a sincerely devoted Benedictine monk, but also a well-informed observer of the events. He was writing his *Commentaria* until 1523. If he had known the story about the miracle on Hvar (and if he had considered it authentic!), he would certainly have written about it first, and only then about the rebellion and its organizers. Meanwhile, there is no information about this event, so either the news about the miracle did not reach Dubrovnik before 1523 or there were serious doubts as to the authenticity of the account.

So who could this enigmatic priest be? Among the rebels sentenced to death by hanging in October 1514 by *provveditore* Vincenzo Capello, there are two clergymen. The identity of one of them is unknown. The second one was Ivan Zovinić, who appears quite often in the sources. Before the rebellion, he was a parish priest in the village of Jelsa. After the death of the above-mentioned Matija Lukanić in February 1510, he became the canon of the Hvar chapter. He wholeheartedly sided with the rebels. During the rebellion, he led the trial of priest Toma Grivičić, who was on the side of the nobility. There was a personal conflict between the clergy, as Zovinić did not only take away Toma's benefice on the island of St. Clement,

---

[74] G. Novak, *Matij Lukanić*, p. 34–35.

[75] J. Bracanović, *500 godina čašćenja sv. Križića. Hvar 1510–2010*, Hvar 2010, p. 43–51; G. Novak, *Matij Lukanić*, s. 34–36.

[76] Ibidem, p. 37.

but also his priority (*primiceriat*) in the chapter. In 1511, Grivičić filed a complaint against Zovinić to Pope Leo X himself, who in 1513 suspended him as a rebel.[77] In 1512, the priest was on the list of the proscribes prepared by Sebastian Giustinian. The *provveditore* described him there eloquently as "the origin of all evil".[78] As N. Klaić writes, the Venetians knew that Zovinić was ready to defend his canon status with weapons in his hands.[79] No wonder he was hanged. This famous figure can most likely be identified with the cleric mentioned by Tuberon.

Turning our attention to the situation of Venice in the era of the rebellion, it should be noted that even a superficial analysis of the events on Hvar shows that the Venetians acted slowly and without any decisiveness. This resulted from the international situation Venice was in at that time. On 10th of December 1508, as J.J. Norwich colorfully put it, two powers issued a death sentence on Venice. Margaret of Austria, governess of the Netherlands, on behalf of her father, Holy Roman Emperor Maximilian I, and cardinal Georges d'Amboise, as the representative of Louis XII of France, created the League of Cambrai: *to put an end to all the wickedness committed by the Venetians*. Pope Julius II and a number of Italian states soon joined the alliance.[80] The defeat inflicted by the French at the Battle of Agnadello on 9th of May 1509 not only deprived Venice of its army but also broke their morale.[81] But Venice persevered. Skillful diplomacy worked to break up the alliance. The empire remained passive and Pope Julius II changed his front in 1510. After humiliating *La Serenissima* envoys, he attacked the French. The creation of the Holy League in October 1511 finally brought the Venetians out of their isolation. The defeat of the papal troops at the Battle of Ravenna on 11th of April 1512 did not directly affect the Venetians, but prompted the Holy Roman Emperor to join the League in May 1512. The years 1509–1512 were therefore a period of deep crisis of *La Serenissima*. Over time, despite some territorial losses, Venice regained its position, although it soon turned out that its allies could pose a serious threat. The conclusion of an alliance with France in 1513 removed the danger of a return of the Treaty of Cambrai. Venice, previously on the verge of collapse, caught its breath and was able to take more decisive actions, including towards its rebellious subjects. The wars continued and only the victory in 1516 marked the end of the critical period of wars for Venice. However, as noted by J.J. Norwich: Venice retained its territories, but lost its power.[82]

Moving on to the last issue, i.e. the influence of Tuberon's views on the description of the Hvar uprising, this seems to be crucial for understanding the fragment quoted at the beginning. I will refer to my findings made in the introduction to the edi-

---

77 N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1983, p. 110–114.
78 M. Zaninović-Rumora, J. Bracanović, *Izvori*, p. 130–131.
79 N. Klaić, *Matija Ivanić*, AV 1983, p. 114.
80 J.J. Norwich, *Historia Wenecji*, Warszawa 2015, p. 392–393.
81 P. Tafiłowski, *Wojny włoskie 1494–1559*, Zabrze 2007, p. 169–173.
82 J.J. Norwich, op. cit., p. 397–431.

tion of his *Commentaria*.[83] Tuberon treated the Venetians with the deepest of dislikes. We can even label it as a certain type of phobia. In his work, he crafted their stereotype: Venetians are merchants who hate nobles. They are calculating, cynical, greedy, ruthless in choosing their methods and principles.[84] Importantly, they sometimes fall into their own traps. We see all the above-mentioned elements in relation to the short description of the rebellion on Hvar. Tuberon was both well-informed, and a great observer, but he should not be trusted when he writes about Venice.

To sum up the above arguments, it must be said that the rebellion in Hvar was the result of growing aspirations of some local plebeians, who wanted to throw off the economic and political restrictions imposed on them by the dominant nobility. Clergy also did participate in the rebellion, such as the above-mentioned priest Ivan Zovinić, who is considered one of its ringleaders. From the beginning, the rebels tried hard to gain the favor of the authorities in Venice, aware that only with their acceptance could they achieve lasting results. For its part, Venice, weakened on the international arena, initially avoided using force against the Hvar plebeians, especially since it had already profited from tangible benefits from a cooperation with them. When political circumstances changed and the plebeians escalated the conflict, the rebellion was quickly defeated by force. Ludovik Crijević Tuberon, a resident of Dubrovnik, extremely unfriendly towards the Venetians, gives his own biased retelling of the events, although it is based on real facts. He presented the plebeian revolt as the result of Venetian manipulation.

REFERENCES

Sources

Bracanović J., *500 godina čašćenja sv. Križića. Hvar 1510–2010*, Hvar 2010.

Bracanović J., Zaninović-Rumora M., *Novi izvori o hrvatskom pučkom ustanku*, "Croatia Christiana Periodica" 2020, vol. 44, no. 85, p. 51–79.

Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae, ed. T. Smičiklas, vol. 3, Zagrabiae 1905.

Hvarski statut. Statuta communitatis Lesinae (*Pharae*), ed. A. Cvitanić, Split 1991.

Ludwik Tuberon de Crieva, *Pamiętniki o czasach moich*, eds. P. Wróbel, J. Bonarek, Kraków 2016.

Marino Sanudo, *Odnošaji skupnovlade mletačke prema Južnim Slavenom*, ed. I. Kukuljević-Sakcinski, "Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku", vol. 5, 6, 8, 12, Mletci (Venecija) 1859–1875.

Marino Sanuto, *I Diarii*, vol. 1–58, Venezia 1879–1903.

Petrus Bembo, *Historiae Venetae libri XII*, Venetiis 1551.

Radonić J., *Dubrovačka akta i povelje*, vol. 1, no. 1, Beograd 1934.

Statuta et leges civitatis Budue, civitatis Scardonae et civitatis et insulae Lesinae, ed. S. Ljubić, Zagrabiae 1882–1883.

Zaninović-Rumora M., Bracanović J., *Izvori o hvarskom pučkom ustanku*, Hvar 2014.

---

[83] The subsection is titled: *Świat widziany oczami Tuberona*; Ludwik Tuberon de Crieva, op. cit., p. 21–31.

[84] Ibidem, p. 29–30.

Publications

Antoljak S., *Dosadašnji istraživački radowi o pokretu Matija Ivanića i neka novonastal pitanja i problemi o njemu*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 7–26.

Benyovski I., *Bratovštine u srednjovjekovnim dalmatinskim gradovima*, "Croatia Christiana Periodica" 1998, vol. 41, no. 85, p. 137–160.

Bezić-Božanić N., *Zanati na otocima Hvaru i Visu u XVI stoljeću*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 471–494.

Bracanović J., *Pučka opsada grada Hvara* (*1.–7. kolovoza 1514.*), "Zbornik Odsjeka za povijesne znanosti HAZU" 2020, vol. 30, p. 219–230.

Bracanović J., Zaninović-Rumora M., *Novi izvori o hvarskom pučkom ustanku*, "Croatia Christiana Periodica" 2020, vol. 44, no. 85, p. 51–79.

Cvitanić A*., Diskriminacija pučana u Hvarskom statutu*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 79–91.

Dančević L., *Istupanja Matija Ivanića i drugih pučkih vođa pred mletačkom vladom*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 1974, vol. 4, p. 42–48.

Dančević L., *Maritimno-političke prilike na Jadranu početkom XVI stolječa*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 179–202.

Duboković-Nadalini N., *Hvar u XIII stoljeću*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 1987, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 27–36.

Duboković-Nadalini N., *Značenje bratovština za razvoj društvene svijesti na Hvaru u XIV, XV i XVI st.*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 65–77.

Gabelić A., *Ustanak hrvatskih pućana. Izvori-tokovi-dometi*, Split 1988.

Foretić V., *Otok Korčula u srednjem vijeku do 1420 g.,* Zagreb 1940.

Huljić V., *Pobude i poticaji hvarsko-viških pučana za ustanak i oružanu borbu 1510–1514. godine*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 106–109.

Kasandrić I., *Društveno-politički uzroci sukoba pučana s vlastelom na Hvaru*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 93–102.

Kasandrić I., *Socijalna struktura hvarske komune i njen ujecaj na pučki ustanak*, "Hvarski zbornik" 1974, vol. 2.

Klaić N., *Matija Ivanić — vojvoda Janko i stoljetna borba hvarskih pučana i plemića za politička prava*, "Arhivski vjesnik" 1977, vol. 19–20, p. 302–342.

Klaić N., *Matija Ivanić — vojvoda Janko i stoljetna borba hvarskih pučana i plemića za politička prava* (*nastavak*), "Arhivski vjesnik" 1983, vol. 26, p. 99–131.

Klaić N., *Matija Ivanić — vojvoda Janko i stoljetna borba hvarskih pučana i plemića za politička prava* (*nastavak*), "Arhivski vjesnik" 1984, vol. 27, p. 161–204.

Ljubić Š., *Pregled hrvatske povijesti*, Rijeka 1864.

Norwich J.J., *Historia Wenecji*, Warszawa 2015.

Novak G., *Hvar kroz stoljeća*, Zagreb 1960.

Novak G., *Matij Lukanić i Toma Bevilaqua prvi vođe pučkog prevrata na Hvaru god. 1510–1514*, "Starine" 1978, vol. 57, p. 5–49.

Novak G., *Pučki prevrat na Hvaru 1510–1514*, Split 1918.

Novak Z., *Hvarska bratovština sv. Duha u kasnom srednjem i ranom novom vijeku*, "Prilozi povijesti otoka Hvara" 2014, vol. 12, p. 113–138.

Petrić N., *Radovi o pučkom ustanku Matija Ivanića*, "Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest" 1977, vol. 10, p. 541–550.

Poderin I., *Mletačka uprava, privreda i polityka u Dalmaciji* (*1409–1797*), Dubrovnik 1990.

Raukar T., *Cives, habitatore, forenses u srednjovjekovnim dalmatinskim gradovima* [w:] idem, *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku. Odabrane studije*, Split 2007, p. 43–52.

Raukar T., *Hvarsko društvo u XVI stoljeću*, "Dani Hrvatskog kazališta" 1987, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 42–53.

Raukar T., *Srednjovjekovne ekonomije i hrvatska društva*, Zagreb 2003.

Raukar T., *Studije o Dalmaciji u srednjem vijeku. Odabrane studije*, Split 2007.
Raukar T., *Venecija i ekonomski Razvoj Dalmacije u XV. I XVI stoljeću*, "Radovi" 1977, vol. 10, p. 203–225.
Strohal I., *Statuti primorskih gradova i općina. Bibliografički nacrt*, Zagreb 1911.
Šunjić M., *Dalmacija u XV stoljeću*, Sarajevo 1967.
Tadić J., *O društvenoj strukturi Dubrovnika i Dalmacije u vreme renesanse*, "Zgodovinski časopis" 1952–1953, vol. VI–VII, p. 552–563.
Tadić J., *Venecija i Dalmacija u srednjem veku*, "Jugoslovenski Istorijski Časopis" 1968, vol. 3–4, p. 5–17.
Tafiłowski P., *Wojny włoskie 1494–1559*, Zabrze 2007.