

# Internal Structure and Lexis of Inventories in the Fonds *Magnifica communitas Iadre* from the 14th century

Linda Mijić

Department of Classical Philology  
University of Zadar

lmijic@unizd.hr

## ABSTRACT

The inventories of goods of city inhabitants are a priceless source for the research of everyday life in medieval Dalmatian communes. The aim of this paper is a diplomatic and lexical analysis of Zadar's published inventory of goods from the fonds *Magnifica communitas Iadre* from the State archives in Zadar, in order to determine the characteristics of this type of document as a special kind of historical source as well as the characteristics of the Latin language that was used in Zadar in the 14th century. Most of the inventories were composed in Latin "office" language, as influenced by a Venetian administration and, occasionally, local Roman idioms, together with a few words of Croatian origin. Because of the nature of the files, there is a more evident influence of vulgar idioms, offering a fuller linguistic picture that is closer to the actual linguistic situation in the city of Zadar in the 14th century.

*Keywords: inventory of goods, Middle Ages, Zadar, Medieval Latin*

## 1. Introduction. Inventories as a historical source

For research of the material culture and various aspects of everyday life within medieval Dalmatian communes, one of the most rewarding types of sources are the inventories of goods. Inventories are private legal documents in which the notary brings a precise list of all movable and immovable property of deceased inhabitants of a commune or district, usually with their monetary value. These special types of legal documents appear at the beginning of the 14th century along the eastern Adriatic and in almost all of the developed communes. The oldest preserved inventory dates back to 1325, but it is evident that the practice of writing inventories started earlier (Leljak 2006, 10).

In the archives of the Dalmatian cities there are a significant number of preserved medieval inventories. While in other archives the documents are scattered among various notary documents, in Zadar's archival holdings, along with individual inventories in notary files, there is also a special fonds called *Magnifica communitas Iadre*, or, in Italian, *Magnifica comunità di Zara* (Magnificent commune of Zadar), with the signature HR-DAZD-19. *Općina Zadar* (12. c.–1797.). In previous works of Croatian researches, the common name was *Veličajna općina zadarska*, but the fonds in the new online Guide of the State Archives in Zadar [1] has a new name *Inventari zadarskih građana (Inventories of Zadar citizens) 1325–1674*. The material of the fonds is distributed into two boxes: the first box includes 94 inventories from 1325 to 1397, and

the second box contains 58 inventories from 1400 to 1674. As supplements, there are *procurae* from 1642, one volume of legal cases and verdicts from 1597 – 1651, a group of testaments from 1346 – 1694 and one volume of various documents from between 1545 and 1592.

It can be assumed that the creator of the fonds is the Community of Zadar; that is, that the fonds was created automatically as a legal requirement after the death of every citizen and was kept in the Zadar Community.

However, inventories can be found in the files of various notaries. It is difficult to conclude without reservation why some inventories were left with other notarial documents (for example, the inventory of *Grisogonus de Cioalelis* (Stipišić 1977)) and others finished ended up in different fonds (for example, the inventory of *Michovillus draparius condam Petri* from 1385 (Stipišić 2000) which was preserved in the archives of the monastery of Saint Marija in Zadar [2]). Stipišić (1977, 375) concludes that the inventories of this fonds were collected from the files of a notary who compiled them. Analyzing the two mentioned published inventories that do not belong to the fonds, it is interesting to see that neither one contains a certificate from the procurator about presenting the inventory and receiving it for storage in *procuria*. From this, we can conclude that the fonds was a unity from the beginning and that inventories outside of the fonds were only sketches or were assembled as part of a different legal act. However, by examining the original manuscript of the inventory of *Grisogonus de Cioalelis*, we find that the last piece of paper contains confirmation from the procurator recorded in another handwriting, which (along with the last sentence of the inventory) Stipišić, for unknown reasons, did not re-write.

Therefore, the open question that remains is whether the fonds is the rest of the whole that is preserved in the archives of the Zadar community or if the fonds was artificially created by an old archivist who took inventories from certain notary offices. If this is the case, it would not be the only example of wrong archival interventions that can be found in the archives. This collecting of files in a single unit might date back to a much earlier date, when we know that the oldest notaries in city offices can be considered the founders of the archives in certain Dalmatian cities. Taking care of the storage of documents took place in Zadar from the earliest times and this is confirmed by the fact that the earliest mention of the word *archive* in the Croatian region was recorded in Zadar in 1390 (*archivium communis Iadre*) (Dokoza 2006, 215). Zadar was the most developed urban center in Dalmatia and because of that it had to produce a large number of notary charters, although the Statute of Zadar does not explicitly state the provisions of such institutions. Maybe both items can reconcile the assumption that there was a core fonds (the rest of the municipal archives, named *Magnifica communitas Iadre*), to which they subsequently added inventory found in the notarial files; but, there is no evidence for a final conclusion. As a comparison, in Split (in which statutory provisions on the compiling of inventory are not as strict as in the Statute of Zadar) inventories were kept in ordinary notary registers, together with other documents. It was only in 1435 or 1436 that the notary *Dominicus de Manfredis* began to keep a separate register in which he filed only testaments and inventories (Ančić 2005, 102).

Whatever the history of this fonds, its extent was certainly far greater than what was preserved. This can be concluded from the fact that, for every deceased inhabitant who died in adulthood, regardless of his properties and based on the statutory provisions, an inventory had

to be compiled. Hilje (2000, 66) compared the number of preserved inventories from the 14th and 15th centuries to the anticipated number of deaths during this period, considering the estimated population of the city (six to seven thousand) [3] and the assumed age, and he came to the conclusion that the preserved inventories represent about 0.5% of the total. [4]

## 2. History, research and publishing of inventories

These types of documents, until recently, have been completely neglected, even though Jireček (1903, 157-158) warned about the treasures kept in Zadar when he partially transcribed the inventory of a Zadar merchant *Damianus* from 1389 which, among other things, mentioned the Croatian version of the book "*Rumanac trojski*". In the edition *Miscellanea*, published by the Zadar archive from 1949 – 1952, three inventories were published: the inventory of *Žuvica*, cousin of *Federicus de Grisogonis* from 1370 (1952, 16-17); the inventory of Zadar's goldsmith Pribislava from 1391 (1952, 20-25); and, the inventory of *Iohannes de Ciprianis* from Zadar from the year 1528 (1952, 54-63).

Stipišić (1977) published the inventory of goods of Zadar's patrician *Grisogonus de Civaellis* from 1384 and the inventory of goods of Michovillus *draparius condam Petri* from 1385, the largest and richest inventory found on our coast, which was compiled for a wealthy textile and salt merchant from a Zadar family of Croatian origin (Stipišić 2000). This document consists of 134 sheets, written on both sides, reflecting the structure of the inventory of wealthy citizens: the first part consists of the list of goods and the second part contains 670 *regesta* of documents from the family archive. From this document we can draw an abundance of information about the economic, social and cultural life within the Zadar commune: for example, a significant fact is that, among other things, this is the first time on Croatian territory that Dante's *Divine Comedy* and a chessboard and figures are mentioned.

In recent times Croatian medieval historians used inventories as a data source while researching particular segments of the material aspects of medieval life (Hilje 1996; 2000; 2007; Kovačević 2010; Anzulović 2006, 2007; Čoralčić 2001) or everyday life in general (Homa 2004; Budeč 2006; 2009; 2010; Ančić 2005). Fabijanec (2003), exploring the activity of merchants, was able to show economic changes in the 14th century based on two inventories composed in different time periods (one from the time of the siege of Zadar in 1346 and the second from the end of the 14th century). Within this work are two transcripts (the inventory of *Fumiça Salvagnele* from 1346 and the inventory of *Damianus condam Martini de Treschiano*) and a dictionary of less known words (clothing, footwear, fabrics, foods and similar items).

The need for systematic publication of this type of document was stressed by Stipišić (1977, 379), and work on this project has only recently begun. Leljak's transcript of *Inventari fonda Veličajne općine zadarske Državnog arhiva u Zadru god. 1325–1385*. (Leljak 2006) begins a new series of sources called Zadar inventories and testaments (*Inventaria et testamenta Iadrensia*). It includes transcripts of 60 inventories from the year 1325 to 1385 and the corpus is researched in this paper.

As for exploring the medieval Latinity in the Croatian region, researchers mainly focused on the "more interesting" narrative works (Perić 1980; 1980-81; 1982; 1984; 1991; 2004; Butić 2007) [5]; while, in the field of notary language, attention was drawn to the language of Croatian royal documents (Bralić 2009) or cartulary (Skok 1953; Leljak 1999) [6]. In addition to the

aforementioned, the language of Dalmatian notaries is only mentioned in review of introductions of critical editions of historical sources.

The language corpus of these inventories is an important monument of Croatian medieval Latinity, but it was not subject to philological research. The text of these inventories is not included in the corpus of published *Lexicon latinitatis medii aevi Iugoslaviae*; and, to researchers, the misunderstanding of the glossary, used by individual Dalmatian notaries during that period, is a large impediment (Budeč, 2006).

### 3. Legal basis of inventory

The manner of compilation and form of inventories was prescribed by the Statute of Zadar in the third book in section 121 (Kolanović & Križman 1997, 362). The testator should appoint, in his testament, two or more executors (*comissarii* or *fideicommissarii*) to secure the fulfillment of all the provisions of the testament, especially considering the legacies. The most common appointed executors were relatives or close friends. The compilation of inventories was considered civil duty and if the executor refused that duty he was looked upon „*tamquam conspectus*“. Every person, regardless of gender [7] and social status with 20 years of age could be appointed as an executor, but only those who were subject to the jurisdiction of the duke could undergo the legal process in matters of those responsibilities (*commissaria*).

If the deceased did not leave a testament, the executor would be appointed by the judicial court. Executors would have to, within 15 days of the testator's death or from the day that they found out that they have been appointed, thoroughly examine all of the deceased's immovable and movable assets and begin assembling the inventory, in person or through the procurator (Kolanović & Križman 1997, 365). [8] The compilation starts at least 15 days from the date of death, recorded in front of the duke and a judicial court by drawing a cross; afterwards, a precise list of properties is compiled, with the measures and exact positions of movable assets, plus any accounting books and notary documents of property ownership, debts or payment of debt, claims from others, etc. Within 60 days the inventory must be taken by the executors to the duke and judicial court, where it is then forwarded to storage „*in procuria communis Iadre*“, that is, to the office of the representative of the Zadar community. By presenting the inventory to the *Curia* and archiving it, the inventory then became legally valid.

If the executors did not complete all that was required within the prescribed time, they would have to leave to the successors their portion that would have belonged to them according to the testament, and would be denied the honor of becoming an executor in the future. If the heir does not make the inventory, or if he does not individually write all the goods that go to him after the deceased's death, as punishment he must assume all debt and claims of the deceased, even if the heritage is not enough to cover those costs (Kolanović & Križman 1997, 386).

Praga (1927, 49–52) describes the circumstances in which inventories were compiled in Split and the technique used for preparation of the same, as well as the ways that the inventories were entered into the register of notaries in the Split offices. The first version of the inventory and the testament would be independently developed and written in the vulgar language. [9] The original would then be presented to the office and the notary would rewrite it in Latin and throw out the original document. Thanks to *Petrus de Serçana*, the careless notary

who did not regularly rewrite the entrusted lists, the original documents were left behind, which helped us confirm this procedure. The same *Petrus de Serçana* worked in Zadar as well as in Split so there is no reason not to assume that in Zadar, at least in some cases, the notaries did not physically list the goods but instead they copied and translated the inventories in Latin or adapted the report of the executor to the Latin language.

#### **4. Distribution of inventories per years and status of the deceased**

The corpus of the 60 inventories that were researched in this paper was composed over a period of 60 years. The inventories are not evenly distributed, however: some years were not preserved, while most of the preserved ones came from 1370 and 1383.

Also, there should be as many inventories as there are testaments, but the discrepancy is evident. For the same time period, from 1325 to 1385, Ladić (2012, 367–394.) recorded 639 testators who either are mentioned as testators (in published and unpublished sources) or have had their actual testaments saved. It is important to know that the names of many of the testators were not preserved and that some citizens died before they were able to put together a testament. On the other hand, in published sources, there are no testaments of the deceased which can relate to the inventories. In unpublished sources, preserved in the records of the notary *Raymundus de Modiis* (box I, volume 3/1, pages 8'-9), we find the testament of *Nikolota de Bastaso*, whose inventory is no. 60 [10] (Leljak 2006, 360); and, partially preserved in the records of *Petrus Perençanus de Lemicetis* from Padova (box IV, volume 17(4), pages 5'-6), we have the testament of *Petrus*, named *Turchus* (whose inventory is no. 44). [11]

The inventories represent different classes of people, with various occupations and from both sexes. Of the total number of deceased, 25 were female, and 35 were male. Twenty-three of them were nobles, thirty-two of them were members of lower social classes, two of them were foreigners and one of them was a churchman; for the others, we cannot be certain of their class due to the lack of information in the name formula. The deceased, whose inventories were compiled in the first half of the 14th century, were mainly nobles (in comparison 13:3); and, in the 2nd half of the century, the deceased were mostly members of lower social classes, with various occupations, for example: laborers, maids, sailors, fishermen, shipwrights, shoemakers, bakers, artists, restaurant/bar keepers, etc. (in comparison 29:12).

#### **5. Basic paleographic and diplomatic analysis**

Each document has its own external and internal characteristics. External characteristics include letter, material, ink, seals and various signs, whereas internal characteristics are structure of the document, language and style (Stipišić 1985, 150).

##### **5. 1. Material, shape and dimensions of manuscript**

The documents, whose text comprises the corpus of this work, were written on 338 sheets of paper which have been partly damaged due to moisture and time; and, some are completely illegible. Some papers are completely empty, and some pages have not been used entirely, leaving space for later interpolation. Writing is on both sides (*recto & verso*) and, subsequently, by archival intervention, foliation was implemented. It should be noted that on the covers of some of the inventories there are two numbers listed because, during the first foliation (written in pencil), lapses took place in the chronology; and, in recent times, another number was added

according to the time that the document was formed (written in red pen). Most of the inventories were written on the standard paper of the time, [12] with width dimensions of 215 to 230 mm, and height, 280 to 315 mm. Only three inventories have different dimensions: inventory no. 3, which was written on one 303x395 mm sheet; no. 5, written on a sheet with dimensions of 330x290 mm, divided into three columns; and no. 13, shaped like a narrow booklet measuring 110x300 mm.

The sheets of paper do not have the same number of rows. Although in most cases the space was used rationally with small handwriting fitting in about 48 rows (e.g. 1,1.) [13] there are some pages with only 21 rows (e.g. 8,11'). The text is mostly written in a single column. A few inventories have the introduction written in one column, and the list of goods written in two columns (inventories no. 4, 16, 26 and 48) [14]; the first inventory has two columns, and the aforementioned no. 13 inventory has three columns. The margins are also different: some of the documents do not even have margins (for example: inv. 1, 28), or they have margins for the introduction but not for the list of goods (for example: inv. 50). There are a greater number, though, which were carefully composed, so that all sides have margins of 50 - sometimes 60 - mm (e.g. inv. 23).

The length of the inventory is determined by the social status of the deceased; that is, the amount of his legacy and the diverse content will depend on the origin, profession, inheritance and private interests of the deceased, as well as other circumstances. When the deceased was a fisherman, laborer, or another poor citizen, the inventory was sparse and short, sometimes consisting of only one sheet of paper. However, the richer citizens, whether they were patricians or wealthy commoners, had abundant, long and accurate lists and descriptions and provided a wealth of data from which we can conclude how the medieval man lived, what he was surrounded by, what he read, etc. The majority of the inventories consist of 2 sheets of paper; however, the largest inventory, inventory no. 11, has 34 sheets.

All inventories (with the exceptions of: 1, 3, 25 and 52) have preserved filigrane signs (trademarks from the workshops that produced the paper). These signs were used to conclude an approximate date of the documents when there was no other data or authentication. Since it is not necessary to determine neither the date nor the authenticity, because it is an autograph, we will simply mention the fact that the filigrane appears in the documents, as was the usual for a printing factory at that time.

## **5. 2. Letter**

Inventories were written in cursive Gothic, which was characteristic of notary offices in Dalmatian communes during that time. There are some inventories where the whole document was written in the same hand, but usually one document had three (or at least two) different handwritings. When added up, taking into account that some handwriting is repeated, the outcome is a total of one hundred different types of handwriting; therefore, it would be overwhelming to describe the morphology of the letters of each document. A brief summary shows us that the morphology does not deviate from the patterns of notary offices during that time period, a main characteristic being the cursive Gothic with a large number of abbreviations and ligatures.

## **5. 3. Medieval notarial forms**

Favorable socio-political conditions that favored the economic life of the Zadar commune caused the high level of development of the notary institutions during the 14th century (with a shorter standstill mid-century due to the outbreak of the uprising in 1345, until the Zadar peace treaty in 1358). The professionalization of the institution of notarial service is reflected in the titles that notaries acquired by educating themselves at contemporary universities, first of all in Bologna and Padua. Notaries used the collection of forms to help them compose the text of a document and at the same time guarantee the legal validity of the formal side (Stipišić 1985, 164; Grbavac 2006b, 394).

Around 1251 the famous professor from Bologna, Salathiel, put together the form *Ars notariae* which was very popular even if it weighed towards ornate forms and excessive theorizing. The fourth book provides examples of the preparation of various types of documents. For the inventories Salathiel prescribed a tripartite structure of the inventory: 1) *proemium*, which contains the circumstances of comprising the inventory and order of the municipal government to start compiling the inventory; 2) *confessio bonorum*, which contains the list of assets, 3) and *publicatio bonorum inventarii*, that is, the verification of communal services (Grbavac 2010, 89) [15].

Salathiel's formula was displaced from service around 1255 by the professor from Bologna, *Rolandinus Passagerii*, when he comprised the form *Summa artis notariae*, which, due to its simplicity and practicality, was considered the best and was used for the longest time. His oldest manuscript from 1275 is saved in the Metropolitan library in Zagreb, but has not yet been published in this new era (Stipišić 1985, 165; Grbavac 2010, 79). In the seventh chapter, subtitled *Instrumentum inuentarii confectum a tutore* he speaks about inventories. He does not mention the verification of communal procurators but instead he lists that the inventory consists of two parts (and the third is optional): *Primum est proemium. Secundum descriptionis bonorum. Tercium addi potest, scilicet replicationis* (Rolandinus Pasagerii, 1565, 465). He then describes in detail what should be entered into each section, stressing the fact that the symbol of the cross must be drawn by each of the decedent's heirs. [16]

#### 5. 4. Internal structure of the inventory

Notaries who compiled inventories of the *Magnifica communitas Iadre* fonds adhered to the guidelines of the forms, but, since they (other than the tripartite structure) were not strict, there are evident differences in the structures. The differences are due to the different legal circumstances at the time of the inventory.

In the introduction, after the symbolic invocation (symbol of the cross), comes the verbal invocation with the formula *Amen*. In most cases the following is written: *In Christi nomine*; however, there are cases when it was written *In nomine Dei* (11. inv.) and *In nomine Domini* (13. inv.), and inventory no 14th contains only the symbolic invocation. Invocation is followed by the dating. All the documents are dated in the style of incarnation which was dominant for Zadar notaries during that time. [17] It is the same with the dating of the *regesta* which are referenced in the inventories. There are also errors which probably occurred during the copying of information, and they usually relate to the number of *indictio* [18]. Incorrect *indictio* were found in the following inventories: 18,5'; 34,6'; 40,4'; 45,3; 46,3'; 46,4 (Leljak, 2006,167; 268; 290; 308; 317; 318).

Subsequently, comes the citation of the authority: first the supreme authority (doge or Croatian-Hungarian king), followed by the citation of the local church authorities (name of the archbishop) and the local secular authorities (name of the duke or city rector), for example: *Regnante serenissimo principe domino nostro naturali domino Lodoico, Dei gratia rege Ungarie, et tempore reuerendi patris domini fratris Dominici, Iadrensis archiepiscopi, ac magnifici et potentis viri domini Simonis Mauricii, regnorum Dalmacie et Crouacie generalis bani et comitis ciuitatis Iadre, ac dominorum Nicolai de Uitor, Iohanne (!) de Varicassis et Francisco (!) de Zadulinis, honorabilibus rectoribus (!) Iadre.* (7,1)

The name of the deceased is given using the form *Hoc est inventarium...* followed by the names of his executors, and it is stated whether the executors were chosen by bequest or if they were chosen by a specific court decision. This is followed by the motives and circumstances for which the inventory was comprised. Most often they refer to the provisions of the Statute of Zadar when speaking about the compilation of the inventory - whether they just mention it, or (which is very common) they site the opening words of the chapter *Ad hoc ut repellatur et cetera*. [19] In inventory no. 14, 17, 29 and 34 it was indicated that the legal act has been completed *in termino et ante terminum quindecim dierum*, as prescribed by the Statute. Most often the statement of the testamentary executor is cited here, indicating that the inventory will include all of what they know; that they are willing, if they find more out at a later time, to supplement the inventory; and whether they failed to state something *eis et alteri eorum non debent aliquod preiudicium generari*. Sometimes, however, this citation appears at the end of the list of goods, just before the confirmation of the procurator.

Notaries that wrote the introduction (or even the entire inventory) rarely mentioned their own names [20], and never wrote their notary signs; but, it seems as if, according to what can be correlated, that the notary who compiled the testament was usually the same person who wrote the introduction to the inventory. Some notaries can be recognized by comparing their handwriting to the handwriting in the preserved registers (for example *Petrus de Serçana, Petrus Perençanus de Lemicetis de Padova, Vannes condam Bernardi de Firmo, Iohannes de Casulis, Raymundus de Modiis*).

The notary usually concluded the introduction with the word *Imprimis* and from that point he left the executors to list the assets, and this is where the handwriting would most frequently change. But there are plenty of inventories (especially if the executors were women, but that was not a rule) where the list of goods was written by the same person.

The list of assets were formulated in a specific order: first, immovable property, followed by movable property (furniture, bedding, clothing, jewelry, tools, weapons, household items, and dishes) and, finally, any documents. In richer inventories, the arrangement was generally respected but had very diverse variants. In the inventory of the fisherman *Pribissus* (no. 23), after the dating of the notary *Laurencius*, the whole dating is repeated in a different handwriting and after the introduction the list starts. In the inventory of a shipwright's wife *Buda* there is only one document about a dowry and two broken silver glasses (no. 58). Some lists contain only *regesta* of the documents, for example the inventory of *Dobra*, the wife of *Maçolus de Ciprianis* (no. 35). In the inventory of the jeweler's wife *Dobra* (no. 38) there are only two, and in the inventory of *Gruba*, the wife of the merchant *Crisanus* (no. 53), there are three documents. From the fact that the women's inventories were so meager and the inventories of men were

very different, we can confirm that women in the Middle Ages, with the exception of their dowry, often did not own anything, not even their own clothes. Instead, everything was entirely their husband's property and was used to promote himself and his family (Fabijanec 2013, 10).

Some inventories appear as though they've been truncated; for example, in inventory no. 59, after an abundant introduction there is only one sentence and then the confirmation of the municipal procurator. Likewise for the inventory of *Petrus* named *Turchus* (inventory no. 44) which contains nothing other than the introduction and it is hard to conclude why it was never completed (the paper is not damaged, there is only an empty sheet). It is possible that there was a piece of paper attached and it fell off, but there is no evidence for this. Such is the case with the inventory of *Iacouica*, wife of *Nicolaus* (no. 33): after the procurator certified the document, a supplement was added because her husband and bequest executors learned that there was an older testament from his deceased wife; after the supplement was added, the procurator would then certify the document again.

The last part of the inventory is the confirmation of the community that the inventory itself has been presented. This part usually consists of the date and a statement that the executors presented the inventory in front of the city rector and that it was accepted into the *Curia*. The first inventory from 1325 states *Ego Paulus recepi cum cruce*. Older inventories indicate that the inventory was submitted to *nobis procuratoribus* without names or *presentatum fuit curie*, and only in 1340 did the name of the communal procurator start to record in the form of *ego... recepi hoc inventarium*. Inventories from the second half of the century started regularly containing the names of the procurators [21], in the form of *ego... procurator comunis Iadre recepi* or *datum michi / presentatum michi... procuratori comunis Iadre*.

In the Statute of Zadar, there is no mention of the communal procurators so we do not know what their responsibilities were or what authority they had. Nor do we know how long their service lasted, but based on the formula *ad vitam / in vitam* we can conclude that some of the procurators were appointed for life. Interestingly, that formula was recorded from 1377 to 1380 and only for two procurators (*Micha de Nassis* and *Bartholomeus de Cipriano* [22]) with no indications of their names in subsequent inventories. Due to the fact that, along with them, other procurators were mentioned during that time (for example *Petrus de Lubauç* and *ser Mazolus* [23] *de Fanfogna*), and some were mentioned more than once, we can conclude that, while a few procurators did work at the same time, they did not all have the same status. The fact that procurators (for life) did not personally write the confirmations, because their colleagues would write them, can be confirmed through this interesting example: the procurator *Miha de Nassis* (found in inventories where he is mentioned in an objective, 3rd person manner), writing in Latin, confirms in inventory no. 40 that the inventory was presented with *coram ...et me Miche de [Nassis], procuratore comunis Iadre in vita*; while, in inventory no. 53, the confirmation was written in a different handwriting, using the Venetian idiom: *fo aprese [n]ta quistu auitarayu (!) a mi Micha de Nasi prochuradur del chomune de Zara*.

The legal act, after the presentation of the inventory in front of the *Curia*, ended by the notary assembling one document (*presentatio inuentarii cum protestatione*). This document would confirm that the executors completed (to the best of their knowledge, on time, and in a form prescribed by the Statute) the presentation of the inventory, asking the *examinator* to verify this

(by laying his hand upon it); whereupon, the notary would prepare a document which two witnesses would sign.

## 6. Inventory lexis

Even though the inventories were created in an era of developed notaries on the eastern Adriatic coast and were assembled by professional notaries educated at Italian universities in the Latin language, we find in the documents a series of errors in spelling, morphology and syntax, and a straying from the classical Latin norm. The notary entered elements from his spoken discourse (mainly from the Italian language) and some features had already become the norm of medieval Latinity. Sometimes entries were influenced by the domestic (Croatian and Dalmatian) discourse of Zadar citizens and sometimes there was just an error in the writing. This corpus, in which there are many different interferences, represents a source for researching languages at all levels, especially in the lexis area.

The lexis is the most variable part of any language and it represents a rich source of data on individual varieties. The Medieval Latin language system coexists with the linguistic systems of the *Romania* people, and serves as a *lingua franca* for the church, science and administration, and shows remarkable dynamism. In any language, change of meaning occurs over time (whether it is specialization, generalization, metonymy, metaphor, synecdoche, etc.) and these changes continue over time. Since the Latin language after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire was maintained over a large territory whose areas developed differently and in different surroundings, some semantic changes occurred in one area without meaning that those same changes occurred in another area. A summary of all the changes within the different areas of *Romania*, with an extensive grammar of Medieval Latin, was made by Peter Stotz (1996-2004.). Medieval Latin is full of localisms and should always be researched by local criteria. The lexis of these writings outline the socio-economic situation of Zadar in the 14th century, especially in the areas of crafts, trades, maritime affairs, household activities, agriculture, etc. Due to the limited length of this paper, examples of the different characteristics of the language in the researched corpus had to be significantly reduced. For more information, see Mijić (2014).

### 6. 1. Semantic innovation

Semantic innovation in medieval Latin of classical Latin words in corpus can best be seen by the following examples: *carta* notarial document (< *charta* (gr. *χάρτης*) writing material made from papyrus), *comes* chief town, prince (< *comes* companion), *concordium* contract (< *concordia* harmony), *confinium* city district (< *confinium* border), *copia* copy of the document (< *copia* abundance), *ecclesia* (gr. *ἐκκλησία*) church (< *ecclesia* national assembly in Grece), *indictio* period of 15 years (< *indictio* announcement), *instrumentum* document (< *instrumentum* instrument), *tenor* content (< *tenor* continuation), *vigor* legality (< *vigor* vitality) etc.

### 6. 2. Neologisms

As for the entry of new lexical items in a language, this can occur in two ways: by forming or borrowing.

#### 6. 2. 1. Neologisms resulting from formation

Within the text there are many complex forms, for example: *antedictus*, *artabancus*, *capiterium*, *epitogium*, *manutergium*, *supraindaoratus*, *supralectum*, *suprascriptus*, etc. The tendency

to form compounds was not foreign even to ancient writers, and they were taken from the spoken language.

Medieval Latin retained from the Vulgar Latin, and then continued to develop, a large number of morphological formations of diminutives. [24] The diminutive forms, as was usually the case in Vulgar and Christian Latin, often lose their diminutive meanings. The most common forms of suffixes for the diminutives in the corpus are:

1) *-ello/a-*: [25] *anelus*, *anellus* ring (< *anellus* (demin. < *anus*) ringlet), *botisela* (< *botta*), *camiselus* shirt (< *camisia* shirt), *capellus* hat (< *cappa* cloak), *capsella*, *cassela*, *caselus* box (< *capsa* box), *cussinellus* pillow (< *cusinus*), *domellus* house (< *doma* (gr. *dîma*) house), *gradella* barbecue (< *crata* grille), *setela* bucket (< *situlabucket*).

2) *-ino/a-*: *bambacina* (< *bambax*), *beretinus* (< *biretus*, *biretta*), *butisinus* (< *botta*), *coracina* armor (< *coraca*), *calcina*, *calzina* (< *calx*), *calderinus* (< *caldare*), *capelinus*, *capilinus* type of helmet (< *capellus*headgear); *colarina* (< *colare*); *capelinus*, *capellina* (< *cappellus*); *cortelinus* (< *cultellus* knife); [26] *curtina* (< *coltra*).

3) *-et(t)ol/a-* i *-it(t)ol/a-*: *anuleta* (< *anûlus*, ring), *armaritus* (< *armarium*), *bancheta* (< *bancus*), *barcheta* (< *barca*), *barileta* (< *barile*), *bucaliti* (< *bocale*), *bursetus*, *bursita*, *bursitus* purse (< *bursa* purse), *busoletus* [27] (< *busula*), *caldarita* (< *caldare*), *caseleta*, *casolita* (< *capsa*) [28], *caseta* (< *capsa*), *çinturita* (< *centura*), *coffanetus* (< *cofinus*), *coroneta* (< *corona*), *facoletus* (< *fazolus*), *flaschetus*, *flaschitus* (< *flascus*), *giardinettus* (< *gardinus*), *lancita* (< *lancea*), *paleta* (< *pala*), *quadernetus* (< *quadernus*), *quaternetus* (< *quadernus*), *sacchetus* (< *sassus*), *scagnitum* (< *scamnum*), *tabulita*, *taboleta* (< *tabula*). Diminutive suffixes containing *-t-* (which are widespread in various Romance languages, it. *-etto/a*, sp. *-ito/a*, fr. *-et/ette*), [29] as are the confirmed examples in the corpus, are most common. The diminutive suffixes *ot(t)ol/a-* from which the French *-ot/-otte* emerged and the Italian *-òtto/-òtta*, in connection with the above suffix (Stotz 2000, 372), were penetrated from Latin, and in the text we find, for example: *camisotus* (< *camisia*).

4) *-olo/a-*: *armarolus* (< *armarium*), *caldarola* (< *caldare*), *cazulus* (< *cazza*), *lapiçolus* (< *lapizius*), *masinola* (< *macina*), *panerolus* (< *panerus*), *plumaçola* (< *plumatium*), *tinaçola* (< *tinacium*), *tobaleola* (< *tobalea*), *tuualola* (< *tobalea*), *uarnazola* (< *varnacia*). This suffix is also characteristic of the Italian language and replaces the classical Latin suffix *-ulo/-ula-*

5) *-culo/a-* and *-colo/a-*: *domuncula* (*domus*), *graticula* (< *crata*), *libraçolus* (< *liber*)

6) *-cello/a-*: *ampulcella*, *amputella* (< *ampula*), *flastoncellus* (< *flascus*). This suffix usually appears as another diminutive form next to *-culus* (in French *-ceau/-celle* and in Italian *-cèllo/-cèlla*) (Stotz 2000, 369).

As far as the primary form of suffixes with substantives, the most common suffixes are:

1) *-aria/-eria -*: *cancellaria* (< *cancellarius*), *boteglarius* (< ital. *bottega*), *calçar* (< *calceus*), *candelarius* (< ven. *candelier*, ital. *candeliere*), *focularium* (< *focus*), *osterius* (< *hostis*, ital. *ostiere*), *peliparius* (< *pellio*), *scutellarius*, *scudelarius*, *scutulerius* *scudeler*, *scuduler* (< *scutella*), *tabulerium* table game (< *tabula*). In ancient times, adjectives were already formed with suffixes *-arius/-aria/-arium* and in certain cases they were used as a substantive. In Italian they appear as *-aia-* and *-ara-* (Stotz 2000, 288).

2) *-men-*: *curamen* (< *corium*), *ramen* (< *aes*, *aeris*), *seraminus* (< *sera*). The old suffix *-men* for *nomina rei actae* in ancient Latinity was much less productive than its expanded form *-mentum*

(for example: *ordinamentum, paramentum*). In Medieval Latin, by using this suffix, new verbal abstract nouns were formed in large numbers (Stotz 2000, 313).

3) *-tor*: *barchator* (< *barcarius*). In ancient times, and so into the middle Ages, this is a formative suffix of the deverbative, *nomina agentis*, which is also productive in *Romania* (it. *-tore*, sp. *-dor*, fr. *-eur* etc.) (Stotz 2000, 270).

4) *-tio*: *sepelicio* (< *sepelire*), *fabricacio* (< *fabrica*). Numerous verbal abstract nouns derived in Medieval Latin with this highly productive suffix. In *Romania* there are, on one side, inherited forms (sp. *-zón*, fr. *-aison/-ison*) and on the other side derivatives (it. *-zione*, sp. *-ción*, fr. *-tion*) (Stotz 2000, 29).

### 6. 2. 2. Loanwords

Loanwords are units of a foreign language that have entered the language system, either due to linguistic reasons (language inventory shortages, need for terminological precision where a foreign word replaces a domestic word) or for extra-linguistic reasons (linguistic interference caused by ethnic, social or historical circumstances of civilization). Loanwords differ from foreign words because they become adapted and end with the language of the host (Stotz 2002, 503). [30] Borrowing can be directly (from the language of the provider into the language of the recipient) or indirectly (language provider lends already borrowed words) and there is also a so-called circular borrowing when the word comes back into the language of the recipient in a different form or with a different content. The model taken in the language of the recipient and adapted is called a replica (Filipović 1986, 38). Filipović believes that the indirectly borrowed word should not be changed to the language of the intermediary, although the word can change its phonetic or morphological form or meaning. Muljačić (1998, 28) claims that the only correct principle is the so-called *etymologia proxima*, which is, determining the language from which the word directly entered into the language of the recipient. In the list that follows, loanwords will be divided according to the provider of the language from which the word originated.

**a) Words of Greek origin.** Some entered the Latin language in the Classical Era, while others were infiltrated at a later stage of development. Greek loanwords in the corpus mostly belong to Christian Latinity, but there are also terms from everyday life. Words related to Christianity entered the Latin language by the breaking through of Christianity in the areas of *Romania*. Within these words, it is necessary to distinguish Latin words, confirmed in the classical language, with a whole new meaning in new condition, [31] from those that have been taken from Greek. Older loanwords of Christianity terms, were not followed based on written text but they became remnants of the spoken Greek language (former bilingual communities of the Western part of the empire). When Latin from the 2nd century emerged as a cult language, Greek terms remained; for example, terms for holders of ecclesiastical offices (*clericus, episcopus, presbyter, diaconus* ect.) which subsequently became loanwords from the ecclesiastical Greek that had been domesticated in Late Antiquity (*icona*) (Stotz, 2002, 542-543). Greek terminology was used by Christians who spoke Latin to distinguish the terminology of pagan and Christian faith (Stotz 2002, 519-520). Some words of Greek origin are: *angastaria, hengristaria* (gr. γάστρα)

the rotund container for wine; *butirum, buttirum* (gr. βούτυρον); *camastreae* (gr. κρεμάστρα); *camera, camara* (gr. καμάρα); *gausapa* cloak (gr. γαυσάπτης); *planeta, planeda* f. (gr. πλανήτης, ven. *planeda*) vesture for priests; *rachana* rural cloak (gr. ῥάκος, croat. rakno); *ydria* (gr. ὑδρία) bucket.

**b) Words of Roman origin.** The text is rich with words from the Romance languages, whether they were the remains of the already defunct Dalmatian language, or a result of contact with Venetian language or other regional Italian languages. It is often difficult to accurately determine which words belong to which of these languages. The Venetian language is primarily linked to the sea and trade, but lacks terms for agriculture. A few examples: *barcharolus* (ven. *barcaròl*) bargee; *botonus* (ven. *botón*) button; *butisela* (it. *boticella*, ven. *botisela*) small barrel; *cadinus* sink (lat. *catinus* > it. *catino* > ven. *cadin*, cf. croat. *kain*); *calcia* (it. *calza*) sock; *cochuma* (lat. *cucūma* large cooking pot, ven. *cogoma*) copper pot, ewer; *draçia, dreçia, dreçera* (ven. *dreza*, it. *trecia*) hair ornament; *fersour* pan (ven. *persora*, dalm. *frixoria*); *fosigna, fosna* (ven. *fòsina*) spear; *marangonus* (it. *marangone*, ven. *marangòn*) carpenter; *scufia* (ven. *scufia*) scullcap; *zangolla* (ven. *zangola*) night pot.

**c) Words of Germanic origin.** The infiltration of the Germanic language into Latin took place between the 4th and 6th centuries; the spoken language thus impacted was then inherited into various Romance languages. Also, words of Germanic origin, which were taken from Romance languages, did not necessarily arrive there via Vulgar Latin; they could have come during or after the migration of peoples (Stotz, 2002: 657-658). Actually, most of the words from this group, according to *etymologia remota*, should be categorized into words of Roman origin because they refer to the borrowing of Germanic words in Latin only through the Romance languages (Stotz, 2002: 701). Words of Germanic origin are: *binda* band (it. *benda*, ven. *binda* < germ. *binda*); *blaucus* blue (< germ. *blau* blue); *gratacasa* grater (ven. *gratacàsa* *grattare*, Frankish \**gratton*); *helmus* (< germ.; it. *elmo*, germ. *Thelm*) helmet; *nappus, napus* glass (it. *nappo* < germ. *hnap* bowl).

**d) Words of Croatian origin.** The Croatian-Latin language contact is evident in words of Croatian origin which mostly appear in the text when speaking of agriculture, clothing and textile production: *bravarius* (croat. *bravar*) shepherd; *breda, barda* part of the loom named *brdo*; *chouarlica, chouerlica* (croat. *hovrlica*) headkerchief; *kletische* (croat. *kletišće*) carpet; *fartilla, vuratilla* (croat. *vrtilo*) accessories for making fabrics; *zuppa* (ven. *zupòn*, it. *giuba*, croat. *šuba*) type of clothes; *pocriuaza* (croat. *pokrivača*) headaddress; *surga* (croat. *surka*) type of women's clothing; *treliza tarlica* (croat. *trlica*) device for beating hemp and linen; *vlische* (croat. *ulište*) beehive.

**e) Loanwords from other languages.** Loanwords taken from other languages include words of Hebrew origin *abbas* abbot and *abbatissa* abbess, and words of Hungarian origin *iobaio* farmer, peasant (< hun. *iobbágy*).

There is another language characteristic that was noted in the corpus and can also be found in the Statutes. Namely, the notary, feeling the need to specify his expressions, often used terms such as *siue, seu, uel, id est, uidelicet* where, along with the local words, he would add a Latin word or he would specify the Latin more precisely. Often these are known synonyms, but these terms have become priceless when (which is frequent in this type of text) because of brevity or a lack of context (as the items are listed only), we cannot determine the meaning of the words. There are numerous examples of such practices (the most common is *siue*), but we will mention

just a few: *cuppam siue cifram* (1,1), *raschi siue naspi* (6,1'), *vaselli siue bote* (18,3'), *auriclorum siue cercellorum* (24,2), *tres busios siue foramina apium siue vlische* (40,1'), *rampina ferea ad tenendum carnes siue terchmari* (40,3'), *virgilii seu vitli* (18,3), *lauizi seu lebetes*(49,6), *chotigi id est maçchi* (8,3'), *lectum videlicet plumatium de pena* (6,1'), *tauula videlicet mensa per mançare*(17,1'), *ordeneum videlicet talare pro tella* (41,4) etc.

## Conclusion

Diplomatic analysis presents the internal structure of documentation, in relation to the medieval forms used most widely at the time, to determine the mode and the circumstances in which the inventories were compiled. Analysis has shown that notaries composed their charters in concordance with medieval notarial theory of their period. The Medieval Latin lexis of the researched corpus shows all its layers and local coloring, illustrating contact with different languages and incorporating new meanings and new terms into itself. Words of Greek origin, which in the classic era were indulged with a culture of education and prestige, later belonged to the Christian cultural circle. By means of the Bible, words of Hebrew origin enter the language. Words from the Romance languages are abundantly confirmed in the text; this is not surprising, considering the predominant Roman origin of the notaries who compiled the inventories, and the presence of the local Roman idiom in the city of Zadar (where these words were mostly related to crafts, trade and maritime activities). Through the Romance languages, many Germanic words entered the language. Most words of Croatian origin are related to geographical terms, agriculture, and textile production. Accessories for the production of textile simultaneously occurred in the Romance forms. The differences in specialty areas (especially in relation to agriculture and maritime terminology) is a reflection of the fact that the Slavs, only in coming to our coast met with this terminology; and they, in the absence of equivalent terms of their own, accepted these terms into their language. The high degree of development of maritime, trade and crafts was connected to the notary laws and literacy and culture in general; on the other hand, this also led to the meeting and mixing of the Romans and Slavs, as well as many foreigners who were in the city at that time, reflecting the language mixology of the Zadar commune in the 14th century.

## Notes

- [1] <http://dazd.hr/vodic/dazd-0019/> (access date: March 15, 2016.)
- [2] The Statute of Zadar decides that the five church institutions have the right to keep the documents of citizens, especially the private ones. (*Zadarski statut* 1997, 349)
- [3] According to the anonymous chronicler, Zadar had 7540 inhabitants in 1410, and 7280 in 1460; in 1500, Zadar had 5740 inhabitants (Raukar 1977, 23, note 8).
- [4] Since this is only an approximate figure, it can be taken to be the correct number, although Hilje incorrectly states that the fonds *Magnifica communitas Iadre* has 123 inventories. There are, in fact, 152.
- [5] Glavičić gives a brief overview of language characteristics of the Chronicle *Obsido Iarensis* (2007, 37-49)
- [6] Galović in his dissertation gives extensive paleographic and diplomatic analysis and a basic philological analysis of the *Libellus Policorion* (Galović 2010, 173-187).
- [7] Women executors preferred that the procurators took care of this job.
- [8] For example, after the death of *Damianus condam Madii de Varikassis*, since the bequest executor, his nephew, *Franciscus condam Nikolai Madii de Varicassis*, died, the court appointed as the executor *Selcha*

- as the executor, daughter of late *Damianus*, the inventory was created by *Marinus de Calcina* as her procurator.
- [9] When he says „vulgar“ Praga was not implying the Croatian language, but the vulgar Roman language spoken in Split.
- [10] For brevity, ordinal numbers of the published inventories in Leljak (2006) are used rather than the titles of inventories.
- [11] I thank my colleague Anita Bartulović for this information.
- [12] Regarding the dimensions of the paper, see Stipišić 1985: 18.
- [13] The numbers in parenthesis represent the ordinal number of the inventory and the number of sheets of paper; the apostrophe next to the sheets of paper represent *verso* while for *recto* there are no special marks.
- [14] Inventory no. 28 was composed in one column, but only on sheet 5, another column was added subsequently.
- [15] Gianfranco Orlandelli published Salathiel's form in 1961 but unfortunately that edition remained inaccessible to me up until the end of issuing this paper.
- [16] *Item necessarium est quod in principio inuentarii fiat signaculum sanctae Crucis ab haerede: et hoc propria manu, si sciat. Si autem nesciret, notarius debet ducere manum: ita quod faciat Crucem.* (Rolandinus Pasagerii 1565: 467).
- [17] *Stilus incarnationis* is the manner of computing time where the beginning of the year is March 25. Besides using this style, they also used the Christmas style (*stilus nativitatis*) and modern or New Year style (*stilus circumcisionis*). The incarnation style remained in Zadar for the longest therefore the notaries call it „*usus Iadertinus*“ (Stipišić 1985, 195).
- [18] *Indictio* was a control element of computing time to verify the accuracy of the year. Each year corresponded to a certain *indictio* but when they would reach the fifteenth *indictio*, they would start the cycle all over again. There are different kinds of *indictio*. In Zadar they used the so-called byzantine, which would change September 1st, and bedan, which would change September 24th (Stipišić 1985, 196; Grbavac 2006a, 106).
- [19] That is the beginning of the 121 chapter of the third book of the Statute of Zadar (Statute of Zadar, 1997: 362).
- [20] The name of the notary was mentioned in: 23,1: *Scriptura suprascripta est manu Laurenci, cancelarii Iadre*, 39,1: *secundum continentiam testamenti predicti condam Iohannis scripti manu mei notarii presbyteri Helye...*; 59,2: *ut in testamento ... scripto... manu mei Raymundi, filii ser Comini de Modiis de Asula, notarii Iadre iurati...*
- [21] From 1347 to 1356, the procurators name would not be mentioned. This is certainly tied to the hard times that Zadar was going through, from the exhausting Venetian siege until the final end of Venetian rule, and a plague epidemic which significantly reduced the number of notaries in the city.
- [22] Year 1377: *Miche de Nassis procuratori ad vitam* (36,2); year 1378: *Miche de Nassis procuratori ad vitam* (37,2); year 1379.: *me Miche de [Nassis], procuratore comunis Iadre in vita* (40,6'); year 1379: *ser Miche de Nassis, procuratori ad uitam* (41,4); year 1379: *ser Miche de Nassis, procuratori comunis in vita.* (42,2'); year 1380: *domino Bartholomeo de Cipriano procuratori ad vitam* (45,4).
- [23] This name has been mistakenly written in one place as *Marulo* instead of *Maçolo* (Leljak 2006, 354).
- [24] In classical Latin, suffix types can be divided roughly into one system: *-ulus/-ula /-ulum* belongs to the substantive of 1st and 2nd declination, while *-culus/-cula/-culum* generally join declinations 3, 4 and 5. On the final consonant roots of *-l-*, *-r-* ili *-n-* the forms of *-ellus/-ella/-ellum* appear, respectively *-illus/-illa /-illum* (Stotz 2000, 359).

- [25] Suffix *-ellu(s)/-illu(s)* remains in *Romania* (it. *-ello/-ella*, sp. *-illo/-illa* i fr. *-eau/elle*) and affects Medieval Latin too (Stotz 2000, 364).
- [26] Here is an extended diminutive suffix *-el(l)-in-*.
- [27] Here is an extended diminutive suffix *-ol(l)-et-*.
- [28] Here is an extended diminutive suffix *-ol(l)-it-*.
- [29] The origin of this suffix is debatable (perhaps it comes from the Celtic or Germanic or Latin loanwords from Etruscan). Lat. suffix *-ittu(s)/-itta* is attested for in the names coming from the Imperial period, but never penetrated into the sphere of written Latin (Stotz, 2000: 370).
- [30] Muljačić (1998, 266-269), instead the word “loanwords” uses the word “transfer”.
- [31] Christian Latin, as opposed to the Vulgar and Medieval Latin, cannot be described by the Laws of circumlocution. Its influence is only seen in the changing of meaning.

## Bibliography

- Ančić, M. (2005), 'Inventar splitskog kancelara i javnog bilježnika Tome Colutii de Cingulo (Prilog poznavanju prvih humanističkih krugova u Dalmaciji)', *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 47, 99–148.
- Anzulović, I. (2006), 'Nakit na zadarskom području u povijesnim izvorima od 13. do konca 16. st.', *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 48, 199–214.
- Anzulović, I. (2007), 'Ukrasno uporabni predmeti na zadarskom području u povijesnim izvorima od 13. do konca 16. st', *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 49, 239–287.
- Bralić, A. (2010), *Latinske isprave hrvatskog kralja Petra Krešimira IV. Jezična analiza s diplomatskim osvrtom*, Ma Thesis, Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Budeč, G. (2006), 'Historiografija i izvori za proučavanje problematike materijalnog života', *Kolo 4*, 299–312.
- Budeč, G. (2009), 'Materijalni predmeti labinskog stanovništva u razdoblju od 1525.-1550.' *Historijski zbornik god. LXII*, 2, 345–369.
- Budeč, G. (2010), 'Inventar dobara šibenskog patricija ser Jurja Kamenarića iz 1451. godine', *Zbornik Odsjeka povijesnih znanosti Zavoda povijesne i društvene znanosti HAZU*, 28, 67-106.
- Butić, D. (2007), *Jezične i stilske osobitosti djela Obsidio Iadrensis*, Ma Thesis, Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Čoralčić, L. (2001), *U gradu Svetoga Marka: Povijest hrvatske zajednice u Mlecima*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Dokoza, S.(2006), "Archivium comunis Jadre' u XIV. stoljeću'. *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru*, 48, 215–230.
- Fabijanec, S. F. (2003), 'Dva trgovačka inventara kao pokazatelji ekonomskog i kulturnog života u Zadru u XIV. stoljeću', *Povijesni prilozi*, 25, 93-131.
- Filipović, R. (1986), *Teorija jezika u kontaktu*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti – Školska knjiga.
- Galović, T. (2010), *Libellus Policorion – Rogovski kartular (diplomatičko-povijesna analiza)*, PhD Thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Grbavac, B. (2006a), *Zadarski notari u 13. i 14. stoljeću*, Ma Thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Grbavac, B. (2006b), 'Svakodnevni život notara u jednoj kasnosrednjovjekovnoj dalmatinskoj komuni - primjer Zadra', *Kolo 4*, 161 – 177.
- >Grbavac, B. (2010), *Notarijat na istočnojadranskoj obali od druge polovine 12. do kraja 14. stoljeća*, PhD Thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Hilje, E. (1996), 'Nekoliko bilješki o zadarskom zlatarstvu XIV. stoljeća'. *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 38, 4 –51.

- Hilje, E.I (2000), 'Slikarska djela u sačuvanim inventarima zadarskih građana iz 14. i 15. stoljeća'. *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 42, 65-78.
- Hilje, E. (2007), 'Dva popisa dobara splitskih slikara iz 15.st.' *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 49, 289-337.
- Homa, S. (2004), 'Kultura svakodnevice u srednjovjekovnom Zadru'. *Povijesni prilozi*, 27, 7–33.
- Jireček, K. (1903), 'Eine slavische Alexandergeschichte in Zara 1389', *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, 25, 157-158.
- Kolanović, J. and Križman, M. (ed.) (1997), *Zadarski statut sa svim reformacijama odnosno novim uredbama donesenima do godine 1563*. Zadar: Hrvatski državni arhiv; Matica hrvatska.
- Kovačević, M. (2010), *Umjetnička obrada plemenitih metala u 14. stoljeću u Zadru*, PhD Thesis, Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Ladić, Z. (2012), *Last Will: Passport to Heaven: Urban Last Wills from Late Medieval Dalmatia with Special Attention to the Legacies pro remedio animae and ad pias causas*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Leljak, R. (1999), *Lingvistička analiza kartulara Samostana sv. Marije u Zadru*, Ma Thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Leljak, R. (2006), *Inventari fonda Veličajne općine zadarske Državnog arhiva u Zadru godine 1325.-1385.*, sv. 1., Državni arhiv u Zadru, Zadar.
- Muljačić, Ž. (1998), 'Modeli i metode proučavanja jezičnih dodira (1880.–1998.)' *Riječ* 4/ 2, 27–31.
- Mijić, L. (2014) *Latinitet inventara fonda Veličajne općine zadarske Državnog arhiva u Zadru (godine 1325.–1385.)*, PhD Thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu.
- Perić, O. (1980), 'Složeni pasivni oblici u djelu Historia Salonitana', *Živa antika*, 30, 1–2, 113–117.
- Perić, O. (1980–81), 'O morfosintaksi srednjovjekovnog latinskog u djelu Tome Arhiđakona splitskog', *Suvremena lingvistika*, 21–22, 3–18.
- Perić, O. (1982), 'Neke jezične osobitosti djela Historia Salonitana', *Živa antika*, 32, 1, 93–103.
- Perić, O. (1991), 'Ablativ apsolutni u hrvatskim srednjovjekovnim ispravama', *Živa antika* (Posebna izdanja 9), 64 – 70.
- Perić, O. (2004), 'Parataksa i hipotaksa u djelu Historia Salonitana', in: Matijević Sokol, M. & Perić O. (ed.). *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo doba*, Književni krug Split, Zagreb, 143-152.
- Praga, G. (1927), 'Testi volgari spalatini del trecento', *Atti e memorie della Società dalmata di storia patria*, sv. 2, Zadar, 36-131.
- Rolandinus Pasagerii (1565), *Summa artis notariae*, Lugduni: Apud Sebastianum de Honoratis, Available: <https://books.google.hr> (Accessed: 13 March 2016).
- Skok, P. (1953), 'Lingvistička analiza kartulara Iura Sancti Petri de Gomai' in: Novak, V. & Skok, P., *Supetarski kartular*, JAZU, Zagreb, 235–312.
- Stipišić, J. (1977), 'Inventar dobara zadarskog patricija Grizogona de Civallelis iz 1384. godine', *Zbornik Historijskog zavoda Jugoslavenske akademije* 8, 375–410.
- Stipišić, J. (1985), *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Stipišić, J. (2000), *Inventar dobara Mihovila suknaara pokojnog Petra iz godine 1385.*, Stalna izložba crkvene umjetnosti u Zadru, Zadar.
- Stotz, P. (1996–2004), *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II 5, 1-5). München: Beck, 1996-2004. 1. sv: Einleitung, Lexikologische Praxis, Wörter und Sachen, Lehnwortgut. 2002. XXXI, 723 S. — 2. sv: Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung. 2000. XXVI, 482 S. — 3. sv: Lautlehre. 1996. XX, 352 S. — 4. sv: Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik. 1998. XXVI, 510 S. — 5. sv: Bibliographie, Quellenübersicht und Register. 2004.

# Struttura interna e lessico degli inventari dei beni del fondo *Magnifica communitas Iadre* del XIV secolo

## RIASSUNTO

Linda Mijić

Department of Classical Philology  
University of Zadar

[lmijic@unizd.hr](mailto:lmijic@unizd.hr)

*Parole chiave: inventari dei beni, Medioevo, Zara, latino medievale*

Gli inventari dei beni dei defunti rappresentano una fonte **imprescindibile per lo** studio della vita quotidiana al tempo dei Comuni medievali in Dalmazia, **nonchè un** corpus linguistico che finora non è stato oggetto di ricerche filologiche. Il presente **contributo** si **prefigge**, attraverso l'analisi diplomatica e quella lessicale degli inventari **pubblicati** zaratini dei beni appartenenti al fondo *Magnifica communitas Iadre* conservati presso l'Archivio di Stato di Zara, di individuare le caratteristiche **precipue** di questo tipo di documento in qualità di fonte storica, **come** di identificare le **peculiarità** della latinità usata a Zara nel XIV secolo. A differenza degli altri documenti di carattere privato-giuridico, che generalmente venivano **interamente redatti** in latino **da notai** e **sulla base dei** moduli appresi nelle scuole di legge in Italia, gli inventari dei beni hanno una predefinita struttura tripartita: la prima parte **solitamente** viene **stilata** da un notaio, la seconda, che include la lista dei beni, dall'esecutore testamentario, dal suo procuratore o dal notaio stesso, mentre la terza parte, ossia la conferma delle autorità comunali, viene compilata dal procuratore comunale, a volte di suo proprio pugno, a volte invece **da un suo** impiegato. La maggior parte degli inventari **redatta** in latino cancelleresco **risente di influssi** dell'amministrazione veneziana e, a volte, dell'idioma neolatino locale, nonché **di parole di origine croata**. Sono evidenti le diverse interferenze nella lingua **d'arrivo** a seconda dell'origine e del livello **d'istruzione** del compilatore. Il testo abbonda di parole di origine neolatina soprattutto nel campo dell'artigianato, del commercio e dell'attività nautica. **Numerosi** i germanismi introdotti nella lingua attraverso parole di origine neolatina. La maggior parte dei croatismi si riferisce alle espressioni geografiche, all'agricoltura, all'abbigliamento e alla produzione tessile. Gli arnesi per la tessitura **compaiono** anche in **forma neolatina**. Vista la **natura caratteristica** degli scritti, nonché il **considerevole numero** dei compilatori, nei documenti esaminati **prevale** l'influsso dell'idioma volgare, e il quadro linguistico è più vicino a quello esistente nella Zara trecentesca.