

VERONICA ORTENBERG WEST-HARLING

‘Venecie due sunt’¹: Venice and its grounding
in the Adriatic and North Italian background

Was Venice unique in the first centuries of its expansion? Was it essentially a Byzantine city, as is so often said? Such indicators as the dating of official state acts by the reigns of the Byzantine Emperors, the use of Byzantine imperial court titles by the doges, or even the marriage of Pietro II Orseolo’s son in 1004 to the Byzantine emperor’s niece, could make one think so². For a long time one or the other of the above views, separately

¹ I should like to express my thanks for helpful discussions, and my gratitude for their unstinting practical support for my research, to my colleagues in the Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici of the Università Ca’ Foscari in Venice, where I spent three months as a Visiting Ricercatrice in 2012, especially to Professors Stefano Gasparri, Gherardo Ortalli, Flavia de Rubeis, Sauro Gelichi and Giorgio Ravegnani, as well as to Maria Cristina La Rocca from the University of Padua. The title quote comes from John the Deacon’s *Istoria Veneticorum*, for which I have used the most recent edition and translation by L.A. Berto, *Giovanni Diacono. Istoria Veneticorum*, Bologna, Il Poligrafo, 1999, henceforth *JnDn*, I, 1.

² Both the uniqueness of Venice’s history and its Byzantine attachments have been highlighted in the last century by some of its most eminent historians, notably R. Cessi, *Venezia Ducale II: L’età eroica*, Padua, 1929, pp. 107-144, repr. Venezia, 1940; *ibid.*, «Politica, economia, religione» in *Storia di Venezia II: Dalle origini del Ducato alla IV Crociata*, ed. Centro Internazionale delle Arti e del Costume, Venice, 1958, pp. 82-229; *ibid.*, «Bizantinismo veneziano», *Archivio Veneto* ser. 5, 69, 1961, pp. 3-22 and «Venezia e il Regno italico nell’alto medioevo», *idem*, 75, 1964, pp. 9-19 [henceforth *AV*]; A. Carile, «La formazione del ducato veneziano», in A. Carile ed., *Le Origini di Venezia. Sezione Prima*, Bologna, 1978; *ibid.*, «Il ducato venetico fra ecumene bizantina e società locale», in *La Venetia: dall’Antichità all’Alto Medioevo*, Rome, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1988, pp. 89-109; *ibid.*, «Venezia e Bisanzio», in *Le relazioni internazionali nell’alto medioevo. Settimane di Studio del Centro di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo* 58, 2011, pp. 629-687; A. Pertusi, «Cultura Bizantina a Venezia», in Folena, G., *Storia della cultura veneta I: Dalle origini al Trecento*, Vicenza, N. Pozza, 1976, pp. 326-49; *ibid.*, «L’impero bizantino e l’evolvere dei suoi interessi nell’Alto Adriatico», in Branca, V. (ed.), *Storia della civiltà veneziana I: Dalle origini al secolo di Marco Polo*, Florence, Sansoni, 1979, pp. 51-71 (henceforth *SCV*); and of course one must not forget the vast exhibition catalogue *Venezia e Bisanzio* ed. by S. Bettini and I. Furlan, Venice, 1974, of the major *Mostra* on the subject held in 1974 in the Palazzo Ducale, nor

or jointly, have coloured the usual perception of the period of the *dogado* (duchy) of Venice from its early days in the late 7th century to its end and its replacement by a system of government by a commune with the doge in the mid-12th. However, completely giving in to this view is by and large subscribing to the myth that Venice itself had been constructing since John the Deacon and throughout the existence of the Serenissima³, while perhaps leaving out too readily the awareness of the deep longstanding connection of the city and the lagoon with that other, original, Venetia, which stretched from Ravenna to Istria across the North Adriatic arc. Recent reevaluations, notably in a seminal paper by Stefano Gasparri, have begun to challenge this understanding, at least for the period of preeminence of the *dogado* in the 9th and 10th centuries⁴. I believe that it is legitimate to question whether, at that period, uniqueness and/or Byzantine association are indeed the only and perhaps even the main components of the day to day existence of the city. My own impression from an initial study of the written, art historical and archaeological material leads me to believe that, in its practical, everyday life, the main component in the history of Venice at this time was a deep grounding in its terraferma, the Adriatic area extending from its original Ravenna and Comacchio associ-

D.M. Nicol, *Byzantium and Venice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 1-67. The most recent and even-handed historian in this respect is G. Ortalli, «Il Ducato e la 'Civitas Rivoalti': Tra Carolingi, Bizantini e Sassoni», in Cracco Ruggini, L., Pavan, M. et al. (ed.), *Storia di Venezia. Dalle origini alla caduta della Serenissima I: Le origini. L'età ducale*, Rome, Treccani, 1992, pp. 725-790 (henceforth cited as SVT); *ibid.*, «Venezia dalle origini a Pietro II Orseolo», in Delogu, P. et al. (ed.), *Storia d'Italia II: Longobardi e Bizantini*, Milan, UTET, 1980, pp. 341-438.

³ Of particular interest is the work of A. Carile and G. Fasoli on the origins of Venetian myth-making itself, see A. Carile, «Le origini di Venezia nella tradizione storiografica», in *Storia della cultura veneta*, Venezia, Patron, 1978, pp. 135-166; *ibid.*, «La città di Venezia nasce delle cronache», in K. Belke et al., *Byzantina Mediterranea*, Cologne, Böhlau, 2007, pp. 105-121; and G. Fasoli, «Nascità di un mito. Il mito di Venezia nella storiografia», in *Studi in onore di Gioacchino Volpe*, Florence, Sansoni, 1958, pp. 447-79, and «I fondamenti della storiografia veneziana», in *La storiografia veneziana fino al secolo XI: Aspetti e problemi*, Florence, Sansoni, 1970, pp. 11-44, both repr. in F. Bocchi, A. Carile and A.I. Ivan (eds.), *Scritti di Storia Medievale*, Bologna, La Fotocromo Emiliana, 1974, pp. 445-452 and 499-527. More recently, new work had been done on the topic of the myth of Venice, see P. Fortini Brown and A. Molho, *The self-definition of the Venetian republic*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 1991, and E. Crouzet-Pavan, *Venise triomphante: les horizons d'un mythe*, Paris, Albin Michel, 2nd ed., 2004, pp. 273-292.

⁴ S. Gasparri, «Venezia fra l'Italia bizantina e il regno italico: la *civitas* e l'*assemblea*», in S. Gasparri, G. Levi and P. Moro (eds.), *Venezia. Itinerari per la storia della città*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1997, pp. 61-110.

ations, to Istria, via the Carolingian march of Friuli in the Italian hinterland, including notably the Trevisano, Bellunese and Ceneda, and beyond this, the counties of Verona and Padua.

This paper deliberately leaves out the issues of the Venetians' developing trade links with Italy, whether with the Po plain or further afield, both North and South⁵. My aim is not to look at commercial exchange, whether of luxury long-distance Eastern goods or of the more locally-based kind through the trading of salt, fish, wood and other basic commodities, but to highlight the rootedness of this Italian hinterland and Adriatic arc in the daily business of living and communicating in the *dogado*. Land ownership and exchanges, cultural and religious affiliations, business interests, legal and administrative customs and institutions, all seem to indicate that, in its daily life and routine, the duchy of Venice in the 9th and 10th centuries, and probably until 1204, was closely intertwined with its positioning within Northern and Central Italy, and especially in its deeply-felt and continued association with its Adriatic background.

It is easiest to observe this during a period of relative peace and quiet, with few truly high-octane events, as were the years between 888, the year of the accession of Berengar to the throne of Italy, when Pietro Tribuno had been doge since the previous year, and 976, the year of the spectacular assassination of Doge Pietro IV Candiano together with the massive destruction of the ducal palace and the basilica of St Mark⁶. At this point the history of Venice has a relatively low-key profile on the international front. Before 888 there had been the conquest of Italy by Charlemagne in 774 and the attempt by his son Pepin to incorporate Venice into the Carolingian kingdom between 805 and 810, ending with his abortive attack on Venice at Albiola in 810, and followed by the rivalry between Charlemagne and the Byzantine Empire for the possession of Venice, settled through the treaty of 812, when Charlemagne officially accepted the continuation of

⁵ Numerous works have concentrated on it, most recently G. Rösch, *Venezia e l'impero 962-1250. I rapporti politici, commerciali e di traffico nel periodo imperiale germanico*, Rome, Il Veltro, 1985, transl. of *Venedig und das Reich: Handels- und verkehrspolitische Beziehungen in der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historisches Instituts in Rom 53, 1982, and H. Zug Tucci, «Negociare in omnibus partibus per terram e per aquam»: il mercante veneziano», in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea*. CISAM 40, 1993, pp. 51-79.

⁶ *JnDn*, III, 35-46 and IV, 1-13; main retellings of the story are, for example, in R. Cessi, *Venezia Ducale*; G. Ortalli, «Il Ducato», pp. 755-767 and «Venezia dalle origini», pp. 369-416.

Byzantine sovereignty over the city as demanded by the Emperor Michael I⁷. At the other end of the period, the Ottonian take-over of Italy led to another western imperial attempt to conquer the city with Otto II's blockade of 983, followed by the much mellower relations of his son Otto III with the doge Pietro II Orseolo, culminating in the secret visit by the emperor to Venice in 1001⁸.

These high-profile events in 'foreign policy' had also been closely associated with some of the high notes of political, social and cultural changes within the city. First was the conflict between several aristocratic factions in the 810s and 820s, traditionally portrayed as representing the old and new settlements of Cittanova Eracleia and Malamocco then Rialto when the doges moved their seat there in 813, and/or the alleged pro- Byzantine and pro- Frankish positions of these factions, the first represented by the Galbaio doges Maurice, Giovanni and Maurice II between 765 and 802, the second by the joint rule of the brothers Obeliero (802-811) and Beato (808-811), and finally the first again by the rule of Doge Agnellus Particiaco (811-827) and of his sons Giustiniano (827-829) and Giovanni (829-836)⁹. Second was the flare-up of the perennial conflict between the patriarchs of Grado and Aquileia, which had led to the papal and imperial Synod of Mantua in 827 giving the upper hand to Aquileia and unwisely demoting Grado to the status of parish, an event which was itself to lead almost directly to the spectacular theft of the relics of St Mark from Alexandria in 827, their reception with great honour by the doge in Rialto, and the beginning of the never-broken connection of the city with the patronage of St Mark¹⁰. Third

⁷ *JnDn* II, 18-44, III and IV; see also some of the Frankish and German views in *Annales Regni Francorum*, ed. G.H. Pertz rev. F. Kurze, in *MGH SRG*, Hannover, 1950, ann. 806-807, 809-811; for the narrative see as above n. 6 and P. Moro, «Venezia e l'occidente nell'alto medioevo. Dal confine longobardo al pactum lotariano», pp. 41-57 and S. Gasparri, «Venezia fra l'Italia bizantina e il regno italico», in *Venezia. Itinerari*, pp. 61-81.

⁸ For Otto's visit, see G. Althoff, *Otto III*, University Park, Penn State University Press, 2003, pp. 59 and 110-112, and N. d'Acunto, *Nostrum Italicum Regnum: Aspetti della politica italiana di Ottone III*, Milan, Vita e Pensiero, 2002, pp. 46 and 114.

⁹ See above n. 7.

¹⁰ *JnDn*, *passim*; on these vast topics, see, for example, S. Tramontin, «S. Marco», and A. Niero, «Reliquie e corpi dei santi», in S. Tramontin, A. Niero *et al.*, *Culto dei santi a Venezia*, Venice, Studium Cattolico Veneziano, 1965, pp. 41-73 and 192-194. The most important recent work has been summarized in various papers in A. Niero (ed.), *S. Marco: Aspetti storici e agiografici. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi veneziani, 26-29 aprile 1994*, Venice, 1996, and in R. Lebe, *Quando S. Marco approdò a Venezia: Il culto dell'evangelista e il miracolo politico della Repubblica di Venezia*, Rome, Il Veltro, 1981, as well as in S. Tramontin, «Culto e liturgia», and G. Cracco, «I testi agiografici: reli-

was the official delimitation of the duchy of Venice in its geographical spread and its practical relations in terms of trade and law with Carolingian imperial Italy, through the privilege granted by King Lothar in 840 to the Venetians, supplemented by a second, even more advantageous one in 841, once Lothar had become emperor¹¹. The *Pactum Lotharii* was to be the blueprint for the relations between Venice and the Carolingian empire, then the *Regnum Italicum*, and again the Ottonians, for nearly 200 years, being renewed almost every time a new ruler ascended the throne of Italy¹². These events had been the backdrop on which the city of Venice had begun its economic and political ascent. But despite two upheavals in Venice, the Hungarian attack on the city in 899-900 followed by the defeat inflicted on the attackers in 900, and the finally successful attempt at destroying the remaining economic power of Comacchio in 932¹³, Venice between 888 and the 970s did not suffer any major external traumas. The documents from these years tend to be less concerned with grand imperial policy and allow us a glimpse of a more Venetian-centred setting within the development of the city¹⁴. A look at this more mundane material highlights how

gione e politica nella Venezia del Mille», in *SVT*, pp. 900-909 and pp. 925-928 and 935-946; the new edition of the *Translatio* text, superseding the traditional N. McLeary one in his «Note storiche e archeologiche sul testo della 'translatio S. Marci'», in *Memorie storiche foriogiuliesi*, 27-29, Cividale del Friuli, Deputazione di storia patria per il Friuli, 1931-33 is now that by E. Colombi, in her «*Translatio Marci evangelistae Venetias (BHL 5283-5284)*», *Hagiographica*, 17, 2010, pp. 73-129, at pp. 112-129. On the conflict between Grado and Aquileia, for which there is a vast literature, see for example P. Kehr, «Rom und Venedig bis ins 12. Jahrhundert», *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 19, Rome, 1927, pp. 71-87 and 171-184; and D. Rando, *Una Chiesa di frontiera. Le istituzioni ecclesiastiche veneziane nei secoli VI-XII*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1994, pp. 13-20 and 60-65.

¹¹ See above, n. 7.

¹² R. Cessi, «Il 'pactum Lotharii' del 840», *Atti del Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* 99, 1940, pp. 1110-1149 (henceforth *AIVSLA*).

¹³ *JnDn* III, 44; Ortalli, «Il Ducato», and S. Gelichi, «The eels of Venice. The long eighth century of the emporia of the northern region along the Adriatic coast», in S. Gasparri (ed.), 774. *Ipotesi su una transizione*, Turnhout, Breppols, 2008, pp. 81-117.

¹⁴ We know from an aside in the treaty with Capodistria of 977 (R. Cessi [ed.], *Documenti relativi alla storia di Venezia anteriori al Mille, II: Secoli IX-X*, Padua, Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, 1940, anastatic ed. 1991 by C.F. Polizzi, Venice, henceforth R. Cessi, *Documenti II*) that the fire of the ducal palace, which had killed Pietro IV, had also destroyed an unquantified number of documents in the ducal chancery, and it is of course always possible to assume the destruction of many early documents on account of that and later fires in the city; it is also likely, however, that we would know from other sources if events with major international implications had occurred.

clearly one sees the city's history relying on the consolidation of its position within the Adriatic, Northern Italian and Western worlds.

The main foreign policy acts between 888 and the beginning of the Ottonian period were the periodic renewals of the *pactum Lotharii* of 840 and its subsequent transformations into the agreement between the Carolingians and the doges with regard to the specified frontiers of the duchy from Cavarzere in the South to Grado in the North, and the terms of reciprocal trade, legal and diplomatic arrangements. Of great significance were the considerable latitude allowed to Carolingian authorities to intervene in the affairs of Venice by sending *missi*, and the ability of the emperors to call a muster of Venetian ships to defend the Italian coastline¹⁵. This was countered by the Italian kings' and emperors' firm engagement to allow free passage, protection and control over their estates to the Venetians travelling or living in the Empire. The *pactum* had been renewed by most Carolingian emperors until Charles III the Fat in 887 and, with few variations, was then renewed by Berengar I in 888, by Guy in 891 at Mantua, by Rudolf in 925 and by Hugh in 927 in Pavia, before its next major rephrasing in 967 in Rome by Otto I¹⁶. The obvious inference is that the doges made certain, at every change of regime within the *Regnum*, to obtain confirmation of the privileges acquired by the Venetians after 840. The only two missing are such documents as should have existed for Hugh's successors Lothar II and Berengar II at their respective accessions to the throne of Italy in 947 and 950. The reasons for the interruption of such a canny tradition lies in the events of the reign of Pietro III Candiano. He became doge in 942 but then had to contend with his son Pietro's rebellion, the latter's exile by the will of the Venetian people, and his refuge at the court of Berengar II, where his career and preferences led him to embrace – as we shall see – a fundamentally different style of political and social attitudes from those of his father¹⁷. When Berengar II came to fight Otto, however, the younger Pietro chose Otto, and subsequently, when he returned to Venice to be elected doge

¹⁵ A good example of this is the phrasing of the capitulary of Lothar in 847, see A. Boretius and V. Krause (eds.), *MGH Legum Sectio II: Capitularia Regum Francorum vol. II*, Hannover, 1897, no. 203, pp. 65-68, ch. 12 at p. 65, and now C. Azzara and P. Moro (eds.), *I capitolari italiani. Storia e diritto della dominazione carolingia in Italia*, Rome, Viella, 1998, pp. 151-162, at ch 12.

¹⁶ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, nos 16, 21, 22, 32, 33 and 37; see also R. Cessi, «Pacta veneta», *AV* 3, 1928, 118-184 and 5, 1929, pp. 1-77, both reprinted in his *Le origini del ducato veneziano*, Venice, Morano, 1951.

¹⁷ See below, pp. 255-256 on Peter IV's attempt to enforce a closer version of the lordship model of the *Regnum* in Venice; also Ortalli, «Il Ducato», pp. 763-766; A. Castagnetti, «Insedimenti», and «Famiglie e affermazione politica», in *SVT*, pp. 585-587 and 613-644; *ibid.*, *La società veneziana nel medioevo. I. Dai tribuni ai giudici*, Verona, Libreria Uni-

after his father's death in 959, the traditional confirmation of privileges took place in 967. Pietro Candiano, after becoming Pietro IV, put into practice the lessons learnt from his years of exile in a world of feudal traditions of land ownership, private armies and marriage alliances, notably after his successful repudiation of his first, Venetian wife Giovanna, and his marriage to one of the foremost heiresses of the *Regnum*, Waldrada, the sister of Marquess Ugo of Tuscany and niece of the widow of Lothar II and subsequently wife of Otto I and Empress, Adelheid. Much has been already written about the impact of this association on the policies of Venice, ending with the dramatic fire set by one of the two powerful factions of the city to the Ducal Palace and the deaths of Pietro IV and his son in 976¹⁸. Historians like Gasparri and Ortalli have argued that this was the highest, possibly the only, point of convergence between the political and ideological traditions of the developing 'feudal' regime of Italy, and the government of Venice. Most of the time, the two were removed from each other in their political organisation, and Venice did not share this with the *Regnum* – an issue which I am leaving aside in this paper. However, this was not the case in the social, cultural, economic and religious spheres, where the convergence between Venice and its Italian hinterland is considerable. We see it through diplomatics, coins and epigraphy, linguistics, onomastics and toponymy, religious and ecclesiastical traditions, the practice of law, land ownership in the *Regnum* by Venetian families or monasteries, and marriage alliances between Venetian and Italian aristocratic families, of which the Candiani are only the foremost example.

To demonstrate these close associations, I will examine some examples of surviving documents, broadly divided into five major blocks. The first block I have already mentioned as being the several renewals of the *pactum Lotharii* and the privileges of Venice within Italy¹⁹. All five documents

versitaria, 1992; *ibid.*, *La società veneziana nel medioevo. I. Le famiglie ducali dei Candiano, Orseolo e Menio e la famiglia comitale vicentino-padovana di Vitale Ugo Candiano (secoli x-xi)*, Verona, Libreria universitaria, 1993; M. Pozza, «Vitale-Ugo Candiano. Alle origini di una famiglia comitale del regno italico», *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 5, 1981, pp. 15-33, henceforth SV; L.A. Berto, «Pietro IV Candiano, un doge deposto perché era troppo virtuoso o perché era troppo autoritario?», SV 40, 2000, pp. 163-168. On this, one needs to look also at the story as depicted after 976, in the understanding of the reign of Pietro I Orseolo, see G. Ortalli, *Petrus I Orseolo und seine Zeit. Anmerkungen zur Geschichte der Beziehung zwischen Venedig und dem ottonischen Reich*, Venice, Thorbecke, 1990; *ibid.*, «Quando il Doge diventa santo. Fede e politica nell'esperienza di Pietro I Orseolo», SV, n.s. 41, 2001, pp. 15-48.

¹⁸ *JnDn*, IV, 11-13.

¹⁹ See above n. 12.

which confirm the renewal of privileges to the Venetians in the *Regnum* in the period 888-976 are dated by the reign of the kings of Italy (Berengar, Rudolf and Hugh) and/or western emperors (Guy, Otto I), and are privileges conceded to the doge and the people of Venice, in a pactum renewed "*cum Petro Veneticorum duce, et cum omnibus habitantibus vestre potestatis*"²⁰; neither the dating nor the interlocutors are defined as Byzantine. The representatives of the doges, when mentioned, are, respectively: Domenico priest and chaplain, Maurizio and Vitalis in 891, the envoys of Doge Orso II Bishop Domenico of Malamocco and Stefano Coloprino in 925, and Giovanni Flabianicum and Stefano Coloprino again in 927²¹. There are differences across the period, not least on account of the progression of the envoys from a mix of clerics and secular nobles to a solely secular embassy in 927 and 967 – an important feature of the rising secular political authority in Venice, which will be discussed elsewhere. The Coloprini and the Flabianici represent two of the families of *maiores*, whose importance in the 10th century increases steadily. The families mentioned, such as the Coloprini and the Flabianici, together with other traditional families mentioned by John the Deacon, and by the much less reliable though not much later version of the *Origo*, also claimed to come originally from Upper Italy (the North Italian cisalpine region), as well as the Adriatic coast, a major building block of Venetian identity²². By studying the geographical location of the main Venetian families as put forward by the two catalogues of the *Origo*, one incorporating what may have been an original 9th century text, one can at least document, in the foundation myths of these families, where they *thought* they came from and how they maintained the memory of that real or fictional origin still in the 12th century²³. It is possible to use the list of signatories and witnesses in the two best-known documents from the reign of Pietro IV, which forbade the slave trade and trading with the Saracens respectively²⁴, and which both have extensive lists of names including those of the leading families in the *dogado*, and to correlate many

²⁰ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, nos 21, p. 29.

²¹ *Idem*, nos 22, 32, 33.

²² *Origo*, in R. Cessi (ed.), *Origo Civitatum Italiae Seu Venetiarum (Chronicon Altinate et Chronicon Gradense)*, Fonti per la storia d'Italia 73, Rome, 1933, first version, ch. 9, pp. 46-47 and third version, chs 8 and 10, pp. 146-153 and 157-160; G. Rösch, *Der Venezianische Adel bis zur Schließung des Großen Rats. Zur Genese einer Führungsschicht*, Siegmaringen, Thorbecke, 1989, pp. 17-34.

²³ *Origo*: the earliest catalogue, in Version 3, dates from 1081-1118, but it is possible that the catalogue in Version 1 is a copy of an older, 9th-century version, see G. Rösch, *Der Venezianische Adel*, p. 25.

²⁴ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, nos 41 and 49.

of these names with the origins given for these families in the *Origo* catalogues. When doing so, we find their alleged origin in Mantua (Mauroceni), Cremona (Coloprini), Pavia (Particiaci/Badovarii), Candiano near Rimini (Candiani), Lake Garda (Grauso), Nigrisa (Mauro), Caulana (Noheli), Treviso (Stornato), Cesena (Centranico), Meluno (Lupanici), Ferrara (Flabiani), Concordia (Contareni), Castro Auxulo (Andreadi), Fano (Faletri). The first nine families are said to have reached Venice from Cittanova Eracleia and the last four from Jesolo/Equilo²⁵. Some families are said to have arrived directly from Parma (Barbolani) or Vercelli (Mastalici), though more often we find prestigious families with no other place of origin than Cittanova (Orseoli, Bragadin, Zupolo or Lupanici). By the 12th century, it was far more fashionable already to highlight Venice's Byzantine connections, if there were any available. Therefore, one might argue that it is all the more remarkable to see how, without a doubt, the most powerful and influential families in the duchy liked to associate their origins with the cities or areas of Northern and Central Italy.

The next three groups of documents are chosen to demonstrate the three major geographical spaces which played a crucial part in the life and in the construction of the identity of Venice in this period. The first set deals with the doge's and the Venetian people's involvement with the monastery of S. Stefano in Altino after its partial destruction by Hungarian raiders in 899-900, showing the continuing link between Venice and its immediate hinterland in the Northern Lagoon²⁶. The second deals with the tribute agreement and promise of peace with Venice made by the cities of Istria, major trading partners for the island city, and shows the importance of the northern Adriatic coast as an essential element in the life of the city²⁷. The third concerns the grant and subsequent confirmations of land given by major figures of the *Regnum*, especially in the Veneto and Friuli, to Venetian monasteries, focusing here on those of the family of the counts of Verona to the monastery of S. Zaccaria²⁸. Let me examine them in turn.

First comes the doge's protection for the monastery of S. Stefano of Altino. Altino was considered to have been the original centre from which the bishop had had to flee and take refuge from the Longobards on the island of Torcello, where he had transferred his see²⁹. For a long time he con-

²⁵ *Origo*, as above n. 17; A. Castagnetti, «Insediamenti e populi», pp. 596-9 and 614-626; Rösch, *Der Venezianische Adel*, pp. 43-6.

²⁶ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, nos 25 and 31.

²⁷ *Idem*, nos 35, 36, 56.

²⁸ *Idem*, nos 30, 34, 45; A. Gloria (ed.), *Codice diplomatico padovano dal secolo sesto a tutto l'undecimo*, Venice, Kessinger, 2010, vol. II, nos. 29, 34 and 46.

²⁹ *JnD*, III, 11.

tinued to call himself bishop of Altino, and gradually after oscillating between the two titles, finally came to use only the title of Bishop of Torcello. S. Stefano of Altino, whose first appearance in the texts dates from 874, remained associated with the six dioceses making up the Church of Venice³⁰. The doges dealt with it in a purely Carolingian political style, using monasteries as political tools, as they did with most of the monasteries they founded both in Venice itself, like S. Zaccaria, S. Servolo and S. Giorgio, and on the terraferma, as exemplified by the transfer of S. Servolo to the newly-founded monastery of S. Ilario near Marghera by the Particiaco doge in 819. The two surviving documents that we have for the monastery of S. Stefano are a privilege of 900, when Doge Pietro Tribuno confirms the grant by his predecessor the doge Orso of some estates and rights originally belonging to 'his' bishop Gislebert in the diocese of Torcello, to Abbot Joanicus of S. Stefano, to help its rebuilding after the Hungarian destruction, and a document of 919 (or possibly 934), in which Doge Orso II Particiaco/Badoer, together with the people of Venice *primates, fideles, una parte populi terrae nostrae*, and "all 'our' bps and judges", in full *placitum* at Rialto, rules in favour of Abbot Marinus and S. Stefano's rights and immunity, against the bishop of Altino/Torcello Pietro who had tried to muscle in on this immunity³¹. By that stage, there were in fact few monks left at S. Stefano itself, most of the monastery having been transferred to the new abbey of SS Felix and Fortunatus at Ammiana, even closer to the centre of power in Rialto³². The grant of 900, witnessed by the patriarch of Grado Vitalis, was approved by the bishop of Torcello/Altino Gislebert, also apparently known as Ingelbert – incidentally a Bavarian reputed to have been a son of King Carloman³³ –, and had a strong proportion of lay signatories such as Giovanni Gradonicus, Orso

³⁰ G. Mazzucco (ed.), *Monasteri benedettini nella laguna di Venezia: Catalogo di Mostra, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana*, Venice, Arsenal, 1983; M. Pozza, «Per una storia dei monasteri veneziani nei secoli VIII-XII», in F.G.B. Trolese (ed.), *Il monachesimo nel Veneto medioevale*, Atti del convegno di studi in occasione del Millenario di fondazione dell'Abbazia di S. Maria di Mogliano Veneto, Treviso, 1996, pp. 17-38; L. Lanfranchi, «I documenti sui più antichi insediamenti monastici nella laguna veneziana», and G. Spinelli, «I primi insediamenti monastici lagunari nel contesto della storia politica e religiosa veneziana», in A. Carile, F. Tonon (ed.), *Le origini della Chiesa di Venezia. Contributi alla storia della Chiesa veneziana I*, Venice, Edizioni studium cattolico veneziano, 1987, pp. 145-146 and 159-160.

³¹ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, nos 25 and 31. For the privilege of 900, see also the edition and commentary in V. Lazzarini, «Un privilegio del doge Pietro Tribuno per la badia di S. Stefano d'Altino», *AIVSLA*, 68, 1909, pp. 975-993.

³² R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 31.

³³ R. Cessi, *Origo*, p. 130.

Badoer, Domenico son of Domenico tribune, and two notaries, as well as the above bishops and other clergy, Pietro deacon of the royal court, and a priest Raphael. Significantly, it too is issued at the ducal court in Rialto, where the *placita* dealing with S. Stefano's affairs and most documents issuing from the ducal chancery are placed. Both documents, unlike the treaties, are dated by regnal years of Byzantine emperors, and include the Byzantine title of the doges, *imperialis protospatrius*, in conjunction with *Venetorum dux*. Venetian subject-status to Byzantium remains in this very official document, and Venetian protocol preserves the Eastern Imperial official status. At the same time, however, the actual transaction and method of it, a secular style intervention in the affairs of a monastery and its immunity – itself a Carolingian concept – in conflict with the local bishop, as well as the method of judgment by *placitum* in Carolingian style, is revealing. It is a good indicator, in the first place, of the reality of Venice's Byzantine lip-service combined with a Longobard then Carolingian tradition of control over monasteries and immunity. Secondly, it showcases the reality of government through the *placitum* associating secular *primates* and ecclesiastical dignitaries of the dioceses of the lagoon (here the bishops of Olivolo, Malamocco, Eracleia and Caorle), all appointed by and under the control of the doges³⁴.

A second set of documents consists of three official agreements between the doge and the representatives of the cities of Istria. The first in 932 is in the form of a promise of tribute from these cities³⁵. The second, a year later, reflects the resolution of the conflict between the Italian-appointed Marquess of Istria Wintherius, probably a Frank, and Venice, which had been manifested by attacks on the Venetian fleet and on some territories belonging to the patriarch of Grado by Wintherius at the head of some mainly Istrian cities which found the Venetian presence in their midst too powerful³⁶. The attacks were defeated by the Venetians and were followed by a promise on the part of the marquess, on behalf of the cities of Justinopolis/Capodistria, Pola, Mugla, Pirano, Cittanova, Caorle, and Trieste, that they would desist in these attacks and support Venice, an especially important concession in the case of Capodistria, which was then an essential trading post. The power of Venice was clearly sufficient to maintain this status quo for a long time, since we do not hear of such altercations

³⁴ On the role of the *placitum* in ducal appointments, and conversely on the relationship between the doges' political power and the Church, see the vast general literature on the *dogado* and the Church already cited above, for example D. Rando, *Chiesa di frontiera*. For the *placitum* see below, pp. 263.

³⁵ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 35.

³⁶ *Idem* no 36.

any more; we just have a renewal of the peace agreement signed in 977 by Doge Pietro I Orseolo and the Istrian Count Sicard representing the inhabitants of Capodistria, the leading city³⁷.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this set of events. The first is the obvious inference of the rising political and economic power of Venice in the North Adriatic, which is displayed through both the imposed tribute and its successful mastery of the 932 rebellion, which effectively placed a province subject to Carolingian then Italian and finally Ottonian control under the real 'protection' of the doge³⁸. This arrangement was reiterated after a time of turmoil within Venice itself after the murder of Pietro IV Candiano, showing that even such a violent internal convulsion in the city would not allow for a change in its domination of the Istrian coast. The importance of the area was such for the power of Venice that keeping control over the province was not negotiable, and the message was as clearly spelled out to the Istrians as to the Ottonians, whose subsequent policy always had to take into consideration the interests of Venice in Istria, for example when Otto III was negotiating with Pietro II in what was said by John the Deacon to have been such exceptionally great amity. Otto III's interests in Venice, apart from the personal link with Pietro II, were said by historians of the Ottonian period to be clearly associated with his aspirations to use the *dogado* as a means of control over the kingdoms of Central Europe, especially Hungary, and the price for this was to be Venetian control of Istria and subsequently of Dalmatia³⁹. However, beyond these political interests, it is significant how strongly Venice was anchored in this region, partly through its links with the cities of the original non-maritime province of *Venetia*, such as Cittanova and Caorle, which had been part of the *dogado* from the beginning, and the Istrian cities subsequently taken on by Carolingian rulers in Istria. Venice's Adriatic bonds crossed the political boundaries between Carolingian province and *dogado*, as well as the ecclesiastical ones, since, for example, the bishopric of Caorle was still part of the patriarchate of Grado, while the others in the province of Istria had been removed to the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Aquileia under the Carolingians⁴⁰.

³⁷ *Idem* no 56.

³⁸ G. De Vergottini, «Venezia e l'Istria nell'alto medioevo», in *SCV*, pp. 72-84. J. Ferluga, «Veneziani fuori Venezia», in *SVT*, pp. 693-720.

³⁹ M. Uhlirz, «Venezia nella politica di Ottone III», in *SCV*, pp. 131-137; N. d'Acunto, *Nostrum Italicum Regnum*, p. 118; G. Röscher, *Venedig und das Reich*, pp. 40-1 and 99-106.

⁴⁰ S. Tramontin, «Fondazione e sviluppo della diocesi», in S. Tramontin (ed.), *Patriarcato di Venezia*, Padua, Gregoriana, 1991, pp. 21-45. D. Rando, *Chiesa di frontiera*, pp.

The anchorage was far more than a matter of politics. In 932 there were twenty people mentioned in the tribute agreement as participants, and fifty-four signatories as witnesses. Of the inhabitants of Istrian cities, only one is directly qualified as 'veneticus'. Twenty-eight at least of the fifty-four names are characteristic for men said to be from the Adriatic hinterland, originally associated with the Exarchate. Many among them are indistinguishable from the most common Venetian (though in some cases just general Italian) names: Domenico, Vitale, Orso, Maurizio, Giorgio and of course Giovanni, while 120 years of Carolingian presence have yielded a variety of Germanic or Frankish names like Audebertus, Faragarius, Amelricus and Theoderic; significantly too, we have a mix of the two, such as Sergius, son of Giselpert or Giselpergus or Accius brother of Folcard, showing the intermarriage between the two ethnic groups in Istria. It is even more interesting to correlate, when possible, the personal names with the nature of their titles: Audebertus *locopositus*, Domenico *scavinus*, and their place of origin when given: Domenico of Istria Ciontauriaci, Giorgio of Armentressa of Isola, Giovanni son of Felicita of Melinda, demonstrating again both the association of Frankish names and Byzantine functions or vice versa, and the ubiquity of some of the 'Venetian' names throughout Istrian cities. In most cases, it is not possible to determine whether these are Istrians or Venetians living in Istria, which well demonstrates the common roots of the two. In 977, nearly fifty years later, we find only one person among the participants who was probably part of the original agreement in 932, but there are several people who were probably the children of some of the above. Among the names recorded in 977, only three have a possibly German origin: Olmann, Waltram (whose brother is, however, called Benedict, and both nephews are part of the Andreadi family) and Robert, the notary. Of the others, many names belong to the Venetian/Istrian/Adriatic tradition, but also to families of note in Venice itself: the Maurocenii, the Noheli/Noeli, the Andreadi. These may be merchants who have family members in the main trading cities of Istria, or Istrian families made good who are migrating towards the bright lights of Venice; what really matters is the constant flow and interaction between Venetians and their Adriatic background.

Having examined two sets of documents which tell us something about the strong and continuing grounding of the people and culture of the Venetian *dogado* both in their terraferma hinterland and in their Adriatic culture, I now come to a third set of documents, which can be taken to show the strong bonds between Venice and its broader hinterland in the Veneto, in

43-46 and 73-75; G. Fedalto, «Organizzazione ecclesiastica e vita religiosa nella 'Venetia Maritima'», in A. Carile (ed.), *Origini di Venezia*, pp. 386-92.

this instance its association with the family of the counts of Verona. Like the first set, these documents too are dated by regnal years of the kings of Italy then Ottonians. In 914 Count Ingelfredo of Verona, son of Grimoaldo and father of Aitengus, all of them *ex Alemanorum genere* or *vivente lege Allemanis*, coming from Friuli, in his court at Verona, surrounded by his vassals, as well as those of the king of the Franks and the king of Italy, grants the *curtes* of Petriolo and Cona, with the chapel of S. Thomas, and their rights, to the monastery of S. Zaccaria in Venice, after the deaths of his heirs⁴¹. In 928 the grant is renewed with the royal confirmation of Hugh, but with a few more estates added, by the bishop of Verona Notker⁴². This time there are present at the court in Verona three men from Friuli (vassals?) and two men who might conceivably be Venetians in this context since they are called Domenico and Pietro, and are sons of a Garibert (a Germanic name), but are said to live by the *lege romana*. In 963, Otto I himself confirms the grant, renewed by the Countess Ildeburga wife of Count Adalberto, on the same terms as before⁴³. This time, two Venetians are specifically mentioned, the abbess of S. Zaccaria Giovanna and a Giovanni priest and monk. How did a family of counts of Verona come to be patrons of the most prestigious and powerful Venetian monastery, to the extent of granting it important estates in the counties of Verona and Padua? Venetian monastic houses and families traditionally owned large extents of land and rights on the *terraferma* outside the *dogado*, in the kingdom of Italy, which was part of the reason for the repeated request to each new king to confirm the privileges granted to the Venetians. In the 9th century. for example the will of Giustiniano Particiaco mentions, among his estates, some on the *terraferma* at Jesolo and Gambararia near Marghera, and some in the county of Padua and Treviso among others, and a privilege of Charles III in 883 granted the estates of Cereseria and Pladano to the monastery of SS Ilario e Benedetto⁴⁴. Meanwhile John the Deacon tells us that, when asked insistently by Otto III what he wanted as an imperial gift, Doge Pietro II Orseolo stated that it was only the confirmation of the estates and privileges of the Venetians in the *Regnum Italiae*⁴⁵.

⁴¹ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 30; *CDV* II, no 29; see K. Modzelewski, «Le vicende della 'pars dominica' nei beni fondiari del monastero di S. Zaccaria di Venezia (s. X-XIV)», *Bollettino dell'Istituto di storia della società e dello stato veneziano* 4, 1962, pp. 42-79, esp. 42-49.

⁴² R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 34; *CDV* II, no 34.

⁴³ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 45; *CDV* II, no 46.

⁴⁴ Both edited in L. Lanfranchi and B. Strina (eds.), *Il monastero di SS. Ilario e Benedetto*. *Fonti per la storia di Venezia: Sez. II Archivi Ecclesiastici Diocesi Castellana*, Venice, 1965, nos 2 and 4, pp. 19-24 and 27-29.

⁴⁵ *JnDn*, IV, 59.

None of these families seem to have had quite as much of an involvement with the Italian mainland as the Candiani⁴⁶. Pietro III had married a woman of obvious Italian descent, Richelda. His two sons, the future Pietro IV and Vitalis, also married into the Italian aristocracy, Pietro IV when he divorced his Venetian wife and married as his second wife Waldrada, Vitale when he married Emilia, from the Longobard family of Count Uberto of Vicenza, with estates of great consequence in the counties of Vicenza, Padua and Treviso. This would later enable Vitale to become himself Count of Vicenza for a short time between 998 and 1001, with the support of Otto III, as well as Count of Padua. Before that, however, Vitale had been already favoured by the Ottonians: Otto I, at the same time as he confirmed Ingelfredo's grant to S. Zaccaria, also gave the vast property of Musestre in the Trevisano to Vitale, a property in a strategic position on the left bank of the Sile river, thus giving a member of the Candiani control over the best river communications with Treviso⁴⁷. In 973 Otto gave Isola d'Istria to Vitale (by then known as Ugo), thus ensuring an important bit of headland in Istria for Venice, to help it deal with the hostility of the Marquess of Istria and the patriarch of Aquileia⁴⁸. To that end, Otto also confirmed the rights of Grado in 974 to a third Candiano brother, also called Vitale, patriarch of Grado⁴⁹. Similarly Pietro IV, whose interests in intervening militarily notably on the mainland in the duchies of Ferrara and Oderzo remained strong, retained Otto's support throughout. We are told that Otto II's allegedly appalled response at Pietro IV's murder and the flight of his brother the patriarch Vitale to the Ottonian court led ultimately to his blockade of Venice in 983⁵⁰. After 976 both Vitale brothers were doing their utmost to hinder the new Venetian doge, the patriarch of Grado by selling Isola to the patriarch of Aquileia Rodoaldo in 977, and Vitale-Ugo by selling Musestre to the Count of Treviso in the hope of gaining his support against Venice, both naturally with the support of Otto II⁵¹. The policies of the Candiano family, with its strong

⁴⁶ A. Castagnetti, «Famiglie ducali», in *Società veneziana nel Medioevo* II, pp. 7-102 esp. 11-41; M. Pozza, «Ugo-Vitale»; M. Brozzi, «Romani e Longobardi nella Venetia orientale», in *La Venetia: dall'Antichità all'Alto Medioevo*, pp. 121-126.

⁴⁷ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 44.

⁴⁸ *Idem*, no 52.

⁴⁹ *Idem*, no 53.

⁵⁰ *JnDn*, IV, 21 and 26; W. Giese, «Venedig-Politik und Imperium-Idee bei den Ottonen», in G. Jenel (ed.), *Herrschaft, Kirche, Kultur. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Festschrift für F. Prinz zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 37, Stuttgart, 1993, pp. 224-227.

⁵¹ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 55.

interests in the *Regnum*, were to use every kind of support of the aristocracy of the terraferma in their fight against the rival Orseolo family once they provided the new doge.

The five sets of documents mentioned above are key groups, but they are not alone. There are other individual grants and donations of the aristocracy of the *Regnum* to Venetian institutions, highlighting the interests of various families of the Italian aristocracy in donations to ecclesiastical establishments in Venice since the early 10th century. These, as well as individual Venetian families, gained great swathes of land, estates with immunities and privileges in the *Regnum*. Here are three examples. In 944 Countess Anna, a widow living by Frankish law, sold lands in Conche and Fogolana to Pietro IV Candiano, in a grant dated by the regnal years of Emperor Hugh and his son Lothar⁵². In 955 in his will Count Milo of Verona granted the castle of Ronco on the Adige to S. Zaccaria, also only as usufruct in the first instance⁵³. In 954 the marquess and duke Amelrico, son of another of the same name, both *ex genere Francorum*, and his wife Franca, daughter of Lanfranco Count of the Palace, himself *ex natione sua lege Longobardorum* but his daughter, because of her husband, living by Salic law, granted the estate of Bagnolo, with its 125 mansi, three chapels, tithes and other rights, originally granted by Amelrico's father to Nonantola, to the monastery of the Trinity and S. Michael Archangel at Brondolo outside Chioggia, at the mouth of the Brenta itself having a Longobard dedication to St Michael⁵⁴. The diploma is also dated by the regnal years of the king of Italy, Berengar II, and his son Adalbert. It is worth noting how the family transfers land from one monastery, and a very famous one at that: Nonantola, to a Venetian one. Quarrel, politics or expression of the perceived stronger spiritual power of Venice? Like the grants to S. Zaccaria, these too clearly demonstrate the engagement of Venetian institutions, families and religious houses, with the customs, legal vocabulary and economic transactions of the rest of the area which had long been called *Venetia-Istria*, the old Roman province. Clearly, for these members of the Italian ruling elite, there was no obvious perception that Venetian monasteries at any rate, were in 'foreign territory', rather than belonging, politically, spiritually or culturally, to the kingdom of Italy; and very likely, they did not see Venice was a separate entity.

As mentioned at the start of this paper, my purpose was to examine examples of linguistics, toponomastics, epigraphy, coinage, religious choices, legal customs and artistic features, among others, to show their closeness

⁵² R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 37.

⁵³ *CDV* II, no. 29.

⁵⁴ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 39.

to Venice's hinterland in Italy. Some of the documents studied above demonstrate this. I should now like to look at more general examples.

After numerous specific studies of the Venetian dialect, Giovan Battista Pellegrini has concluded that the Venetian language as spoken in the Lagoon is closely associated with that of the areas of the Livenza valley and Northern Cisalpine Italy, that is to say the areas of Belluno, Treviso and Friuli, and is in fact quite different in its evolution from the Paduan language of the Veneto⁵⁵. He concludes that this was due to the original population migration to Venice from Oderzo, Cittanova and the islands of the Northern Lagoon, which contributed to the formation of the Venetian form of Italian. In addition, he also ascertains that even those relatively rare Venetian words which have Greek roots were in fact mediated through the Latin, as in some of the vocabulary associated with the sea and with urbanism and building. The most noticeable feature of the documentation of Venice is of course the total absence of the use of Greek as a language, including in the commercial sphere. This matches the evidence from anthroponymy, where we find relatively few Greek names, whether of saints or as patronyms. Antonio Niero's study of the most common names in the onomastics of the duchy shows how strong is the dominance of names associated with an Exarchal/Ravennate or Northern Italian origin as local saints, for example Vitaliano, Vitale, Pantaleon, Agnello, Orso who was venerated in Ravenna through originally bishop of Aosta, Albino (Vercelli), Vigilio (a saint from Trento or Brescia), Felice (martyr of Aquileia with Fortunato), Magno (the refugee from Oderzo and first legendary bishop of Castello), Donato (Zara)⁵⁶. The second most significant group after these is that of names associated with Francia and Germany and their saints, including, allegedly, the family name of the Contareni family, deriving from Guntharinus, and the also allegedly Frankish Badovarius, which became Badoer⁵⁷.

A similar mix is present in the coinage. I have mentioned earlier the continuing use of Byzantine aulic titles by the doges, including their progression from the modest *ypatos* for the first doges through the *spatarivus* for Orso I Par-

⁵⁵ G.B. Pellegrini, «Dai Veneti ai Venetici», in *SVT*, pp. 103-148 and *ibid.*, *Ricerche di toponomastica veneta*, Padua, CLESP, 1987.

⁵⁶ A. Niero, «I santi nell'onomastica», in *Culto dei santi a Venezia*, pp. 105-165. However, both Orso and Donato were also common names in Longobard Italy.

⁵⁷ *Idem*, p. 115. One must recall, however, that in 575-577 already, a Baduarius was commander-in-chief of the armies of Italy and probably also the Emperor Justin II's brother-in-law, see for example, D. Mauskopf Deliyannis (ed.), *Agnellus of Ravenna: The Book of Pontiffs of the Church of Ravenna*, Washington D.C., Catholic University of America Press, 2004, p. 163 – but, of course, he may very well have been a Frank too.

ticiaco to the highest *protospatarius* for Pietro II Orseolo⁵⁸. I have also mentioned the contrast between the use of Byzantine imperial dating for prestigious state documents in Venice, while for ordinary documents the dating from the Carolingian onwards is reckoned in the years of the reign of Italian kings, and for purely internal documents such as grants of land or fisheries in the Lagoon, the dating increasingly relies on the Anno Domini style. In the same way, Byzantine coinage circulates in the *dogado*, and is clearly the currency used by Venetian merchants in their Eastern Mediterranean trade⁵⁹. However, clearly far-seeing Venetians made the decision that, in parallel with it, silver *denarii* would be minted in Venice with Carolingian inscriptions, the first one going back to Louis the Pious (814-40) and Lothar I (840-55)⁶⁰. These were followed by 'anonymous' coins (with no named ruler) with the inscription "Xe salva Venecias" (855-80) and "Christus imperat" (970-1024), based on the Carolingian tradition⁶¹. It seems clear that both Byzantine and Carolingian, then Ottonian, forms of coinage were running in parallel, an interesting occurrence since both the Byzantine and the Carolingian Empires regarded coinage as a manifestation of sovereignty⁶². As usual, Venice man-

⁵⁸ V. Lazzarini, «I titoli dei dogi di Venezia», *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* 2, 1903, pp. 271-280; R. Cessi, «L'Investitura Ducale», *AIVSLA*, 126, 1968, pp. 251-294; A. Pertusi, «Quedam Regalia Insignia: Ricerche sulle insegne del potere ducale a Venezia durante il medioevo», *SV* 7, 1965, pp. 3-121; G. Fasoli, «Liturgia e cerimoniale ducale», in *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV, Atti del Convegno internazionale di storia della civiltà veneziana*, Florence, 1974, repr. in *Scritti*, pp. 529-61; G. Ravegnani, «Dignità bizantine dei dogi di Venezia», in G. Benzoni *et al.* (ed.), *Studi Veneti offerti a Gaetano Cozzi*, Venice, Il Cardo, 1992, pp. 19-29; G. Ravegnani, «Insegne del potere e titoli ducali», in *SVT*, pp. 829-846.

⁵⁹ M. McCormick, *Origins of the European Economy. Communications and Commerce, AD 300-900*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 352-353 and 361-384. For examples of such coins see the finds now in the Sezione Medievale e Moderna of the Museo Archeologico di Torcello, <http://sbmp.provincia.venezia.it/mir/musei/torcello/home.htm>

⁶⁰ N. Aldobrandini Papadopoli (ed.), *Le monete di Venezia I*, Bologna, 1893-1919, pp. 6-53, at pp. 14-40; also reproduced in G. Rösch, «Mercatura e moneta», in *SVT*, pp. 549-573 and in M. Stahl, *Zecca. The Mint of Venice in the Middle Ages*, Baltimore and London, JHU Press, 2000. These were of course minted well after Charlemagne abandoned his claim of sovereignty over Venice and hence could only have been done so for the purposes of commercial links. The Venetian mint was not a Carolingian one, but it is interesting to note that one of the few other places in Italy which went on to mint coins on the Carolingian model, even after many Carolingian mints in the empire had closed down, was another political 'state' with a Byzantine past, but on the periphery of the *Regnum*: Rome. I am grateful to C. Wickham for having brought this to my attention.

⁶¹ N. Aldobrandini Papadopoli, *Le monete di Venezia*, pp. 49-53.

⁶² A. Rovelli, «774. The mints of the kingdom of Italy: a survey», in S. Gasparri, 774, p. 138.

aged to reconcile the two, sometimes by striking coins with no reverse lines so as to be able to work with both powers. The fact remains that it did feel the need to mint 'Western' coins for its links with the Western local as well as international markets.

Venetian religious choices are another manifestation of its closeness to its Exarchal and Adriatic hinterland. Among its main saints of this tradition are the dedications to SS Apostoli and to the Ravenna saints Apollinaris, Vitalis, Theodore, George, Laurence (not the Roman cult), Geminianus, Severus, Paternianus, Eufemia, and the prophet Zachariah⁶³. Some of these were mediating Constantinopolitan traditions, notably St Zachariah, to whom a chapel in the imperial palace in Constantinople was dedicated in the 5th century, perhaps partly at the root of the placing of the monastery of S. Zaccaria itself near the Ducal Palace (though the dedication is still found in two churches in Ravenna in 959 and 964, clearly indicating the importance of a local cult there); and SS Sergius and Bacchus, possibly the name of the first church at Olivolo, later to become the cathedral of Olivolo/Castello, but with a new church significantly dedicated to S. Pietro, the ultimate Western Roman saint. Other cults or dedications in Venice reached it from Grado (Ermagora and Fortunatus), Istria/Trieste (Servolo)⁶⁴, Altino (Jeremiah), Split (Victor, later to become the church of S. Moisè). It was thought for a long time that the frequency of dedications to Old Testament figures in Venice was a characteristic Byzantine feature, one which it shared with Ravenna; while it is entirely true that this is a feature of Greek spirituality, and one found quite prominently in Venice, it is also the case that, when studying closely the dedications of these churches, it often turns out that they are later than the period of the *dogado*, not infrequently dating from after the Fourth Crusade⁶⁵.

Apart from specific cults and traditions, for example in the use of feasts of saints mainly on the basis of their Western dates as in the Martyrologies of Bede, Ado and Usuard rather than in the Byzantine calendar⁶⁶,

⁶³ A. Niero, «I santi patroni» and C. Candiani, «Antichi titoli delle Chiese», in *Culto dei santi a Venezia*, pp. 99-153.

⁶⁴ A. Niero, «Sull' intitolazione 'monasterium Beati Yllarii e Benedicti'. Appendix: Noticina sul titolo 'S. Servolo'», Centro di Studi Storici Mestre. Quaderno di studie e notizie 7/8, 1965, suggested the possibility of the saint being a companion of S. Benedict rather than the Trieste saint – not a generally accepted view; but that in itself would suggest an emphasis on a strong Benedictine and Gregorian tradition.

⁶⁵ S. Tramontin, «Influsso orientale nel culto dei santi a Venezia fino al secolo XV», in *Venezia e il Levante*, pp. 801-820; Tramontin, *Culto dei santi a Venezia*.

⁶⁶ S. Tramontin, «Il 'Kalendarium' Veneziano», in *Culto dei santi a Venezia*, pp. 275-327.

the most important aspect of the grounding of the Venetian Church in its Italian roots is the way in which it functions as a Church controlled by the doge. We see it in the doge's control over episcopal sees and appointments; in his control of monasteries, which he uses in a characteristically Carolingian style of government through immunities and abbatial appointments of members of the ducal family, especially in major political nerve centres like S. Zaccaria, S. Servolo and SS Ilario e Benedetto, S. Lorenzo and S. Michele Archangelo of Brondolo; and often as a way of ensuring control over the areas of the terraferma on which such monasteries were situated, for example in the case of S. Ilario and Brondolo⁶⁷. These monasteries all followed the Benedictine rule (even when previously some like S. Servolo had followed another previously unknown, they changed to become Benedictine) – a prime Carolingian government tool since Benedict of Aniane's reform in 817. All monasteries in the *dogado* remained Benedictine in this traditional form, even S. Giorgio founded by Giovanni Morosini on his return from S. Michel de Cuxà, where he had experienced the Cluniac reform⁶⁸. Significantly, there was also no importing of any form of Greek monastic lifestyle at any time, even as a result of the revival of Basilian monasticism under the influence

⁶⁷ D. Rando, *Chiesa di frontiera*, pp. 43-72; D. Rando, «Le strutture della chiesa locale», in *SVT*, pp. 645-673; Tramontin, «Sviluppo»; on the ducal control over the monasteries in Carolingian style, see M. Pozza, «Storia dei monasteri veneziani», and P.A. Passolunghi, «Origini e sviluppo del monachesimo veneto sino al secolo xii», in *Il monachesimo nel Veneto medioevale*, pp. 4-6; G. Spinelli, «Primi insediamenti», pp. 151-160; and G. Mazzucco, *Monasteri benedettini nella laguna di Venezia*, nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 78, 9. For the history of individual monasteries, see, for S. Zaccaria, S. Tramontin, *San Zaccaria*, in *Venetia Sacra* 13, 1979, and U. Franzoi and D. di Stefano (eds.), *Le chiese di Venezia*, Venice, Alfieri, 1976, pp. 390-404; for S. Servolo, N.E. Vanzan Marchini, *S. Servolo e Venezia. Un' isola e la sua storia*, Verona, Cierre, 2004, pp. 13-28; for S. Ilario, L. Lanfranchi and B. Strina, *SS. Ilario e Benedetto*, pp. vii-xv and D. Calaon, M. Ferri and C. Bragato, «SS. Ilario e Benedetto (IX secolo): un monastero del nascente dogado veneziano tra terra e laguna», in G. Volpe and P. Favia (eds.), *V Congresso nazionale di archeologia medievale*, Florence, Al-Insegna del Giglio, 2011, pp. 498-499 and 503; for S. Michele Archangelo, L. Lanfranchi and B. Strina (eds.), *SS. Trinità e S. Michele Arcangelo di Brondolo. Fonti per la storia di Venezia. Sez. II Archivi Ecclesiastici Diocesi Clodiense*, Venice, 1981, II: Documenti 800-1189; for S. Lorenzo, founded in the will of Bishop Orso Particiaco as a nunnery for his sister Romana in February 853, see F. Gaeta (ed.), *S. Lorenzo. Fonti per la storia di Venezia. Sez. II Archivi Ecclesiastici Diocesi Castellana*, Venice, 1959, pp. x-xv and 7-11.

⁶⁸ L. Lanfranchi (ed.), *S. Giorgio Maggiore. Fonti per la storia di Venezia. Sez. II Archivi Ecclesiastici Diocesi Castellana*, Venice, 1968, II, pp. 19-27.

of St Nilus in the South of Italy and Rome in the 10th century⁶⁹. The *dogado* stuck to the monastic model of Carolingian Europe, and the doges continued to use the political power that this monastic tradition gave them. A good example was the founding of S. Ilario in 819, when the monks of S. Servolo asked the doge to grant them some land for a new monastery in Gambarare near Fusina and Marghera, a monastery whose buildings were partly made up of construction materials willed to it by Giustiniano Particiaco from his estates in Jesolo in 829, and which had become by the 10th century the necropolis of the Candiani doges. In the same way, Giustiniano Particiaco in his will in 829 had been the presiding force behind the building of S. Zaccaria, an abbey very closely associated with the ducal family itself especially through the presence there of several of its women as nuns and abbesses, and the burial of several doges⁷⁰. We saw earlier how the monks of S. Stefano of Altino asked the doge to help them rebuild their monastery in 900, and with his help transferred the main body of the abbey to the new monastery of SS Felix and Fortunatus of Ammiana, built on land granted by the doge. So we see that, far from being Greek-style ascetic retreats, the monasteries of Venice were a political and social tool in the Western Benedictine mould. Throughout the 9th and 10th centuries, the doges maintained control over them, some of which they had founded as family religious houses, especially S. Zaccaria and S. Lorenzo, some which they had helped develop or move onto land belonging to the doge or granted by him, from the Lagoon to the terraferma in the case of S. Servolo or vice-versa in that of S. Stefano of Altino, and some just skillfully placed on the terraferma, like Brondolo. Control was exercised through several means, in the Longobard then Carolingian tradition, as it was for example on monasteries like S. Giustina of Padua, Nonantola or Farfa. First it was associated with the original endowment by the founding family and thus through continuous association with that family or, in the case of Venice, with the doges more generally. It took the form of power over abbatial appointments, with the abbots often related to the founding family. In the case of female monasteries in particular, it was also exercised through the

⁶⁹ B. Hamilton, «'Orientale lumen et magistra latinitas': Greek influences on Western monasticism (900-1100)», B. Hamilton and T. Mc Nulty, «The monastic revival in tenth-century Rome», and B. Hamilton, «The City of Rome and the Eastern churches in the tenth-century», in his *Monastic Reform, Catharism and the Crusades*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1979, pp. 181-216, 35-68 and 5-26.

⁷⁰ *JnDn*, III, 27 and 39 for example; and 22, telling the story of the first restoration of the monastery at the end of the 9th century by Orso Particiaco's daughter who was the abbess at the time; S. Tramontin, *S. Zaccaria*.

use of the monastery to place female members of the family who would uphold its political as well as spiritual values. Immunity from episcopal interference, supported by the doge against the bishop even when the latter was himself a ducal appointee, as in the case of S. Stefano's quarrel with the bishop of Torcello, was a key feature of the close link between monasteries and the doge, who was then their only protector. Finally, territorial as well as economic expansion was rooted in the use of monastic buildings for economic reasons, such as hunting on the *terraferma* at S. Ilario but, far more importantly, in the use of the economic resources of the *curtes* and *castelli*, run, unlike Venetian economic units, entirely according to the seigniorial feudal model⁷¹. Last but not least, political use was also made of the monasteries. One typical example of the latter is the way in which the secret meeting of Doge Pietro II Orseolo with the Emperor Otto III took place first on the island monastery of S. Servolo, the small monastic establishment left behind when most monks had moved to S. Ilario on the *terraferma*, then at S. Zaccaria, linked to the ducal palace by a covered passage; both perfect places for discretion, just as previously the abbey of Pomposa had been, when Otto III claimed to retire there for three days to take the waters, then immediately went off secretly to Venice without any but a few close courtiers' knowledge⁷².

Several of the land grants mentioned above were made by people living according to Salic, Longobard or Alemannic law. The *Origo* claims that Venice from the 9th century functioned under both Roman (Byzantine) and Salic (Carolingian) law⁷³. The Byzantine South of Italy used Roman law and, later, this was supplemented by new elements of Byzantine legislation as they were produced by the later Byzantine Emperors such as the Macedonians Basil I and Leo VI; Venice did not. For internal purposes it used a much adapted version of Roman law, but when there was a crossover into or exchanges with the *terraferma*, it had a choice of which law to follow; whenever examples of legislation or of everyday implementation of the law are found, they belong to the Longobard then Frankish-Carolingian tradition⁷⁴. This applies to clauses regarding land grants and sales, or to the legal disputes between Venetians and the inhabitants of Imperial lands as defined in the *pactum Lotbarii*, and repeatedly reiterated every time this was renewed. Even families as pres-

⁷¹ D. Rando, *Chiesa di frontiera*, pp. 54-60, 105-108.

⁷² *JnDn*, IV, 57.

⁷³ *Origo*, p. 61.

⁷⁴ G. Ferrari delle Spade, «La legislazione dell'imperatore d'Oriente in Italia», *AIVSLA*, 96, 1937, pp. 186-697; R. Cessi, «Il diritto penale in Venezia prima del Mille», *Nuovo Archivio Veneto* 33, 1917, pp. 5-23; Lujko Margetić, «Il Diritto», in *SVT*, pp. 677-692.

tigious as the Candiani or the Falier acknowledged living by the Longobard law when dealing with property in Italy. The dominance of Longobard and Frankish legal assumptions also applies to wills, for example in the general Venetian, certainly not Roman, principle of not leaving family landed property to women so as to avoid alienation and breakup, and to keep the patrimony intact, and not allowing for the disinheriting of sons⁷⁵. Also different from Roman law is the Venetian *repromissa*, the dowry remaining the wife's property, as well as a specific form of *pretium virginitatis*, the 'Monday gift', different from both the Roman legal *donatio propter nuptias* and the Longobard *Morgengabe*, presumably reflecting a more archaic local custom⁷⁶. On the other hand, Longobard legal practice is reflected in the use of the *vadia/vadimonium*, the pledge, within legal procedure, and also in the diplomatic *formulae*, for which the Venetian chancery clearly uses the forms developed by the Carolingian chancery and maintained by the Italian kings: the privilege for S. Stefano d'Altino in 900 is a good illustration of this⁷⁷.

We have already seen how a key element of the political and social life of Venice was the *placitum*, or *concio*, the assembly, for which the first evidence goes back to the S. Stefano privilege in 900 – though that text implies its existence before that when it claims that the original privilege was given to the monastery by Doge Orso and his son Giovanni, at some unspecified date in the second half of the 9th century, in an assembly 'cum episcopis et iudicibus et populo Veneciarum', effectively defining the same kind of meeting⁷⁸. The *placitum*, in its name and in its use, was a Carolingian institution which was superimposed in the *Regnum* on to a fairly similar Longobard one. As Stefano Gasparri has shown, attempts to differentiate between this, a purely comital assembly meeting as a tribunal, and the Venetian *placitum*, the assembly of all Venetians (gradually only of a certain standing, and mostly from Rialto), *primates*, bishops and other ecclesiastics, to advise the doge rather than simply as a tribunal, are rather academic. It is quite clear that the Italian *placitum* was also increasingly, and certainly by the 10th century, an assembly of all important people around the count, and had political as well as simply judicial functions⁷⁹. The existence of the *placitum* is a clear sign of strong Carolingian influence on Venetian

⁷⁵ A. Bonnini, «Per 'Divinam Inspirationem': uomini e testamenti nella Venezia dei secoli IX-XII», *SV n.s.* 49, 2005, pp. 28-38.

⁷⁶ L. Margetić, «Il Diritto», pp. 682-683.

⁷⁷ *Idem*, pp. 683-686; S. Lazzarini, «Un privilegio del Doge Pietro Tribuno per la badia di S. Stefano d'Altino», p. 988.

⁷⁸ R. Cessi, *Documenti* II, no 25, p. 35.

⁷⁹ S. Gasparri, «Venezia fra l'Italia bizantina e il regno italico», pp. 70-72.

political practice. But it was not the only institution with a Carolingian or Longobard name and role to have become of crucial importance in the history of Venice. Key figures within it were the *iudices* or *scabini*, the latter name being another office developed under the Carolingians⁸⁰. The long-standing debate about whether the *iudices* were the descendants of the tribunes of 8th and 9th century Venice is not immediately relevant here⁸¹; what matters is the development of the function of *iudex* in parallel in mainland Italy and Venice, pretty much at the same time as the rise of the power of the city elites which take on increasing significance in the 10th century. Lastly, the *gastaldi*, a Longobard term, become the standard name for the doge's administrators, the first example being that of the *gastaldo* at the head of a group of doge's men charged with the earliest attempt to colonise and make parts of Dorsoduro habitable⁸².

There is unfortunately relatively little archeology of material culture to focus on in Venice for the purposes of this enquiry. Most of the archaeology of the Lagoon has been focused on the islands, especially in the Northern Lagoon, where artifacts such as inscriptions, coins and various lapidary elements can be seen, many in the museums of Torcello and Murano, and in the Correr Museum in Venice itself⁸³. Much of the archeological work carried out in the last hundred years or so has either focused on excavations of and around major ecclesiastical sites like S. Mark's or Torcello, and/or on issues relating to the

⁸⁰ F. Bougard, *La justice dans le royaume d'Italie de la fin du VIII^e au début du XI^e siècle*, Bibliothèque de l'École Française d'Athènes et de Rome, *MEFRM* 291, Rome, 1955, pp. 140-158 on the *scabini*, with a list in Appendix A, esp. for Istria, pp. 354, Cittanova, pp. 357-358 and Verona, pp. 369-370, and pp. 281-305 on the *iudices*; on the *iudices* see also G. Rösch, *Venezianische Adel*, pp. 65-69 and A. Castagnetti, *Società veneziana*, pp. 89-94. On the evolution of various institutions in the sense of a greater similarity with Longobard ones, see S. Gasparri, «Venezia fra i secoli VIII e IX: una riflessione sulle fonti», in *Studi offerti a Gaetano Cozzi*, pp. 13-17.

⁸¹ A. Castagnetti, *Dai tribuni ai giudici*, pp. 77-97.

⁸² W. Dorigo, *Venezia Romanica: la formazione della città medioevale fino all'età gotica*, Venice, Cierre, 2003, p. 29; on the *gastaldi*, see also A. Castagnetti, «Insediamenti e populi», pp. 592-596.

⁸³ S. Gelichi, «Venezia tra archeologia e storia: la costruzione di un'identità urbana», in A. Augenti (ed.), *Le città italiane tra la tarda antichità e l'alto medioevo. Atti del convegno, Ravenna 26-28 febbraio 2004*, Florence, All'Insegna del Giglio, 2006, pp. 151-183. The two most recent surveys of the archeology of the lagoon are M. de Min (ed.), *Ritrovare restaurando. Rinvenimenti e scoperte a Venezia e in Laguna*, Venice, Grafiche Antiga, 2000, and F. Baudo, *Stato degli studi, linee di ricerca e prospettive future per l'archeologia dell'edilizia religiosa altomedievale nella laguna di Venezia*, doctoral thesis, University of Venice, 2004. I am grateful to Dott.ssa Cecilia Moine for bringing this thesis to my attention.

first urban development of the city, as well as its architecture and art⁸⁴.

There is relatively also little remaining of the contemporary art and buildings of 9th and 10th-century Venice. From very early on, the re-use of architectural salvage from the terraferma was already practiced: Giustiniano Particiaco left in his will the remains of his houses in Jesolo to be used as building materials for the construction of S. Ilario, and material of this kind was used even when new buildings were erected, such as the palace built by the Particiaci in Cittanova⁸⁵. Nevertheless, one of the most prominent manifestations of the extent to which Venice belongs to the Adriatic world is to be found in architecture and art. Both remain deeply rooted in the style which historians have called 'Exarchal-Adriatic'. They define this as a continuation of the Early Christian style found in Aquileia and Grado and along the Istrian coast in such places as Parenzo and Pola, of the Byzantine style of Ravenna as it spread throughout the Exarchate, and of the innovation of Longobard then Carolingian features⁸⁶. Thus, the characteristic architectural form remains that of the Early Christian basilica on the model

⁸⁴ Of the most recent bibliography on these, see, for S. Mark's, the four volumes of *San Marco: Basilica patriarcale di Venezia*, the first two edited respectively by O. Demus and M. Andaloro, Milan, Fabbri, 1990 and 1991, the next two focusing specifically on the crypt, Milan, Fabbri, 1992 and 1993, as well as the classics by O. Demus, *The Church of San Marco in Venice: history, architecture, sculpture*, Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Series 6, 1960, and R. Polacco, *S. Marco: la basilica d'oro*, Milan, Berenice, 1991. On Torcello, see as well as the key excavations of the Polish team, reported in L. Leciejewicz *et al.*, *Torcello: I scavi 1961-1961*, Rome, Istituto nazionale di archeologia e storia dell'arte, 1977 and *idem*, *Torcello: nuove ricerche archeologiche*, Rome, Bretschneider, 2000, the more general surveys of R. Polacco, *La cattedrale di Torcello*, Venice, L'Altra Riva, 1984, and A. Niero, *La basilica di Torcello e Sta Fosca*, Torcello, Ardo edizioni d'arte, 1967, and now the catalogue of the 2009 exhibition, G. Caputo and G. Gentili (eds.), *Torcello: alle origini di Venezia tra Occidente e Oriente*, Venice, Marsilio, 2009. A great deal of modern archaeological work focused primarily on the history of the urban development of the city (Rivolto-Venice) itself, and we now have several contrasting views, mostly exemplified by W. Dorigo in his large corpus of work, notably in his *Venezia Romanica* and *Venezia: Origini, ipotesi, metodi*, Milan, Electa, 1983, and by A.J. Ammerman, «Venice before the Grand Canal», *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 48, 2003, pp. 141-158, and *ibid.* and C.E. McClennen (eds.), *Venice Before San Marco. Exhibition and Conference, Colgate University Hamilton, New York, October 5-6, 2001*, Colgate, 2001.

⁸⁵ Will of Giustiniano, see note 44.

⁸⁶ G. Fiocco, «L'arte esarcale lungo le lagune di Venezia», *AIVSLA* 97, 1938, pp. 586-611; E. Concina, *Venezia. Le chiese e le arti*, Udine, Magnus, 1995, 2 vols., and especially his *Storia dell'architettura di Venezia dal VII al XX secolo*, Milan, Electa, 1995, I, pp. 17-45; S. Bettini, «Il cammino dell'arte dalla Venezia paleocristiana alla Venezia bizantina», *SCV* I, pp. 116-28 esp. 120-128, and especially his *Venezia. Nascità di una città*,

of S. Apollinare and S. Severo in Ravenna, S. Eufemia at Grado or the Duomo at Parenzo, with occasional more recent additions as in the church of Caorle. This is what we see in S. Pietro in Castello⁸⁷ or S. Maria in Torcello, while the few remaining mosaics from contemporary Venetian churches, such as those of the floors of the chapel of S. Tarasio at S. Zaccaria or of S. Ilario are clearly in the Early Christian tradition of the Aquileia and Grado floors, and sculpture as represented in *plutei*, reused sarcophagi, capitals and well rims is comprehensively decorated with the animal and bird forms, spirals, rosettes, crosses and interlace often found in the hinterland between Verona and Aquileia⁸⁸. Similarly the two remaining crypts with features dating back to the 9th and 10th centuries in Venice, those of S. Zaccaria and St. Mark's, with their semi-circular apse inside a pentagonal frame, reflect an original Exarchate tradition, and we know that so did various no longer existing one, like that of S. Salvador⁸⁹. More interesting still are the results of extensive excavation work and impassioned debate about the crypt of St. Mark, now accepted by most as being in its current form partially a remnant of the original basilica of the Particiaci, and which may have included a Carolingian-style west end⁹⁰. Of course the original form and function of St. Mark's, technically the palatine chapel of the doges before becoming the basilica at the heart of Venetian life, have also been dis-

Milan, Electa, 1988, pp. 94-97, 101-10 and 125-157; and G. Cuscito, «L'alto Adriatico paleocristiano», in *Torcello*, pp. 32-49 esp. 38-49.

⁸⁷ On the most recent archaeological excavations see S. Tuzzato, «Venezia. Gli scavi di S. Pietro in Castello (Olivolo)», *Quaderni di Archeologia del Veneto* 7, 1991, pp. 92-103 and 9, 1993, pp. 72-78.

⁸⁸ The mosaic at S. Zaccaria is still in place, while those of SS. Ilario e Benedetto have been moved, together with a variety of other pieces of sculpture, to the courtyard of the Archaeological Museum in Venice. On the latter, see R. Farioli, «Pavimenti di Aquileia e pavimenti di Ravenna: il problema delle maestranze», in *Aquileia e Ravenna. Atti dell'VIII Settimana di Studi Aquileiesi, Antichità Altoadriatiche XIII*, Udine, 1978, pp. 277-280. What else is left of the sculpture of the period can be found in the courtyard of the Procuratorie of S. Marco (and I thank the Proto of S. Marco Dott.re Ettore Vio, for allowing me access to them) and in the Cloister of S. Apollonia, now the Museo Diocesano of Venice.

⁸⁹ On the crypt and the pavement of S. Zaccaria, see S. Tramontin, *S. Zaccaria*, pp. 20-21, who defines the pavement mosaic as 'romanesque', and E. Concina, *Chiese e arti*, I, pp. 238-249. On the sculpture, W. Dorigo, *L'arte a Venezia dal 9. al 12. secolo*, Venezia, 1977.

⁹⁰ The most recent participants to discuss this are E. Vio, «Cripta o prima capella ducale», in *San Marco. La cripta. Il restauro*, Milan, 1993, pp. 23-70; W. Dorigo, «Lo stato della discussione storico-archeologica dopo i nuovi lavori nella cripta di S. Marco» in *idem*, pp. 25-41, and *ibid.*, «Una discussione e nuove precisazioni sulla capella sancti

cussed for decades. It has been long seen as a deliberate imitation of the Apostoleion in Constantinople, but increasingly striking parallels have been made for its structure, decoration and function to have been also by choice an imitation of the Palatine Chapel at Aachen, itself of course modelled on S. Vitale in Ravenna⁹¹.

When introducing this essay, I made the point that its primary argument was to demonstrate the extent to which day-to-day life in Venice in the 9th and 10th centuries was anchored in her closely-knit relation with her North Italian and especially Adriatic origin. It would be entirely wrong to deny the extent to which Venice developed out of its Byzantine past, or indeed the way in which her development, partly as a bridge and/or meeting place of the Western/Italian and the Byzantine traditions, came to display unique characteristics. Both 'byzantinité'⁹² and uniqueness, whether highlighted by the men who constructed the Venetian narrative in the Middle Ages or by modern historians, have been part and parcel of the entity which was to become La Serenissima. But not just yet. At this stage of its history, Venice functioned mostly as part of the North and Central Italian worlds, from the economic links of its leading families and monasteries with their possessions in the *Regnum*, her developing administrative and legal system, her religious and artistic affiliations and her political links with the Carolingians, the kings of Italy and later the Ottonians and indeed the rising political system of a communal government with parallels in other Italian cities. It may have been aware of this connectedness or it may have wanted to believe in its remaining ideological, perhaps emotional, attachment to Byzantium and kept alive that memory. It may have had no interest in either the Western or the Byzantine ideological positions, and its leaders may have spent their time continually walking the tightrope between the demands of both entities, being essentially concerned with her freedom of movement and trade – perhaps the only medieval political power whose

Marci nel IX-X secolo», *Venezia Arti* 7, 1993, pp. 17-36; and R. Cecchi, *La basilica di S. Marco. La costruzione bizantina del IX secolo. Permanenze e trasformazioni*, Venice, Marsilio, 2003, pp. 1-32.

⁹¹ G. Frasson, «La basilica di San Marco come cappella palatina (la mistica dell'impero e il regno dello spirito)», *AV*, n.s., 30, 1993, pp. 63-91; W. Dorigo, «La cultura carolingia della prima 'Capella Sancti Marci'», *Hortus artium medievalium: Journal of the International Research Center for Late Antiquity and Middle Ages* 8, 2002, pp. 149-158.

⁹² As successfully used by G. Ortalli, «Venise et Constantinople: une 'byzantinité latine'», in C. Rizzardi (ed.), *Venezia e Bisanzio: Aspetti della cultura artistica bizantina da Ravenna a Venezia (V-XIV secolo)*, Venice, Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 2005, pp. 417-429.

264 'Venecie due sunt': Venice and its grounding

ideology was to have no ideology⁹³. It is difficult to ascertain which of these options, alone or severally, was dominant. But what seems fairly clear to me is that between the late 8th-century and the Fourth Crusade, Venice's affiliations were essentially with Northern and Central Italy and the Adriatic arc of Carolingian Friuli up to and including Istria and, from 1000, Dalmatia. The fascination of Venice itself, and of its historians, with Byzantium comes to the fore in a much more obvious way, not even after Venice's increasing role in the trading world of Constantinople and the remaining Byzantine Empire in the 11th and 12th centuries, but after 1204, when Byzantium appears to have gone, and Venice⁹⁴ begins to see itself as the new Constantinople. It would endure well into the 15th century. Prior to that, however increasingly aware of its unique position, the *dogado*, unlike Naples and Byzantine Southern Italy, related first and foremost to its Adriatic and Italian roots.

⁹³ Personal communication from Prof. G. Ortalli.

⁹⁴ This is quite obvious from a large part of the literature which sets out with a title along the lines of *Venice and Byzantium in the Middle Ages*, and then rarely includes papers on the post-1204 period, see, for example, *Venezia e Bisanzio: Aspetti della cultura artistica bizantina da Ravenna a Venezia (V-XIV secolo)*, or H. Maguire and R.S. Nelson (eds.), *S. Marco, Byzantium and the Myths of Venice*, Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks, 2010.