

GIUSTINIANO PARTECIPAZIO AND THE REPRESENTATION OF THE FIRST VENETIAN EMBASSY TO CONSTANTINOPLE IN THE CHRONICLES OF THE SERENISSIMA

ȘERBAN MARIN

It is true that previous to the reign of Doge Agnello Partecipazio (Badoer, Badoaro) (811-827), there are records of several *magistri militum* or Doges bearing Byzantine titles (especially the title of *ipatos*)¹; however, since no record of their presence in Constantinople can be found in the Venetian chronicles, the fact remains mere supposition; as to Beato, the brother of Doge Obelerio (804-811), there is clear mention about his presence in Constantinople, where he was invested with the title of *spatharios*²; one cannot speak of an embassy proper though, but rather of some self-imposed exile on the banks of the Bosphorus, on the backdrop of the conflict – with alternating consequences – between the pro-Frank and pro-Byzantine parties. Moreover, all the above-mentioned cases bring into discussion leaders of the Lagoon State, or relatives of such leaders, with residence at Malamocco. As a result, the first embassy of the Venetian State to Constantinople is that of Giustiniano Partecipazio, sent on this mission by his father, Agnello Partecipazio, the latter being the first Doge with headquarters in Rialto, after the devastation of the residence in Malamocco by the Franks led by Pepin, Charlemagne's son.

Unfortunately, there is no contemporary source attesting to the event. The Byzantine sources of the time disregarded the episode, no doubt considering it of lesser importance. As to the Venetian sources, to my knowledge, there are no

¹ Cf. Giovanni Giacomo Caroldo, *Historia di Venetia*, Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale*, mss. Italien 320, cf. Arhivele Naționale ale României, Microfilme Franța, reel 231 [to be further quoted *Caroldo*]: Tibiano Ypato (*magister militum* in 740, cf. *ibidem*, f. 7b: “[...], il quale, per esser nobile et de virtù insigne, ottenne dall’Imperatore la dignità chiamata ypato, che vuol dire, Consule Imperiale, d’honor sommo”); Diodato (Doge between 742 and 755, cf. *ibidem*, f. 7b: “[...], il qual, per la nobiltà sua, fù insignito della Consular dignità, chiamata ypato, et fu grandemente amato dall’Imperator de Greci”); Maurizio (Doge between 764 and 787, cf. *ibidem*, f. 7b: “questo Duce, divenuto Imperial Consule”); Obelerio (Doge between 804-811, cf. *ibidem*, f. 9a: “Concesse Niceta, per nome dell’Imperatore, a Obelerio Duce il titolo di Spataro”). For the titles of the Venetian Doges, see especially Vittorio Lazzarini, *I titoli dei dogi di Venezia*, in “Nuovo Archivio Veneto”, new series, 2 (1903), p. 271-311; Giorgio Ravegnani, *Dignità bizantine dei dogi di Venezia*, in *Studi veneti offerti a Gaetano Cozzi*, [Vicenza], 1992, pp. 19-29.

² Cf. *Caroldo*, f. 9a: “Beato, con il consiglio di Venetiani, andò a Constantinopoli [...]. Beato, con honore dall’Imperator ricevuto et ornato della dignità e titolo d’ypato.”

official documents mentioning the event³, whereas the Venetian chronicles would only come on stage in the early eleventh century, with the chronicle of Giovanni Diacono.

The present paper makes an analysis of the reflection of this episode – pertaining to the early stage in the Venetian-Byzantine relations – in the Venetian chronicles, a historical genre developing long after the event under consideration. As a result, the topic will be not the event itself, but rather its reflection several centuries later

The episode is described in the first Venetian chronicle known in history, the chronicle of Giovanni Diacono:

*Diacono*⁴, p. 106

Prelibatus siquidem Agnellus dux, cum duos haberet natos, unus illorum, id est Iustinianus, Constantinopolim destinavit. quem imperator honorifice suscipiens, ipati honorem sibi largivit; [...].

Further on, the chronicles would fail to mention the event for over three centuries. Thus, the episode is disregarded in *Origo*⁵, in *Annales Venetici Breves*⁶, in the chronicle of Martino da Canale⁷, and in the one attributed to Marco⁸, whereas *Historia Ducum Veneticorum*⁹ only begins with the dogate of Ordelaaffo Faliero (1102-1118).

A classification of the Venetian chronicles will be undertaken in what follows, with the employment of a number of categories developed in a recent study¹⁰, based on the representation of the non-Venetian participants in the Fourth Crusade.

³ Collection edited by G. L. Fr. Tafel, G. M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante*, vol. I: 814-1205, Amsterdam, 1964 (Anastatic print after the edition of Vienna, 1856) [to be further quoted *Urkunden*], doc. II, p. 3, strictly makes reference to the major chronicle of Andrea Dandolo, and the collection of Roberto Cessi (ed.), *Documenti relativi alla storia di Venezia anteriori al Mille*, vol. I: *Secoli V-IX*, Venezia, 1991 (Anastatic print after the edition of Padua, 1942 by Carlo F. Polizzi) [to be further quoted *Documenti*] does not mention the event.

⁴ Giovanni Diacono, *Historia Veneticorum*, în *Cronache veneziane antichissime*, ed. Giovanni Monticolo, vol. I, Roma, 1890, pp. 59-171 [to be further quoted *Diacono*].

⁵ *Origo Civitatem Italiae seu Veneticorum (Chronicon Altinate et Chronicon Gradense)*, ed. Roberto Cessi, Roma, 1933.

⁶ See *Testi storici veneziani (XI-XII secolo). Historia ducum Venetorum. Annales Venetici breves. Domenico Tino, Relatione de electione Dominici Silvi Venetorum ducis*, ed. Luigi Andrea Berto, Padova, 2000 [1999], pp. 2-83.

⁷ Martin da Canal, *Les estoires de Venise. Cronaca veneziana in lingua francese dalle origini al 1275*, ed. Alberto Limentani, Florența, 1972 [to be further quoted *Canal*].

⁸ *Marci Chronica universalis ...*, BNM, mss. It. XI. 124 [= 6802].

⁹ See *Testi storici veneziani*, quoted in note 6 [to be further quoted *AVB*].

¹⁰ Șerban Marin, *Venetian and non-Venetian Crusaders in the Fourth Crusade, According to the Venetian Chronicles' Tradition*, in "Annuario. Istituto Romeno di Cultura e Ricerca Umanistica di Venezia", 4 (2002), pp. 111-171. The classification was also employed in other studies, the functionality of it being largely maintained.

Category 1. Historia Ducum Veneticorum was undoubtedly excluded on this occasion, for the above-mentioned reason. The presentation in the three other chronicles follows the same line:

<i>Giustinian</i> ¹¹ , p. 33	<i>M 2571</i> ¹² , f. 20b	<i>M 2581</i> ¹³ , f. 13b
Hic dux filium suum, [...] fo fio Zustignan allo Iustinianum nomine, misit ad Greorum imperatorem, a quo idem Iustinianus fuit benigne receptus honoremque Ypati, sive consulis imperialis, ab eo obtinuit gratiose.	Imperador de Grecia, dal quale ello fo molto onorado e de grandi exenij magnificado et da lui ello otene honor de ipato zoe consolo Imperial [...].	Questo Dose ave 2 Fiolj [...] manda lo ditto Dose per alcuni seruicij so fio Zustignan alo Imperador de Gretia, dal qual elo fo molto onorado e de grandi dignita magnificado e da lui ottene honor de Ipato zoe Consolo Imperial [...].

Category 2. A presentation somewhat similar with that in Category 1 is given by two of the chronicles ascribed to Category 2 (the major chronicle of Andrea Dandolo and the chronicle of Lorenzo de Monacis), with the only difference that – unlike in Category 1 – the name of the Byzantine Emperor is mentioned explicitly:

<i>A. Dandolo-extensa</i> ¹⁴ , p. 142	<i>Monacis</i> ¹⁵ , p. 34
Hic dux Venecie, cum duos haberet filios, Iustinianum Constantinopolim missit, qui ab imperatore Leone votive susceptus, honorem ypati, seu imperialis consulis, ab eo optinuit; [...].	Justinianus filius dicti ducis accederis Constantinopolim consensu Patris a Leone Imperatore Ypati sive Imperialis Consulis honorem suscepit. [...].

However, Pietro Delfino, who follows as a rule the Dandolian model, offers an original variant:

*P. Delfin*¹⁶, f. 150a

Habiando de [sic! = due] figlioli, l'uno clamado *Justignan*¹⁷ l'altro Zuane. E Justignan fò menado à Lion Quinto Imperador in Constantinopoli, per voler fermar nuovi patti cum lui per li navilij [che] passava in le parte de Romania à trafegar; e da quello fò molto honoradamente acceptado e de gran doni magnificado, tractando e confermando cum lui tutto quello perche de lui era mandato.

¹¹ *Historia vulgo Petro Iustiniano Iustiniani filio adiudicata*, ed. Roberto Cessi and Fanny Bennato, Venezia, 1964 [to be further quoted *Giustiniano*].

¹² *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1457*, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana di Venezia [in continuare, BNM], mss. It. VII. 2571 [= 12463] [to be further quoted *M 2571*].

¹³ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1570*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2581 [= 12473] [to be further quoted *M 2581*].

¹⁴ *Andreae Danduli Ducis Veneticorum Chronica per extensium descripta aa. 46-1280 d. C.*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* [to be further quoted *RIS*], vol. 12, new edition, ed. Ester Pastorello, Bologna, 1923, pp. 5-327 [to be further quoted *A. Dandolo-extensa*].

¹⁵ *Laurentii de Monacis Cretae Cancellari Chronica de rebus venetis ab U. C. ad Annum MCCCLIV, sive ad conjurationem ducis Faledro*, ed. Flaminio Cornaro, Venetia, 1758 [to be further quoted *Monacis*].

¹⁶ *Pietro Delfin. Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1422*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2557 [= 12449] [to be further quoted *P. Delfin*].

¹⁷ Underlined in the original manuscript.

The chronicle of Andrea Navagero, very similar in other points to the chronicles ascribed to this category, also embarks upon an original path:

*Navagero*¹⁸, p. 943

E avendo il detto Doge due figliuoli, uno avea nome Giovanni e l'altro Giustiniano. Ed essendo bisogno mandare un'Ambasciadore a Costantinopoli, fu eletto pel Maggiore Consiglio messere Giusti[ni]ano, figliuolo del detto Doge, il quale andò a Costantinopoli. Il quale fu ricevuto dall'Imperadore benignamente, con lodare molto i Veneziani di avere fabbricata una sì nobile Città nelle acque salse. [...].

The short chronicle of Doge Andrea Dandolo offers a more succinct presentation:

*A. Dandolo-brevis*¹⁹, p. 356

[...]; et, cum duos haberet filios, Iustinianum videlicet ad Grecorum imperatorem destinavit, a quo ypati honore decoratus fuit, [...].

Category 3. The event under consideration is missing completely from the Chronicle *M 2592*²⁰ and from the chronicle of Flavio Biondo²¹, so I shall exemplify the episode exclusively with the chronicle of Marcantonio Sabellico:

*Sabellico*²², p. 44

Nunc ad Particiatii gesta redeo: qui quum duos haberet filios, alterum Justinianum nominatus, ad Leonem Graeciae Imperatorem misit: a quo benigne acceptum ferunt, aplissimisque verbis laudatum, ornatumque honoribus non parvis; [...].

Category 4. As the pages referring to the first centuries of the history of Venice were lost, the chronicle of Antonio Morosini²³ will not make the object of my investigation on this occasion. The two remaining chronicles ascribed to this category follow a line similar with that in the chronicle of Pietro Delfino, belonging to Category 2:

¹⁸ *Storia della Repubblica Veneziana scritta da Andrea Navagero patrizio veneto*, in *RIS*, vol. 23, ed. L. A. Muratori, Milano, 1733, pp. 923-1216 [to be further quoted *Navagero*].

¹⁹ *Andreae Danduli. Chronica brevis*, in *RIS*, vol. 12, part I, new edition, ed. E. Pastorello, Bologna, 1938, p. 351-373 [to be further quoted *A. Dandolo-brevis*].

²⁰ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1247*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2592 [= 12484] [to be further quoted *M 2592*].

²¹ *Blondi Flavii Forliviensis, De Origine et Gestis Venetorum Liber*, in *Thesaurus antiquitatum et historiarum Italiae*, vol. V, part I, new edition, ed. Johann Georg Graevius, Leyden, 1722, pp. 1-26.

²² *M. Antonii Sabellici, rerum Venetarum ab urbe condita, ad Marcum Barbadicum, Sereniss. Venetiarum Principem & Senatus, Decadis Primae*, in *Degl'Istorici delle Cose Veneziane, i quali hanno scritto per Pubblico Decreto*, Venezia, 1718 [1487] [to be further quoted *Sabellico*].

²³ *The Morosini Codex*, vol. I, ed. Michele Pietro Ghezzi, John R. Melville-Jones and Andrea Rizzi, Padova, 1999.

*E. Dandolo*²⁴, f. 19a-19b

[...] habiando el ditto doxe dò fioli, l'un clamado Zustinian et l'altro Zuanne, et habiando mandato Justinian al Imperador de Constantinopoli per voler alguni patti fermar con lui per li navilij che passava in le parti sue à mercato, el ditto Justinian fò dal ditto Imperador molto ben ricevudo et de grandi doni magnificado, confermando i / patti che i Veniziani haveva con lui, [...],

*pseudo-Dolfìn*²⁵, f. 20a

[...], habiando doi fioli chiamadi per nome luno Justignan, laltro Zuane, el quale Justignan habiando mandato alo Imperador de Constantinopoli per voler alguni pati cum lui per li navilij che passavano per le sue contrade a trafegar, fo molto da quello Re [sic!] receptado & de grandi doni magnificado, tractando & confirmando cum lui tuto quello che da lui era domandado [...].

Category 5. A type of presentation similar with that in chronicles ascribed to Category 4 is noted in the chronicle of Pietro Delfino, and – to a certain extent – in the chronicle of Nicolò Trevisano:

*Donà*²⁶, f. 8a

[...] el ditto habiando dieci [sic!] fioli, uno chiamato per nome Iustinian, l'altro Zuane, il qual Iustinian habiandolo mandato a l'Imperator de Costantinopoli per Inbasador per haver alcuni pati fece ai mar [sic! = armar] con lui più navilij che trafegava et pavava [sic! = pasava] in quelli parte, zonto il diso [= dito] à Costantinopoli, fo molto da quel Imperator aceptando et have de gran doni magnificando, tractando et conferendo con lui tutto quello perche era mandado, [...].

*Veniera 791*²⁷, f. 57b

[...], el ditto habiando duoi figlioli, uno chiamato per nomme Justinian havendo mandato all'Imperador de Constantinopoli per Imbasciator per haver alcuni patti fece armar con luj piu navilij che trafegava et passava in quelle parte, giunto el ditto à Constantinopoli, fu molto donni, magnificando et conferendo con lui tutto quello perche era mandato, [...].

*Trevisan*²⁸, f. 12a, col. 1

E abiando el dito Doxe doi fioli Çustinian e Çuane, el qual Zustinian abiandolo mandado a Lione Imperador de Constantinopoli per ambaxador per alguni pati fermar con luj per i navili e marcadantie che trafegava a pasava in quele parte; azonto [sic!] el dito a Constantinopoli, fo molto da quello Imperador rezatado [sic!] et a due da lui de grandi donj magnificando e tratando e confermando tuto quello per che el iera andado. [...].

Category 6. A more succinct presentation of the event, pointing out to an increased interest of the respective manuscript in the internal life of Venice, rather than in the relations with the Byzantine Empire:

²⁴ *Enrico Dandolo. Cronaca veneta dall'origine della città fino al 1373*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 102 [= 8142], microfilm Pos. Marc. 127 [to be further quoted *E. Dandolo*].

²⁵ *Cronaca di Venezia, detta di Pietro Dolfino, dall'origine della città sino all'anno 1418*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 559 [= 7888] [to be further quoted *pseudo-Dolfìn*].

²⁶ *Antonio Donà. Cronaca veneta dall'anno 687 al 1479*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 10 [= 8607] [to be further quoted *Donà*].

²⁷ *Cronaca Veniera*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 791 [= 7589] [to be further quoted *Veniera 791*].

²⁸ [*Nicolò Trevisan.*] *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1444*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2567 [= 12459] [to be further quoted *Trevisan*].

<i>M 2544</i> ²⁹ , f. 29a, col. 1	<i>M 47</i> ³⁰ , f. 18a, col. 2	<i>M 48</i> ³¹ , f. 44a	<i>M 2028</i> ³² , f. 6a
Costui Doxe haveva dui fioli, luno haveva nome Zustignian, laltro Zuano; luno lo mando allo Imperador de Grecia, lo quale fu molto ben ricevudo [...].	[Q]uesto Doxe haveva do fiolli, lun haveva nome Zustignian, laltro Zuane. Luno lo mando al Inperador di Gretia, loqual fu molto ben ricevudo [...].	Questo Doxe havea doij fioli, luno havea nome Zustignan e laltro Zuane. Luno lo mando alo Imperador de Grecia, qual fo benissimo receputo [...].	[...]. Uno lui mandò allo Imperator de Grecia, il qual fù molto ben ricevuto, [...].

Category 7. The two chronicles belonging to this category, although different one from another, seem to follow the narrative line of the major chronicle of Andrea Dandolo, apart from the fact that Giovanni Giacomo Caroldo establishes a direct link between this episode and the appointment of Giustiniano Partecipazio as consort of his father:

<i>Caroldo</i> ³³ , f. 10a-10b	<i>Sanudo</i> ³⁴ , p. 451
Et, havendo 2 figliuoli, Giovanni et Giustiniano, questo mandò a Constantinopoli, / che dall'Imperatore fù gratamente ricevuto et insignito del titolo d'Ypato, quello fece consorte nel Ducato.	[...]. Questo Doge, avendo due figliuoli, mandò Giustiniano a Constantinopoli, dove da Lione Imperadore fu o[no]rrevolmente ricevuto, e ottenne da lui il titolo d'Ipato ovvero Consolo Imperiale.

One should note that Marino Sanudo previously inserts a strange episode, similar with the one under consideration, for which I have no plausible explanation:

<i>Sanudo</i> , f. 451
Nota che Angiolo Badoer Doge mandò Giustiniano suo figliuolo da Aliprando Re de' Goti, dal quale fu benignamente ricevuto e fatto Ipato ovvero Consolo Imperiale.

Category 8. Among the three manuscripts ascribed to this category, I have left aside the details about the episode given in *M 2541*³⁵ and *Barbo*³⁶, focusing

²⁹ *Cronica di Venezia fino al 1382*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2544 [= 12436] [to be further quoted *M 2544*].

³⁰ *Cronaca veneziana dall'origine della città fino al 1446*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 47 [= 8139] [to be further quoted *M 47*].

³¹ *Cronaca veneta dall'origine della città fino al 1446*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 48 [= 7143] [to be further quoted *M 48*].

³² *Cronica veneta, dal 703 al 1420*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2028 [= 8559] [to be further quoted *M 2028*].

³³ See *supra*, note 1.

³⁴ *Marini Sanuti Leonardi filii Patricii Veneti De origine Urbis Venetae et vita omnium Ducum feliciter incipit*, in *RIS*, vol. 22, ed. L. A. Muratori, Milano, 1733, p. 399-1252 [to be further quoted *Sanudo*].

³⁵ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1310*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2541 [= 12433].

³⁶ *Cronaca veneta detta Barba dal principio della città fino al 1545*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 66 [= 7766], ff. 1^r-73^v.

exclusively on the presentation made in the chronicle *M 67*, which is rather similar with the one in the chronicle of Sabellico:

*M 67*³⁷, f. 130a

[...], havendo il detto Dose doi fioli, uno haveva nome Justinian e laltro Zuane; se delibero de mandar Justinian a Leon Imperator de Grecia, il quale fu da quello degnamente acetado et fatoli assai carezze per magnificar Anzolo Dose [...].

Category 9. One among the chronicles ascribed to this category adopts the variant put forward in Categories 4 and 5, as well as in the chronicle of Pietro Delfino:

*M 793*³⁸, f. 48b

[...] el dito habiando dui fioli uno chiamato Justignan e laltro Zuane, el qual Zustignan habiandolo mandado alo Imperador di Chostantinopoli per Imbasador, per voler alcuni pati, fece armada chon lui piu navilii chi trafegava e pasava in quele parte; e zonto el dito a Costantinopoli, fo molto da quel Imperador azetado et have grandoni [sic!], magnifichando, tratando, chonfir[m]ando chon lui tutto quello che iera mandado [...].

On the other hand, the chronicle of Patriarch Giovanni Tiepolo, the chronicle of Agostino degli Agostini, and *M 77* give an original description of the event:

*Tiepolo*³⁹, f. 66a

Ditto Dose, per le cose che occorreano, mandò suo fiol Meser Zustignan à Lion Imperador de Greci, per trattar diverse cose, lo qual Imperador lo hebbo molto grato et lo uide volontiera et honorarlo et tenelo molto tempo con lui, facendoli infiniti et ampli privilegij, [...].

*Agostini*⁴⁰, f. 6b

Ditto Dox[e], per le cose che occorreano, mandò suo fiol meser Zustignian à Lion Imperator de Greci, per trattar diverse cose, loqual Imperator l'hebbe molto grato et lo vidde volontiera et honorollo et tenelo molto tempo con lui, facendoli infiniti et ampli privilegij.

*M 77*⁴¹, f. 12

Detto Dose p[^] le cose, che occorreua, mandò suo fiol m[^] Zustiniano à Leon Imp^{re}. De Greci, p[^] trattar diuerse cose, lo qual Imp^{re}. lo haue molto grato, et lo uedè uolontieri, et honorolo, et tenele molto tempo con lui, facendoli infiniti, et ampli priuilegij, [...].

³⁷ *Cronaca veneta dal principio della città fino all'anno 1549*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 67 [= 9132] [to be further quoted *M 67*].

³⁸ *Cronaca di Venezia dall'origine della città al 1478*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 793 [= 8477] [to be further quoted *M 793*].

³⁹ *Giovanni Tiepolo Patriarca di Venezia. Cronaca veneta ad esso attribuita dall'anno 421 al 1524*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 129 [= 8323] [to be further quoted *Tiepolo*].

⁴⁰ *Agostino Agostini. Storia veneziana di Agostino Agostini dal principio della fondazione di Venezia (421) fino all'anno 1570*, Biblioteca della Fondazione Querini Stampalia di Venezia, mss. IV. 16 [= 770] [to be further quoted *Agostini*].

⁴¹ *Cronaca veneziana dall'anno 421 fino al 1379*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 77 [= 7420] [to be further quoted *M 77*].

The chronicles falling into this category, although with a similar line of approach, give different accounts of the episode under consideration; such is the case with the chronicle of Francesco Sansovino (in which praise is given in general) and of the chronicle *M 1833* (which on the contrary, lessens the merits of the Venetians, in general, and, in particular, of the son of the Doge).

*Sansovino*⁴², p. 538

[...], & Giustiniano, ch'era il maggiore, lo mandò a Leone Imper[ator] di Costantinopoli, si perche fosse honorato di qualche degnità & si perche si intrinsecasse con quella Corte à beneficio della sua Città; conciosia che quella con questa furono sempre corrispondenti per la conformità de i negotij: percioche l'vna è sostegno dell'altra: essendo per rispetto del mare, quella capo dell'Oriente; & questa senz'alcun dubbio dell'Occidente. Dal qual Leone raccolto gratiosamente, fu fatto Hypato.

*M 1833*⁴³, f. 6b

Il Doge Partecipazio [...], intanto che Giustiniano suo Primogenito era alla Corte di Costantinopoli, per coltivarla.

The anonymous chronicle *M 1999*⁴⁴ mentions the two sons of the Doge but makes no reference to the episode of the embassy to Constantinople, whereas in the chronicle *M 2572*⁴⁵ the dogate of Agnello Partecipazio is disregarded completely.

Category 10. The manuscripts *M 2556*⁴⁶ and *M 2576*⁴⁷, were set aside, since they do not mention the episode. The remaining chronicles give fairly similar presentations, with a number of differences; for instance, the Emperor glorifies either Giustiniano – *M 44* and *M 38*, or Agnello – *M 2550*, *M 2559* and *M 39* (in a rather similar way with the codice *M 67* belonging to Category 8), or again, the verb “*magnificar*” is missing completely – *Abbiosi, Curato* și *M 104*.

*M 44*⁴⁸, f. 11a

[...] e questo Doxe, habiando dui suoi fioli, chiamadi per nome Zustignan e Zane, elo manda al'Imperador de Gretia Zustignan, dal qual elo fo molto ben onorado e d'molti grand'doni magnificado [...].

*M 38*⁴⁹, f. 7a, col. 2-7b, col. 1

E questo Doxe, abiando do fijolli, chlamadi per nome Zustignan e Zanne, ello manda / Zustignan allo Imperador de Greçia, dal qualle fo molto ben honorado e de mo[I]ti donni magnifficchado.

⁴² Francesco Sansovino, *Venetia città nobilissima et singolare*, vol. 2, ed. Giustiniano Martinioni, Venezia 1968 [1663] [to be further quoted *Sansovino*].

⁴³ *Storia veneta dalla fondazione della Repubblica sino all'anno 1750*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 1833 [= 8376] [to be further quoted *M 1833*].

⁴⁴ *Epitome della Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 1999 [= 7918] [to be further quoted *M 1999*].

⁴⁵ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1471*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2572 [= 12464].

⁴⁶ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1422*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2556 [= 12448].

⁴⁷ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1501*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2576 [= 12468] [to be further quoted *M 2576*].

⁴⁸ *Cronaca veneziana dal principio della città fino al 1433*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 44 [= 7865] [to be further quoted *M 44*].

⁴⁹ *Cronaca veneziana dal principio della città fino al 1388*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 38 [= 8748] [to be further quoted *M 38*].

<p><i>M 2550</i>⁵⁰, f. 40b [...], et questo Dose, habiando dui fioli chiamadi per nome Zustignan et Zuanne, et mandò Zustignan allo Imperador de Grecia, dal qual el fo molto honorado et donatoli de molto gran donj, magnificando Anzolo Dose suo padre. [...].</p>	<p><i>M 2559</i>⁵¹, f. 6, col. 3 4 [...] p^ nome Zustignan halo Imperador de Grezia, dal qual molto el fo honorado e donoli de molti grandoni [sic!], magnifichando Anzolo Doxie suo padre [...].</p>	<p><i>M 39</i>⁵², f. 7b [...], mando Zustinian allo Imperatore de Gretia, dal qual fu molto ben veduto et honorato et donolj grandissimi donj, magnificando Angelo Dose suo padre, [...].</p>
<p><i>Abbiosi</i>⁵³, f. 8a Questo have do fioli, uno Zustignian e l'altro Zuane; Zustignan el mandò à l'Imperador de Grecia, dal qual fo honorado et presentado de molti doni.</p>	<p><i>Curato</i>⁵⁴, f. 7a [...], questo Dose have do fiolj, un Zustignan, [...], el mando allo Imperador de Gretia, dal qual fo honorado e presentado de molti donj, [...].</p>	<p><i>M 104</i>⁵⁵, f. 68b [...], questo have do fioli, un Zustignan e laltro Zuanne; Zustignan el mando allo Imperador de Gretia, dal qual fo honorado et apresentado de molti donj, [...].</p>

Category 11. The classification previously made within this category (11a și 11b) becomes inoperative. On the other hand, there is considerable variation in the presentation of the event.

Manuscript *M 78*⁵⁶ only begins its account with the dogate of Sebastiano Ziani (1172-1178), whereas the pages in manuscript *M 1586*⁵⁷ pertaining to the period under consideration were lost. On the other hand, I have been unable to identify the episode in the chronicle of Giorgio Delfino⁵⁸.

Manuscripts *M 2563* și *M 46* give a succinct version of the episode (in general, along the line of approach given in chronicles belonging to Category 6), and so does manuscript *M 550*:

⁵⁰ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1410*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2550 [= 12442] [to be further quoted *M 2550*].

⁵¹ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1427*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2559 [= 12451] [to be further quoted *M 2559*].

⁵² *Cronaca veneziana dal principio della città fino all'anno 1405*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 39 [= 8609] [to be further quoted *M 39*].

⁵³ *Camillo Abbiosi detto il Seniore di Ravenna. Cronaca di Venezia dall'origine della città fino all'anno 1443*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2052 [= 8981] [to be further quoted *Abbiosi*].

⁵⁴ *Antonio di Matteo di Curato. Cronaca veneta*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 162 [= 8037] [to be further quoted *Curato*].

⁵⁵ *Cronaca veneziana dal principio della città fino al 1443*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 104 [= 8611] [to be further quoted *M 104*].

⁵⁶ *Cronaca veneziana dall'anno 1190 all'anno 1332*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 78 [= 9135].

⁵⁷ *Cronaca veneta dal principio della città fino al 1450*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 1586 [= 9611].

⁵⁸ [Zorzi Dolfin.] *Cronaca di Venezia dall'origine della città sino all'anno 1458*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 794 [= 8503].

*M 2563*⁵⁹, f. 3a

[...], el ditto Doxe haveva do fioli, uno [...], el ditto Doxe haveva do fioli, uno [...]

*M 46*⁶⁰, f. 18b-19a

[...] aveva di [sic! = do] fiollj, uno ave/va [...]

*M 550*⁶¹, f. 52a

[...] il qual Principe havea doi figlioli, uno detto Giustiniano e l'altro Giovanni; il primo Giustinian li mandò il padre all'Imperatore de Constantinopoli, del qual honorevolmente fu accettato, [...].

On the other hand, the chronicle of Gasparo Zancaruolo is no doubt under the influence of Categories 1 and 2 (especially of the chronicle of Lorenzo de Monacis):

*Zancaruolo*⁶², f. c xxx iiij a

Iustiniano fiolo del dito Doxe, venendo da Constantinopoli per consentimento del padre, da Leone Imperatore receve honore de i pacti [sic! = ipato] overamente del Imperiale consule; [...].

The remaining chronicles ascribed to this category either opt for various interpretations based on the approach given in the chronicle of Andrea Navagero (*M 1577*, *Erizzo*, *M 798*, *M 80* and *M 628a*), or give original descriptions (*M 2543*, *M 2560*):

*M 1577*⁶³, f. 47

[...]. Questo Dose aveva dò fioli, uno aveva nome Zustignan, e l'altro Zuane. El mandò Zustignan all'Imperator de Costantinopoli et quello i fece grande onor et delli molti doni magnificando et laudando i Veneziani della bella Zittà che havevano fatto in l'acqua salsa. [...].

*Erizzo*⁶⁴, f. 52b

E' de saver che questo Doxe haveva do fioli, clamadi per nome Zustignan e Zuanne; e siando necessario de mandar un'Imbassador all'Imperator de Constantinopoli e così el fu eletto per Imbassador suo fiol Zustignan; e zonto el ditto à Constantinopoli à Michiel Imperator, dal qual el fu molto honorado e ben visto e ricevudo e li donà da molti gran doni, magnificando Anzolo Doxe so padre e laldando molto Venetiani e la incliza e nobel città de Veniexia da loro fabricada in le acque salse.

⁵⁹ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1441*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2563 [= 12455] [to be further quoted *M 2563*].

⁶⁰ *Cronaca veneziana dalla fondazione della città fino al 1444*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 46 [= 7603] [to be further quoted *M 46*].

⁶¹ *Cronaca dall'origine di Venezia sino all'anno 1442*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 550 [= 8496] [to be further quoted *M 550*].

⁶² *Cronaca veneta supposta di Gasparo Zancaruolo, dall'origine della città fino al 1446*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 1274 [= 9274] [to be further quoted *Zancaruolo*].

⁶³ *Cronaca della città di Venezia dalla sua fondazione fino all'anno 1400*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 1577 [= 7973] [to be further quoted *M 1577*].

⁶⁴ *Cronaca veneta attribuita a Marcantonio Erizzo, fino all'anno 1495*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 56 [= 8636] [to be further quoted *Erizzo*].

*M 798*⁶⁵, f. viiii b

E questo Doxe have do fiuoli, luno vegniva chiamato Justignan e laltro Zuane. El dito Doxe mando Justignan da lo Imperador de Greci, dal qual Imperador el fo molto honorado e donoli de gran doni, magnificando e laudando li Veneciani de la bona e bela Cita che li haveva fato in le aque salse et in cusi piccolo luogo, [...].

*M 80*⁶⁶, f. 85a

[...], lo detto Dose mandò Justinian al Imperator de Grezzi, dal qual Imperator fù molto honorado et gli donò de gran doni, magnificando et lodando Venetiani della buona et bella Città che lor havevano fatto dentro al acque salse et in cosi picciol logo [...].

*M 628a*⁶⁷, f. 72a

Et questo Dose have doi figlioli [...]; lo ditto Dose mando Iustiniano allo Imperador de Grezzi, dal qual Imperador el fo molto honorado et le dono de grandi doni, magnificando et laudando Venitiani della bona et bella Citta che lor havevano fatto dentro alle acque salse et cosi in piccol logo; [...].

*M 2543*⁶⁸, f. 7b

Que[sto] Dose haveva do fioli per nome chiamadi luno Justignan et laltro Zuane; et ello manda Justignan alo Imperador de Gretia, daloqual ello fu molto ben honorado e donoli de molto gran done [sic! = doni] è confermando con lui tutto quello per che da lui el giera andado.

*M 2560*⁶⁹, f. 42a

Questo Doxe haveva do fioli, uno haveva nome Justignan, laltro Zuane; e quello Zustignan suo padre el mano alo Imperador de Constantinopoli, dal qual Imperador el fo az[e]tado e amado et magnificado per riverentia del padro, fazandoli de molti doni e belli honoro. [...].

The chronicles I have ascribed to this category (the chronicles of Daniele Barbaro and of Girolamo Savina) give original versions (somewhat similar with the one in manuscript M 1833, in what concerns the purpose of Giustiniano's mission), which differ, especially in the presentation of the Emperor. Moreover, *Savina* also establishes genealogies, and puts forward the idea that Agnello Partecipazio had married into the Giustiniano family, judging so no doubt by the Christian name of Agnello Partecipazio's eldest son.

⁶⁵ *Cronaca veneta dall'origine della città sino all'anno 1478*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 798 [= 7486] [to be further quoted *M 798*].

⁶⁶ *Cronaca veneta dall'anno 1400 fino al 1684*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 80 [= 8026] [to be further quoted *M 80*].

⁶⁷ *Cronaca breve veneziana dall'origine di Venezia sino all'anno 1465* [in miscellanea], BNM, mss. It. VII. 628a [= 8049] [to be further quoted *M 628a*].

⁶⁸ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1356*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2543 [= 12435] [to be further quoted *M 2543*].

⁶⁹ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1432*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2560 [= 12452] [to be further quoted *M 2560*].

<i>Barbaro</i> ⁷⁰ , f. 39b-40a	<i>Savina</i> ⁷¹ , f. 13a
[...], havendo havudo doi figlioli, l'un che era nominado Zustignan, il mandò a Costantinopoli, al servitio / di Niceforo Imperator, perche l'imparasse a quella Corte buoni costumi et se facesso pratico delle cose del mondo, [...].	Questo [Doxe] havea per moglier una della famiglia Justiniana, con la qual l'have dui fioli, [...] l'uno chiamato Giustignan, che fu mandado dal padre ad Leone Imperator de Costantinopoli, per instruirlo nelli negocii del mondo, & l'altro fiol chiamato Zuanne, [...].

Moreover, *Savina* establishes a relation between the presence of the Doge's son in Constantinople and the acquisition of St. Zachary's relics.

<i>Savina</i> , f. 13a
[...], et fese anche refar la Chiesa et Monasterio de San Zacharia con li Ipati [sic!], nel qual luoco fu posto el corpo del ditto santo, qual fu donado da Leone Imperator de Costantinopoli con el corpo de San Taris et un puoco del legno della Crose et una partesella della vesta de Christo, le qual reliquie furno portade dal ditto Giustinian fiol del Dose, al suo retorno de Grecia, [...].

Veniera 2580 adopts the variant put forward in Categories 4 and 5, more exactly in the chronicle of *P. Dolfin* and in *M 793*:

*Veniera 2580*⁷², f. 109a

El ditto haveva duo fiogli, l'uno chiamato Justinian; et mandolo dall'Imperator di Constantinopoli per Imbassador, per haver alchuni patti; fece armar con lui piu naviglij che trafegava[no] et passavano in quelle parte. Juntto il ditto à Constantinopoli, fu molto da quello Imperator accettato et have de gran doni, magnificando et conferendo con lui tutto quello perche era mandato, [...]

I shall add here two chronicles not included in my previous analysis of the presentation of the Fourth Crusade. They both offer extremely succinct variants, somewhat in the line of chronicles ascribed to Category 6:

*Contarini*⁷³, f. 62a, col. 1

[...] el mando Zustignian alo Imperador de Grezia, dal qual lo fo moltto ben hnorado e da moltj donj magnificado [...].

*M 2555*⁷⁴, f. 8b

Questo Doxe aveva doi fioli, uno aveva nome Iustig[n]an e laltro Zuane; uno lo mando alinperador de Grecia, la qual fu benisimo rezeuto [...].

⁷⁰ *Daniele Barbaro. Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1275*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2554 [= 12446] to be further quoted *Barbaro*].

⁷¹ *Girolamo Savina. Cronaca veneta dal principio della città sino al 1616*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 134 [= 8035] [to be further quoted *Savina*].

⁷² *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1556*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2580 [= 12472] [to be further quoted *Veniera 2580*].

⁷³ *Donato Contarini. Cronaca Veneta dall'origine della Città fino al 1433*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 95 [= 8610], microfilm Pos. Marc. 140 [to be further quoted *Contarini*].

⁷⁴ *Cronaca di Venezia fino al 1414*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2555 [= 12447] [to be further quoted *M 2555*].

As to the destination of the embassy involving Giustiniano Partecipazio, several chronicles try to identify the basileus in the person of Nicefor I (802-811)⁷⁵, Michael (who might be Michael I *Rhangabe* – 811-813 or Michael II *Gângavul*, the founder of the Amorium dynasty to the Byzantine throne – 820-829)⁷⁶ or Leon V the Armenian (813-820)⁷⁷; taking into account the dogate of Agnello Partecipazio (811-827) and the fact that the episode of the embassy is placed in all chronicles as being the first event of this reign⁷⁸ and, implicitly, having taken place at the very beginning of this reign, it becomes rather difficult to establish who among the four emperors was the host of young Giustiniano, all of them fitting the chronology of the event. It would be more credible to opt for one of the variants involving Michael I and Leon V, knowing that Nicephorus I had fallen victim to an ambush organized by the Bulgarians of Khan Krum (cca 803-814), in one of the gorges of the Balkans in July 811.

Should one give credit to the more frequent version, which refers to Leon, one would conclude that Giustiniano's mission took place after 813, knowing that the stratege of the Anatholikon theme became emperor in the summer of that year. Moreover, the authority of the major chronicle of Doge Andrea Dandolo – considered to be of absolute accuracy as to the dating of events – places the episode of the embassy after the description of the accession to throne of Leon the Armenian⁷⁹, which is dated correctly to 813, and shortly after the defeat of the Bulgarian khan by the new emperor (in the autumn of the same year)⁸⁰ and the proclamation of his son Constantine as co-emperor (in the month of December of the same year)⁸¹, as well as previous to the assassination, in December 820, of the related emperor by the partisans of Michael of Amorion (who would later become Michael II, 820-829)⁸².

Undoubtedly, when attempting to date the event, one cannot rely on the information provided by the Venetian chronicles, first and foremost because the episode is undated (the sole identification is immediately after the accession of Agnello Partecipazio to the office of Doge), but also due to the errors and differences in dating, a characteristic feature of the Venetian chronicles, especially

⁷⁵ *Barbaro*.

⁷⁶ *Erizzo*.

⁷⁷ *A. Dandolo-estensa, Monacis, P. Dolfin* (with the mentioning that this may have been Leon V), *Trevisan, Sanudo, M 67*, categoria 9, *Sansovino, Zancaruolo, Savina*.

⁷⁸ It is true that *A. Dandolo-estensa* places between the beginning of the reign of Agnello Partecipazio and the embassy of his son a few details strictly referring to Byzantine history, which were eliminated from subsequent chronicles, focussing mainly on elements pertaining to the history of Venice. Other chronicles erroneously place different other events between, such as the relocation of St. Mark's relics or the building of the Ducal Palace!

⁷⁹ *A. Dandolo-estensa*, p. 140.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*. Also, *Diacono*, p. 106, makes the same dating and placing, namely after these events that took place at the Byzantine Court.

⁸² *Ibidem*, p. 144.

for the first centuries in the history of Venice⁸³. On the other hand, despite the serious errors in dating, the Venetian chronicles narrate events in a mostly correct chronological order, and the placing of the embassy of Giustiniano Partecipazio to Constantinople immediately after the accession of his father may indicate that the episode under consideration took place shortly after the beginning of the reign of Agnello Partecipazio, that is shortly after 811.

The modern historiography carries the issue even further, and sets the event in relation to the accession of Leon V (813) to the throne of Constantinople, the purpose of the embassy being considered to have been that of conveying congratulations to the new emperor. Thus, the episode is dated to 813⁸⁴ or 814⁸⁵, or again, only the succession of emperors to the Byzantine throne is being mentioned⁸⁶. I find it difficult to understand the reason for which the editors G. L. Fr. Tafel and G. M. Thomas date the episode to 819 (undoubtedly, under a question mark)⁸⁷. In any case, the references made by the

⁸³ I shall use as an example the beginning of A. Partecipazio's dogate, which is dated, when so is the case (this dating is missing from *M* 2571, f. 20b; *P. Dolfin*, f. 149b; *A. Dandolo-brevi*, p. 356; *M* 89, f. 10a, col. 2; *M* 47, f. 18a, col. 2; *M* 2028, f. 6a; *Sanudo*, p. 451; *M* 77, f. 11; *M* 1833, f. 6b; *Contarini*, f. 62a, col. 1; *M* 2559, f. 6, col. 3; *M* 38, f. 7a, col. 2; *M* 39, f. 7b; *M* 2543, f. 7a; *M* 550, f. 52a), to the following years: 782 (*Giustinian*, p. 32), 783 (*Navagero*, p. 943; see adaugă *Lorenzo Barozzi. Cronaca di Venezia fino al 725*, BNM, mss. It. VII. 2540 [= 12432], în miscellanea, f. 8b), 789 (*M* 2592, f. 5b; *Veniera* 2580, f. 109a), 792 (*M* 2581, f. 13a; *E. Dandolo*, f. 19a; *pseudo-Dolfin*, f. 20a; *Donà*, f. 8a, *Veniera* 791, f. 57b; *M* 67: 129b; *M* 793, f. 48b), 793 (*M* 2576, f. 8a), 798 (*Barbaro*, f. 39b), 800 (*M* 80, f. 85a), 806 (*M* 2544, f. 29a, col. 1; *M* 48, f. 44a; *M* 2555: 8b; *M* 2550, f. 40b; *M* 1577, f. 46; *Erizzo*, f. 52a; *M* 798, f. viii b; *M* 2560, f. 42a; *M* 2563, f. 3a; *M* 46, f. 18b; *M* 628a, f. 72a), 807 (*M* 44, f. 11a; *Abbiosi*, f. 8a; *Curato*, f. 7a; *M* 104, f. 68b), 809 (*Monacis*, p. 34; *Sabellico*, p. 42; *Trevisan*, f. 12a, col. 1; *Caroldo*, f. 10a; *Tiepolo*, f. 65b; *Agostini*, f. 5b; *Sansovino*, p. 538; *M* 1999, f. 4b; *Savina*, f. 13a), 810 (*A. Dandolo-extensa*, p. 139), 811 (*Diacono*, p. 105 – in fact, the text has a blank exactly where the year should have been mentioned, and 811 is offered as a possible choice by editor Giovanni Monticolo, in a note to the text), 814 (*Zancaruolo*, f. cxxxiiij a – even if the text mentions 914 [sic!], by error). *AVB*, p. 1/2 and *Canal*, p. 20/21, strictly mentioning the relocation of St. Mark's relics in relation to Giustiniano Partecipazio, speak of 700 and 900 respectively, even if they both provide a date, for the sake of accuracy, namely "the last day of Januray"! *Origo (editio prima)*, p. 29 and *Origo (editio tertia)*, p. 117, only address the duration of the reign, mentioning "Agnellus dux ducavit annos .XVIII."

⁸⁴ Donald M. Nicol, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, Milano, 1990, p. 39; G. Ravegnani, *op. cit.*, p. 20. Editor Giovanni Monticolo, in *Diacono*, p. 106, makes no dating of the episode, merely placing it immediately after the eviction of Michael and the accession of Leon V, which he places in 813.

⁸⁵ Antonio Carile, "La formazione del ducato veneziano", in Antonio Carile and Giorgio Fedalto, *Le origini di Venezia*, Bologna, 1978, pp. 11-237 (236); Gherardo Ortalli, *Il ducato e la «civitas Rivoalti»: tra carolingi, bizantini e sassoni*, in *Storia di Venezia*, vol. I: *Origini – Età ducale*, ed. Lellia Cracco Ruggini, Massimiliano Pavan, Giorgio Cracco and Gherardo Ortalli, Roma, 1992, pp. 725-790 (734). In addition, editor E. Pastorello, in *A. Dandolo-extensa*, p. 142 dates to 814-815 the whole page (which comprises both the event under consideration and the relocation of St. Zachary's relics). Furthermore, the editor of 1718 of Sabellico (see Sabellico, p. 44) puts down 814 for the embassy event.

⁸⁶ S. Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, vol. I, second edition, Venezia, 1912, p. 158; John Julius Norwich, *A History of Venice*, Londra, 1983 [1977], p. 28; V. Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 274; G. Ravegnani, *op. cit.*, p. 20, note 5, who adds that this practice "answered the purpose of obtaining some sort of recognition from Byzantium and a guarantee for succession within the family."

⁸⁷ *Urkunden*, doc. II, p. 3. This is all the more strange as reference is made to the major chronicle of A. Dandolo, where the event can by no means be dated to 819.

modern researchers, when so is the case, are either to Giovanni Diacono⁸⁸, or to Andrea Dandolo⁸⁹, or to both of the above⁹⁰.

Most of the Venetian chronicles give no details as to the emperor, who is strictly mentioned as “the Emperor of Greece”⁹¹, “the Emperor of the Greeks”⁹², “the Emperor in Constantinople”⁹³, or merely “the Emperor”⁹⁴ (in this latter case showing a more accentuated attachment to the Byzantium, from the point of view of the imperial legitimacy). In the chronicle M 1833, the Doge’s son is merely said to have been sent to the “court in Constantinople”, with no further details.

However, some writings make it explicit that the mission was an embassy proper⁹⁵.

The Venetian chronicles are unanimous as to the initiative of this mission, which is attributed to the Doge, and the fact that the Doge’s son was received with great honors in Constantinople⁹⁶, be they gifts⁹⁷ or praise⁹⁸. A certain degree of concreteness can also be seen, when an account is made of the amazement of the Byzantine emperor at the unique character of Venice, built in “salty waters”⁹⁹ and “in a place so narrow”¹⁰⁰. The chronicle of Sansovino embarks upon a eulogy on the topic of the two towns, Venice and Constantinople, noting that Giustiniano had been sent over “also in order to get acquainted with that court, to the benefit of his town, knowing that they have always been complementary one to another, through trade, for one gives support to the other, knowing that as far as the sea is concerned, one is the head of the East, and this other one, undoubtedly, of the West.”

Although mentioned in most of the Venetian chronicles, the purpose of the visit to the Byzantine capital – namely that of obtaining the title of *ipatos* – is disregarded in some writings¹⁰¹. On the other hand, another purpose is given,

⁸⁸ A. Carile, *op. cit.*; G. Ortalli, *op. cit.*, p. 783, note 36.

⁸⁹ *Urkunden*, p. 3.

⁹⁰ Lazzarini, *op. cit.*, p. 274, note 2; D. M. Nicol, *op. cit.*, p. 543, note 9; G. Ravegnani, *op. cit.*, p. 20, note 5.

⁹¹ M 2571, M 2581, *Sabellico*, categoria 6, M 2555, *Contarini*, Category 10, M 2543.

⁹² *Giustinian*, A. *Dandolo-brevis*, M 798, M 80, M 628a.

⁹³ Categories 4 and 5, M 793, M 1577, M 2560, M 550, *Veniera* 2580.

⁹⁴ *Diacono*, *Navagero*, *Caroldo*, M 2563, M 46.

⁹⁵ *Donà*, *Veniera* 791, *Trevisan*, M 793, *Veniera* 2580; even more assertive in this respect are *Navagero* and *Erizzo*, who consider the sending of an Ambassador to Constantinople to have been imperative. Moreover, the same *Navagero* believes that the sending of Giustiniano was strictly a decision of the High Council!

⁹⁶ They are only missing in A. *Dandolo-estenssa*, *Monacis*, A. *Dandolo-brevis*, M 1833, *Barbaro* and *Savina*.

⁹⁷ Categories 4 and 5, *Trevisan*, M 793, *Contarini*, Category 10, M 2543 (where the term “*doni*” becomes “*done*”, from where the amusing situation of the Emperor placing at the service of Giustiniano “many grand ladies”, an error undoubtedly attributable to the copier), M 1577, *Erizzo*, M 798, M 2560, M 80, M 628a, *Veniera* 2580.

⁹⁸ The Emperor’s praise sometimes targets Giustiniano’s father: M 67, M 2550, M 2559, M 39, *Erizzo*, whereas M 2560 mentions the “reverence” showed by the Emperor to Agnello.

⁹⁹ *Navagero*, M 1577, *Erizzo*, M 798, M 80, M 628a.

¹⁰⁰ M 798, M 80, M 628a.

¹⁰¹ This detail can only be found in *Diacono*, Category 1, A. *Dandolo-estenssa*, *Monacis*, A. *Dandolo-brevis*, *Caroldo*, *Sanudo*, *Sansovino* ‘i *Zancaruolo*. Among these, Category 1, A. *Dandolo-estenssa*, *Monacis*, *Sanudo* and *Zancaruolo* further add an explanation of the synonymy between the titles of *ipatos* and of Imperial Consul. On the other hand, *Caroldo* believes that the Ambassador was “invested with the title of *ipatos*, which makes him consort in the dogate”, thus getting involved in the subsequent dispute among the two brothers over the position of consort.

namely that of some negotiations of commercial nature¹⁰² and, the success of the mission is pointed out, Giustiniano Partecipazio being noted to have achieved all his objectives¹⁰³. The chronicles belonging to Category 9 (Tiepolo, Agostini, and M 77) vaguely mention as a reason “negotiations on some matters”, leading eventually to “infinite and ample privileges”, without making it clear if these were commercial privileges or of other nature. Other chronicles have a different approach, less commending, and advancing the hypothesis – unlike other writings – of some dependency of Venice in relation to Constantinople. Thus, the chronicle M 1833 believes that Giustiniano was sent to Constantinople in order to get an “education”, Barbaro – “so that he may learn at that court the proper ways, and get instructed into the matters of the world”, this latter reason being also put forward in the Savina chronicle. Moreover, several chroniclers place the embassy of Giustiniano Partecipazio in direct relation with the acquisition of St. Zachary’s relics and of other religious objects¹⁰⁴.

As a matter of fact, the writings speaking of trading relations exaggerate the facts, by transposing a situation to occur subsequently – in which Venice would negotiate with Byzantium from equal stands – into the first part of the ninth century, when the Venetian community was still dependent on Constantinople, and when the Doges continued to regard the Eastern Empire as a factor liable to secure legitimacy.

Giustiniano Partecipazio’s embassy occurred on the backdrop of the ideological rather than military tension between Byzantium and the Carolingian Empire. The accession to office of Agnello Partecipazio had been in fact a prestigious victory of the Eastern Empire, the Doge being a partisan of Byzantium. However, the embassy of Giustiniano Partecipazio was undertaken shortly after a compromise had been reached, with the emissaries of Michael I acknowledging to Charles the Great his imperial title, in April 812.

In points of internal history of the Venetian community, this episode had as a first consequence the fact that Giustiniano, visibly upset about the fact that, during his absence, his father had appointed Giovanni Partecipazio, his brother, consort (and implicitly, successor), would withdraw from the dogal court, together with his wife, Felicità; as a result, his father would send Giovanni away, first to Zara and subsequently to Constantinople again, and would place Giustiniano in his stead, appointing consort Giustiniano’s son Agnello¹⁰⁵.

On the backdrop of Agnello Partecipazio’s reign, this episode is dimmed by another event, namely the relocation of the holy relics of St. Zachary¹⁰⁶, the father of St. John the Baptist, from Constantinople to Venice¹⁰⁷. Starting from the erroneous dating of the embassy to Constantinople, Tafel and Thomas went as far as placing the acquisition of these holy relics at a date prior to the mission

¹⁰² P. Dolfin, E. Dandolo, pseudo-Dolfin, Donà, Veniera 791, Trevisan, M 793, Tiepolo, Agostini, M 77, Veniera 2580.

¹⁰³ M 2543 adds to the chronicles mentioned in the previous note.

¹⁰⁴ Category 6, Savina.

¹⁰⁵ For all these, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 10b.

¹⁰⁶ This latter episode is somehow shadowed by another episode, to which a similar approach is given, more exactly the acquisition of the St. Mark’s relics, an event to occur shortly after.

¹⁰⁷ I shall not dwell any further on the fact that Emperor Leon V was an iconoclast, at least after the decisions taken at the synod summoned in Constantinople in April 815 by himself!

undertaken by Giustiniano¹⁰⁸, although all the chronicles that mention this latter episode place it at a date subsequent to the embassy to Constantinople¹⁰⁹.

Giustiniano Partecipazio himself was looked upon by a number of specialists from a different perspective, more exactly in connection to the Marcian episode, that is the relocation of St. Mark's relics, an event which took place at a later date, when, after the death of his father, Giustiniano became the only leader of the Venetian State. This point of view is substantiated by the chronicles¹¹⁰, and especially by the secondary literature, in which case the researchers who addressed the history of Venice or that of the relations between Venice and Constantinople were more tempted to consider the position of inferiority of Venice in relation to the Byzantine State, or the internal relations of the Venetian community, rather than point out to the primordial nature of this Venetian-Byzantine diplomatic contact; moreover, in other instances, even if other events occurred during the dogate of Agnello Partecipazio are mentioned, the episode of the embassy to Constantinople is disregarded¹¹¹.

Although extremely short (827-829), the reign of Giustiniano Partecipazio as a sole Doge¹¹² would record, beside the Marcian episode which was a major event in the history of Venice, other events, such as the anti-Saracen campaign led along the Byzantine¹¹³ or the rehabilitation of his brother Giovanni¹¹⁴.

The title of *ipatos* secured during the embassy to Constantinople would be highly regarded by Doge Giustiniano Partecipazio, and would be quoted even

¹⁰⁸ *Urkunden*, doc. I, pp. 1-3 (dated 814-820). Reference is specifically made to the major chronicle of A. Dandolo. For a different dating of the event: 814-815, E. Pastorello, in A. Dandolo-*extensa* (together with the episode of the embassy); 817-820, T. C. Lounghis, *Les ambassades byzantines en Occident depuis la fondation des Etats barbares jusqu'aux Croisades (407-1096)*, Athens, 1980, p. 473, again with reference to A. Dandolo; 819, Sabellico's editor, p. 44; and D. M. Nicol, *op. cit.*, p. 39. On other occasions, the episode is mentioned to have taken place in the time of Emperor Leon the Armenian, see for instance S. Romanin, *op. cit.*, p. 162; J. J. Norwich, *op. cit.* p. 27.

¹⁰⁹ *Giustinian*, p. 34; *M 2571*, f. 21b; *M 2581*, f. 14a; A. Dandolo-*extensa*, p. 142-143; *Monacis*, pp. 34-35; *P. Dolfin*, f. 150b; *Sabellico*, p. 44; *Trevisan*, f. 12a, col. 2; *M 2544*, f. 29a, col. 2, *M 2579*, f. x b; *M 47*, f. 18b, col. 1; *M 2028*, f. 6a; *Caroldo*, f. 10b; *Sanudo*, p. 451-452; *Agostini*, f. 6b; *M 77*, f. 13; *M 2543*, f. 8a; *Zancaruolo*, f. cxxxiiiij a; *Savina*, f. 13b (in this case, the acquisition of the holy relics is considered to have been made during the embassy of G. Partecipazio).

¹¹⁰ See for instance *Canal*, where a detailed description is made of the Marcian episode, pp. 16-23, whereas the episode of his embassy to Constantinople is completely disregarded.

¹¹¹ See for instance Augusto Fr. Gfrörer, *Storia di Venezia dalla sua fondazione fino all'anno 1084*, translated by Pietro Pinton, excerpt from "Archivio Veneto", 12-16 (1876-1878), Venezia, 1878, p. 89 ff. for the dogate of Agnello Partecipazio; Eugenio Musatti, *Storia di Venezia*, third edition, Milano, 1936, pp. 21-22 for the dogate of A. Partecipazio.

¹¹² Thus excluding the period in which he was Doge-consort and reigned together with his father.

¹¹³ The reflection of this episode in the Venetian chronicles will be among the objects of my future research work.

¹¹⁴ Having no direct heirs [Agnello the Young, previously appointed consort, is mentioned by Diacono, p. 107, to have died during his legation at Constantinople, a fact confirmed in the will of Giustiniano, which also notes, "*Romana, nurus mea, ab eo anno, quo vidua remansit*", cf. *Documenti*, doc. 53, pp. 93-99 (97)], Giustiniano would be succeeded by Giovanni (829-836). For the reign of Giustiniano, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 11a; for the reign of Giovanni, cf. *ibidem*, ff. 11a-12a.

before the dogal title, at the establishment of the San Zaccaria Monastery¹¹⁵, and on two other occasions, in his will¹¹⁶.

The mission to Constantinople undertaken by Giustiniano Partecipazio opened the way to series of practices of the Venetian Doges of the ninth and tenth centuries, namely that of sending their sons (and implicitly, successors to the dogate) to the Byzantine capital¹¹⁷, on other occasions the Doges themselves receiving titles or gifts from the Byzantine Emperors¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁵ *Urkunden*, doc. I, pp. 1-3 (2) (“*ego Justinianus, imperialis Hypatus et Venetiarum Dux*”); *Documenti*, doc. 52, pp. 92-93 (92) (“*ego Iustinianus, imperialis hypatus et Venetiae dux*”).

¹¹⁶ *Documenti*, doc. 53, pp. 93-99 (93: “*ego quidem Justinianus, imperialis hipatus et dux Venetiarum provincie*” and 99: “*ego Justinianus, imperialis ipatus et humilis dux provincie Veneciaru[m]*”).

¹¹⁷ The same Agnello and Giustiniano Partecipazio (sending over Agnello, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 10b: “*Gli Eccelsi Duci mandorono messer Angelo loro consorte all’Imperatore di Constantinopoli*”); *Urkunden*, doc. IV, p. 4, dated 821, with specific reference to the chronicle of A. *Dandolo-extensa*; Orso Partecipazio (Doge, 912-931 sending over his son Pietro, the future Doge – 939-942, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 15b: “*Egli, per gratificarsi il Greco Imperatore, subito fatto Duce, mandò a Constantinopoli Messer Pietro suo figliuolo, il quale [fu] onorevolmente ricevuto et dall’Imperiale munificenza fù fatto Prothospatario et suo Consigliero; espedito da quella Maestà et havuti pretiosi doni, venne a ripatriare*”; *Urkunden*, doc. VIII, p. 5, dated 912, with reference to A. *Dandolo-extensa*); Pietro II Candiano (Doge, 932-939, sending over his son Pietro, the future Doge – 942-959, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 16a: “*Mandò suo figliuolo a Constantinopoli, secondo il consueto, il quale de quella Imperial Maestà ottene la dignità di Prothospatario et la confirmatione di privilegij; et dopò, con molti pretiosi doni che gli diede / l’Imperatore, venne a ripatriare*”; *Urkunden*, doc. IX, p. 5, dated 932, with reference to A. *Dandolo-extensa*); Tribuno Memo (Doge, 979-991, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 20b: “*Nel XIII anno del Ducato suo, mandò Mauritio suo figliuolo a Basilio et Constantino Constantinopolitani Imperatori, per farsi a loro grato; [...]*”); Pietro II Orseolo (Doge, 991-1008, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 21b: “*Il Duce, richieso da Basilio et Constantino Imperatori, a Constantinopoli mandò suo figliuolo, il qual, da loro molto honorato, ritornò alla Patria con non piccioli doni.*”; *Urkunden*, doc. XVII, pp. 36-39, dated 991); also during Pietro II Orseolo (cf. *Caroldo*, f. 24b: “*Dopò, destinò Giovanni consorte et Otho figliuoli suoi a Basilio et Constantino Imperatori Greci, dalli quali furono amorevolmente et con molto honore ricevuti. A Giovanni Orseolo Duce diedero per moglie Maria loro nepote figliuola di loro sorella et di Larnopulo uomo nobile et pregiato, con dote conveniente; et dal Patriarcha nell’Imperial Capella furono fatte le sponsa di cerimonie; dopò, ebbero in dono dall’Imperatori due corone bellissime. Finite le nozze, Giovanni voleva con la consorte ripatriare; ma, a prieghi di Basilio, convenne aspettare il ritorno suo dall’espeditone che all’hora era per fare contro Bulgari. Tornato in Constantinopoli, diede a Giovanni il titolo di Patricio et concesse alla nepote il corpo di Santa Barbaram così da lei instantemente pregato; et egli poi, con la moglie et Otho suo fratello, ritornò alla patria; ove giunti, furono gratamente veduti dal padre et popolo Veneto; et poco dopo, la moglie parturi un figliuolo che volse fusse nominato Basilio.*”; *Urkunden*, doc. XVIII, p. 40, dated 997, with reference to A. *Dandolo-extensa* and doc. XX, pp. 40-41, dated 1004, with reference to A. *Dandolo-extensa*).

¹¹⁸ Giovanni Partecipazio, the brother of Giustiniano (Doge, 829-839, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 11b: “*L’Imperatore di Constantinopoli, volendo riconoscer l’inclito Ioanni Badoaro Duce, per l’aiuto contro Saraceni ch’infestavano l’isola di Sicilia, gli mandò in dono la Cadrega di San Pietro in marmo, [...]*”); Pietro Tradonigo (Doge, 836-863, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 12a: “*In questi giorni, Theodosio Patricio venne a Venetia et, per nome, dell’Imperatore, fece il Duce Spataro dell’Imperio, [...]*”); *Urkunden*, doc. VI, p. 4, dated 840, with reference to A. *Dandolo-extensa*); Pietro Tribuno (Doge, 888-912, cf. *Caroldo*, f. 15b: “*Costui, per la bonta sua et nobilta, fù fatto dal Greco Imperatore Prothospatario*”).