of Andrea Dandolo’s Chronica per extensum descripta in the light of the ms. Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.IV.7

By Miika Kuha

This article examines the early circulation of the universal chronicle of the doge and prehumanist Andrea Dandolo (1306–1354). The focus of the present study is to give new insights in the transmission of Dandolo’s chronicle – and in general in the Venetian textual culture of the period – by analysing its second oldest manuscript witness, the ms. J. IV. 7 of the Turin National University Library. It will be argued, furthermore, that the Turin copy is closely linked to an early reworking of Dandolo’s chronicle, the Chronica Venetiarum attributed to the Gran Chancellor Benintendi de’ Ravagnani (c. 1318–1365). Both Chronica Venetiarum and the Turin copy reflect the response of contemporary readers to Dandolo’s chronicle as it started to circulate outside the ducal chancellery.

Andrea Dandolo’s historical works

During the decades after and before the dogeship of Andrea Dandolo (1342–1354), history writing flourished in Venice both in vernacular and in Latin.

---
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2 See the Dandolo bibliography in Ravegnani 1986. The last two decades have seen the publication of a number of studies dedicated to Dandolo’s dogeship, especially as regards his artistic patronage. For the latter aspect, see Pincus 2010 and Belting 2006.
These are the beginnings of the so-called Patrician chronicle, a term used to describe the role of the leading men of the Venetian Republic as patrons and authors of historical works. The historiographical production of the period also reflects the important role of the chanceries as centres of learning and dissemination of knowledge in the Late Middle Ages. In Venice, as elsewhere, various members of the chanceries were involved in history writing.

The key figure of this phase of Venetian historiography was the doge Andrea Dandolo, described by some contemporaries as wise and learned, by others as untrustworthy. The historians of the early modern period remembered Andrea Dandolo as a man of letters connected to Petrarch, who spent a long time in Venice. For Flavio Biondo, he was the only Venetian man of letters worth mentioning before Carlo Zeno (1334–1418), humanist and hero of the War of Chioggia. The two surviving letters from Dandolo to Petrarch were known to the wider public through several fifteenth- and sixteenth-century copies, both manuscript and printed, of Petrarch’s Latin works.

In addition to his correspondence, Dandolo’s two chronicles, the *Chronica brevis* and the *Chronica per extensum descripta*, were widely read in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance but only published in print as late as the eighteenth century (Muratori 1728). The first chronicle was probably written before Dandolo’s election as doge. Despite its conventional structure and contents, the *Brevis* was pivotal in the proliferation of history writing in Venice during the latter half of the fourteenth century. In Dandolo’s role in Venetian prehumanism, see Mann 1976a & 1976b, Lazzarini 1930 & 1976.

3 Melville Jones 2007. For an ample bibliography on history writing in Venice, see Fiori 2014.

4 For the production of historical works by members of the chanceries, see Zabbia 1999.

5 For a discussion on differing contemporary views with regard to Dandolo’s dogeship, see Carile 1969, 7–10, 47 and Vespignani 2005, 184–190.


8 For a description of the manuscripts and prints preserving the Venetian collection of Petrarch’s letters, see Voigt 1882, Rossi 1933, L–LX and Rausa 2000. The latter study contains a critical edition of Dandolo’s letters to Petrarch.

9 In the following the titles *Brevis* and *Extensa* will be used.

10 The oldest printed version was published in the eighteenth-century *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* vol. 12. It includes the *Extensa*, an extract of the *Brevis*, and the chronicle of Venice written by Rafaino Caresini. The circulation of manuscripts containing these texts will be sketched below p.140. The modern editions of the *Brevis* and *Extensa* were published by Ester Pastorello in 1938 (Dandolo 1938a & 1938b).
contrast to earlier chronicles, mostly anonymous, the Brevis was invested with the honour and dignity stemming both from the connection to the ducal institution and from the great deeds associated with the House of Dandolo.11

The Extensa greatly differs from the Brevis both with regard to contents and structure. It covers the history of Venice from the revelation of St. Mark during his travel across the Venetian lagoon until the year 1280, a narrative merging local and universal history. It is particularly the latter aspect, a wider perspective, that distinguished the Extensa from previous works on the city’s past. Compared to other medieval Venetian chronicles, the Extensa was a monumental work drawing extensively on both local documents and the universal chronicle, Satirica Ystoria, by Paulinus Minorita.12

The aspect of Chronica per extensum descripta in the manuscript Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.IV.7

The process of compiling the Extensa is illustrated by Ester Pastorello, the editor, through a codicological and palaeographical analysis of the oldest manuscript of the work, now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. Z. 400 (=2028). On the basis of its physical and textual structure, Pastorello argued that this manuscript would have been the working copy produced in the ducal chancery.13 The organization of the text shows that it was meant to be used as a reference work. The chronicle was rigidly divided into books (libri), chapters (capitula), and smaller units called partes, usually consisting of a few sentences only. Since there is most often neither a chronologically nor a thematical connection between the adjacent partes, the chronicle conspicuously lacks narrative coherence. Furthermore, each book is preceded by a table of contents indicating the titles of the capitula and partes.
Despite auxiliary paratextual elements facilitating the consultation of the manuscript, the structure of this first version of the *Extensa* is far from optimal for a reference work. The text is written in long lines with only two vertical lines and the number of the *pars* in the interlinear space [the word *pars* together with the number] separating the units. No doubt due to various *partes* being rather difficult to locate, corresponding marginal titles were sometimes added. Since these marginalia, together with the vertical lines, the numbers in the interlinear space, and the tables of contents seem to have been added after the transcription of the text proper, it has been suggested that the original plan would have been to articulate the text on two hierarchical levels only, those of the *libri* and the *capitula*, the division in *partes* having been created afterwards.\(^{14}\) An examination of the manuscript reveals, however, that the majority of the *partes* are also separated by a gap on the line. This gap is clearly wider than a space between words. The beginning of a new *pars* was also highlighted with a point on the base line (*punctus*) and a majuscule letter. Normally, the scribe marks sentence limits and other pauses with hair-line strokes (*virgulae suspensivae*), sometimes with *punctus elevati* both followed by a minuscule letter.\(^{15}\) The idea to divide the *Extensa* in *partes* is therefore not a later addition.

Pastorello’s introductory chapter also includes brief descriptions of the most important manuscript witnesses with some remarks on their mutual relations. The editor did not provide a full *stemma codicum*. Consequently, several questions regarding the early dissemination of the *Extensa* are pending. To address some of these questions, we shall compare the Marciana ms. to its earliest copy, now Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.IV.7.

Pastorello’s short description is still the most detailed study on the Turin ms. It is partly based on Giovanni Monticolo’s remarks made before the volume was severely damaged in the 1904 fire. According to Monticolo, a colophon identified the scribe as Giovanni Ferrarese da Pola, notary, who made the copy in the years 1359–1370. Monticolo also lists a series of documents and a history of Venice written by Rafaino Caresini, Grand Chancellor of Venice. This text was a continuation of Dandolo’s shorter chronicle.\(^{16}\)

\(^{14}\) Zabbia 1999, 235.
\(^{15}\) For the present article ff. 1r–9r were examined.
\(^{16}\) Pastorello 1938a, L–LI. For Monticolo’s remarks, see Sanudo 1900, 361–362, n. 1. There are short descriptions of the Turin ms. in Vinay 1947, 218, Giaccaria 1986, 48–49, Cosentini 1922, n. 1409 and Peyron, *Appendice*. So far it has not been possible to identify either the person who commissioned the volume or any early owner. Two Venetian chronicles are mentioned in Giulio Torrini’s catalogue of the Ducal Library (Torrini 1659, 52 & 53 both titled “Chronica de Venetia Ms.”) and three similar works in the eighteenth-
Since many leaves damaged in the fire were restored in 1937–38, 1949–1963, and 2009, it is now possible to get a better picture of the physical characteristics and contents of the volume. It is a parchment manuscript written in littera semitextualis in two columns. While all of the volume suffered some damage, the leaves in the inner part of the volume, least exposed to fire and water, are fairly well preserved. For one of them, f. 46, the measures are c. 20.8 x 13.1 cm.; most of the inner and probably some of the upper and lower margins are, however, missing. On the same leaf, the columns measure c. 15.5 x 4.3 cm., the intercolumnal space being c. 0.9 cm. The dimensions of the letters and columns also vary from leaf to leaf depending on the amount of twisting caused by water.

The Marciana and Turin manuscripts differ in layout. In the Turin volume the partes are separated from each other by a line return, coloured pied-de-mouche (blue and red alternating) and, occasionally, an empty space at the end of the first line of the new unit. The beginning of each chapter, capitulum, is also highlighted with a rubric and with a red or blue initial. Furthermore, the manuscript, not unlike the Marciana volume, is divided into books, libri. There is a blank space at the end of the last page of each book, so that a new book always begins on a new page. The beginning of each book presents a rubric and an initial taller than the secondary initials.

17 For the restoration, see Giaccaria 1986, 49. While the leaves restored in 2009 are kept unbound in a box, in the earlier operations leaves were attached to paper and bound inside covers. During the rearrangement, several leaves were misplaced. Despite information on some of the accidents in the present volume, it is somewhat difficult to consult the manuscript. Here is the correct order of the leaves. The Extensa: 1r–5v, 10, 7, 6, 9, 107, 11–17, 104, 19–20, 8, 22–92, 118 (97), 117 (98), 121 (99), 124 (100), 122 (101), 119 (102), 125, 120 (104), 126 (105), 123, 127 (107). A fragment of the Brevis covering the years 1280–1342: 93r–94r. Raphayni de Caritas cancellarii Venetiarum Chronicar: 94v–99, 101, 100, 102–103, 18, 105–106, 109, 108, 21, 110–111, 113, 112, 114–115. Part of the Partitio terrarum imperii Romanie: 116. The numbering corresponds to the present order of the leaves both in the volume and in the box holding the recently restored unbound leaves. The folio numbers of the latter are marked in bold. For the unbound leaves, also the page number in the upper right-hand corner is indicated in parentheses. The unbound leaves cover the final part of the Extensa from the dogeship of Jacopo Tiepolo onwards (295, 1 Pastorello, f. 118 inc. “q(uit) se in na-”).

18 The scripts are identified according to the classification system developed by Albert Derolez (Derolez 2003).
marking the beginning of a chapter.\textsuperscript{19} In the Turin ms. the three-tiered structure of the Extensa is thus made obvious to the reader, from partes to libri.

The Turin volume lacks the tables of contents present in the Marciana ms. This would seem to contradict both the referential concept of the Extensa and the three-tiered structure of the Turin ms., facilitating the retrieval of information. It is plausible that a plan to add tables of contents existed but was never carried out.

The Turin ms. seems uncompleted, which is shown e.g. by the frequent absence of rubrics for the partes. Three fairly well-preserved leaves in the middle of the manuscript (ff. 29v–30r and f. 32v), which have rubrics for all the 32 partes of these leaves, give, however, an idea of what the volume was supposed to look like.\textsuperscript{20} The rubrics mostly correspond to the titles contained in the table of contents of the Marciana ms. The model of the Turin ms. thus seems to have contained the titles of the partes or at least part of them.

There are also other leaves with rubrics pertaining to partes in the Turin volume. On several folios, they serve to highlight episodes and documents regarding Rialto and surroundings. Some further rubrics pertain to facts of general interest, such as prince-electors.\textsuperscript{21}

While some of the partes pertaining to key episodes in the history of Venice were rubricated, many others were not, e.g. the pars on the translation of St. Mark’s relics.\textsuperscript{22} The first rubricated pars contains Cassiodorus’ letter on the society of the Venetian lagoon. Since the letter eulogizes the early Venetians, it became central to the myth of Venice.\textsuperscript{23} The text also circulated independently, e.g. in two fifteenth-century miscellaneous manuscripts containing orations and poems by humanists. In these manuscripts, the letter is placed next to a text on the legend of the foundation of Venice. Both the letter and the legend probably originate in the Extensa.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{19} Both types of initials are situated in an empty space left by the scribe inside the column. The rubric of the ninth book exceptionally occupies the last two lines of f. 61r, while the book begins from the verso side of that leaf.

\textsuperscript{20} They correspond to Dandolo 1938a 90,10–93,13 & 99,14–100,33.

\textsuperscript{21} The rubrics on ff. 23r (on the pope John III, Dandolo 1938a, 73,7–8), 34r (on the synod of Aquileia, \textit{ib.} 116,16–18), 62v (on prince-electors, \textit{ib.} 196,16–21).

\textsuperscript{22} Dandolo 1938a, 146,24–147,38 lat. J.IV.7, 46r–46v.

\textsuperscript{23} There is an edition of the letter in Cassiodorus 1894, 379–380. For the letter, see also Carile & Fedalto 1978, 157–158 and 174–182.

\textsuperscript{24} The manuscripts are Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ham. 254 and Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, H.III.8. For a description of the Turin manuscript, see Kristeller 1967, 181 and Cipolla & De Sanctis & Frati 1904, 546. The catalogue of the Hamilton Latin manuscripts attributes the legend passage to the Chronica Venetiarum by Benintendi de’ Ravagnani (Boese 1966, 126), a compendium of
The Turin copy and the *Chronica Venetiarum* attributed to Benintendi de’ Ravagnani

An early compendium of the *Extensa*, titled *Chronica Venetiarum secundum Benintendi (sic!) cancellarium eius*, represents a similar approach to the *Extensa*. The *Chronica Venetiarum* mainly uses *Extensa*’s material on local events, most of the universal history being left out. Even the structure is different. The *Chronica Venetiarum* is divided into chapters in general corresponding to single dogeships. In the oldest manuscript witness, the Princeton University Library, Garrett 156 (fourteenth century), these chapters are marked by an initial in red or blue. Some of the chapters are also divided into smaller units by a *pied-de-mouche* situated in the middle of the text. The layout is typical of fourteenth-century Venetian chronicle manuscripts.

The title attributes the text to the Venetian prehumanist Benintendi de’ Ravagnani, Grand Chancellor, head of not only the chanceries of Venice but of the entire civil service of the Republic. He is best known for his correspondence with Petrarch. Six of the letters survive, two from Benintendi to Petrarch, the other four by the poet. These letters, together with Benintendi’s correspondence with the humanist Moggio Moggi of Parma, circulated in manuscripts and editions that also preserved Dandolo’s letters. Several other works have also been attributed to Ravagnani, e.g. an oration to King Louis of Hungary and a continuation of the *Brevis*.

A comparison of the Turin manuscript, the Berlin manuscript, and the *Extensa* with the *Chronica Venetiarum* would seem to invalidate this hypothesis. Firstly, there are readings present in the Turin and Berlin manuscripts as well as the *Extensa* but absent in the *Chronica Venetiarum*. Secondly, the Turin and Berlin manuscripts show no traces of the modifications and additions that the author of the *Chronica Venetiarum* made to the passage. It was enriched e.g. by accounts of biblical events and martyrdoms purported to have occurred on the day that Venice was founded. For details on the legend passage, see Kuha 2012, 86–87.

For the manuscript tradition, see Kuha 2012. To the three copies described in that article should be added Venice, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Gradenigo Dolfin 34. The Correr manuscript was copied from Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. XIV. 177 (=4607), which is shown e.g. by some omissions caused by *saut du même au même*. The author is currently preparing a critical edition of the *Chronica Venetiarum*. The edition will be based on an unpublished Licenciate thesis discussed at the University of Jyväskylä on 18 January 2014 (*Benintendi de’ Ravagnani, Chronica Venetiarum: Edizione critica con introduzione*).

For a biography of Ravagnani, see Bellemo 1912.

For Ravagnani’s works, see Bellemo 1912. In addition to the manuscripts of the Venetian collection of Petrarch’s letters, there are at least two copies that preserve Ravagnani’s letters. These are Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, L III 35 (the second letter of Ravagnani to Moggio Moggi, inc. “Rem non novam”) and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 5223 (letter from Ravagnani to his colleagues in the ducal chancery, inc. “Si conceptum sermonem” and the letter of presentation of the
The material selected for the *Chronica Venetiarum* was most probably rewritten in order to increase the readability of the text. To use St. Bonaventure’s famous terminology in his prologue to the commentary on the Sentences, the author seems to be closest to a compiler (*compilator*) who “copies the words of someone else and adds material, not of his own, but someone else’s”.

Yet, to say that he merely copies, does not cover all of the operation, since the source text is often radically altered. There is also material absent in the *Extensa*. A close look at the additions reveals that they often clarify the text, e.g. by making causalities more evident. The author modified those specific passages like a *commentator*, who “uses someone else’s material and his own, but mostly someone else’s and his own as a supplement added for clarification”.

The *Chronica Venetiarum* also supplements the *Extensa* with a brief prologue emphasizing the providential role of Venice as guardian of justice and refuge of the faithful in terms borrowed from the Bible. The prologue seems an integral part of the chronicle that also evidences several other re-

---

*Extensa*, inc. “Frequenter sciscitatus sum”). The letter of presentation is also transmitted in numerous *Extensa* manuscripts and three copies of the *Chronica Venetiarum*. The oration to King Louis (inc. “Quanta de virtutibus et probitatibus”) has a more complex transmission history. Seven copies are currently known: 1) Fiecht bei Schwaz, Stiftsbibliothek der Benediktinerabtei St. Georgenberg-Fiecht, 183; 2) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Nouv. acq. lat. 1152; 3) Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, ms. 14579-14585; 4) Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, lat. H. III. 4; 5) Wroclaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, M. IV. F. 61; 6) Milan, Biblioteca dell’Università Cattolica del S. Cuore, Visconti di Modrone 2 and 7) Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Z. lat. 476 (=1944). The Marciana copy, a luxury manuscript of Petrarch’s works, is the only fourteenth-century one containing the oration. This manuscript was probably used by Simone da Loreto and Andrea Torresano, who published a printed edition of Petrarch’s Latin works in 1501 (*1501 Librorum Francisci Petrarche Impressorum Annotatio... Impressis Venetiis: impen(n)sis d(omi)nii Andree Torresani de Asula : per Simonem de Luere, Anno Incarnationis Christi M.CCCCC. die. XXVIJ. Marcij. Feliciter.*). The volume also contains Ravagnani’s oration. The printed edition presents all of the marginalia of the Marciana manuscript written by two different hands (the fourteenth-century hand *a* writes the marginalia from *prudentia* to *fides* and *Jacobus Apostolus* at the end; the fifteenth-century hand *b* writes the names of Andrea Contarini and Michele Faledro, members of the delegation to King Louis with Ravagnani). For the Marciana manuscript, see Rotondi 1935 and Belloni 1983, 44. The print is described in Rossi 1933, xciii. On the attribution of historical works to Ravagnani, see Voigt 1882, 62–63, Pastorello 1938b, 338–340, Arnoldi 1970, 151, Zabbia 1999, 224–228 and 259–264, Ortalli & Pittarello 2014, 33–43.

---

28 “Aliquis scribit aliena, addendo, sed non de suo; et iste compilator dicitur”. The terminology of the prologue is discussed in Minnis 1979, 415.


30 For the prologue, see Kuha 2012, 86.
ligiously motivated modifications and additions. Like in many chronicles of Venice, the identity of the writer is not revealed. The prologue also lacks reference to both the aims and methods of the writer. More importantly, it does not mention Dandolo’s historical works or the ducal institution, which seems problematic, since Dandolo and Ravagnani were close collaborators. The prologue, therefore, raises doubt on the identity of the writer.

Since the Marciana ms. must have been known to Ravagnani, it is important to compare the *Chronica Venetiarum* with the early witnesses of the *Extensa*. The comparison also gives information on the earliest diffusion of the *Extensa*, since the Princeton manuscript of the *Chronica Venetiarum* (p. 133) was written during the dogeship of Dandolo or soon afterwards. This is indicated by the miniature on the first leaf which resembles those of a Roman Missal made for St. Mark’s Basilica in the middle decades of the fourteenth century.31

A comparison between these texts is often hampered by the numerous modifications present in the *Chronica Venetiarum*. Although the order and structure of the sentences is mostly similar, there are considerable differences in vocabulary and spelling. The parts that seem to show fewer divergences are the documents and letters, abundant in the *Extensa*. The legal and esthetic values associated with these parts thus probably prohibited large-scale interventions to these parts.

The *Chronica Venetiarum* only contains four of these. The first item in common is Cassiodorus’s letter (see p.132), which unfortunately provides little material for comparison. This is due to the poor condition of the leaves in that part of the Turin ms. The leaves containing the second and the third items are much better preserved. These are the acts of the synod of Grado in 579 and the letter of pope Pelagius confirming the transfer of the Metropolitan seat to Grado.

The following example is taken from the subscriptions at the end of the acts of the Synod. To facilitate the comparison, the parts omitted in the Turin ms. and the *Chronica Venetiarum* are emboldened, while the modification connecting the two is in italics. The *Chronica Venetiarum* and the Turin volume also share an addition (*similiter*) which is underlined.

31 I wish to thank Susy Marcon (Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana) for her kind help with the datation. The Missal manuscript is now Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. III. 111 (=2116).
Extensa, p. 83, ll. 35–39

Virgilius episcopus sancte ecclesie scarauaciensis superueniens sancto synodo his gestis sinus relictis (sub)scripsi
Laurentius presbiter superueniens in Sancta sinodo, locum faciens viri beatissimi Frontei episcopi sancte ecclesie feltrine, his gestis michi relictis subscripsi.
Martianus episcopus sancte ecclesie patenatis superueniens sancta sinodo, his gestis michi relictis subscripsi.

Extensa, Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.IV.7, 27r

Virgilius episcopus scarauaciensis subscripsi superueniens subscripsi
Laurentius presbyter similiter superueniens locum tenens episcopi feltrensis subscripsi
Martianus episcopus ecclesie patenatis superueniens sinodo subscripsi

Chronica Venetiarum, Princeton, Garrett 156, 6v

Virgilius episcopus scarauaciensis subscripsi
Laurentius presbyter similiter superueniens locum tenens episcopi feltrensis subscripsi
Martianus episcopus ecclesie patenatis superueniens sinodo subscripsi

The subscriptions clearly show substantial differences between the Turin and Marciana manuscripts, thus reflecting authorial or early scribal interventions. Despite some modifications, the Turin ms., however, generally corresponds to the Marciana ms. The Extensa scribes, thus, mostly seem to have preserved the text they were copying. Importantly, the passage also indicates a connection between Chronica Venetiarum and the Turin volume. It is evident, consequently, that the Chronica Venetiarum was not based on the Marciana ms. There are, however, some differences between the Turin ms. and the Chronica Venetiarum, which possibly indicate that the connection is not direct.

It should be pointed out that a considerable amount of readings of the Turin ms. was left out of the modern edition. Most of the omissions are probably due to the dire condition of the manuscript before the restoration, while some variant readings may have been deliberately discarded by the editor. It is difficult to determine why a particular reading is not present in the appa-

32 By contrast, the vernacular chronicles of Venice written in the Late Middle Ages were subject to extensive scribal interventions. For the transmission of Venetian chronicles, see Carile 1969.
33 Pastorello argued (1938a, LI) that the Turin ms. does not contain the revised official version, since it presents numerous errors.
ratus, since the editorial principles are only briefly described.\textsuperscript{34} The apparatus also lacks any remarks on the legibility of the Turin ms. Consequently, it is of very little help in reconstructing the Turin text.\textsuperscript{35} To give an example, none of the differences between the Turin and the Marciana manuscripts indicated above are registered in Pastorello’s apparatus.\textsuperscript{36}

The role of the Turin copy in the transmission of Andrea Dandolo’s chronicles and the \textit{Venetiarum Chronica} by Rafaino Caresini

As we already mentioned (p.131), significant parts of the Turin ms. have been recovered since Pastorello’s edition.\textsuperscript{37} The most valuable of them is no doubt the chronicle of Venice written by Rafaino Caresini (c. 1314–1390), and placed after the \textit{Extensa} in the volume (ff. 94v–115v).\textsuperscript{38} This section,

\footnotesize
\par
\textsuperscript{34} Pastorello 1938a, LXXVI: “Benchè la riproduzione della stesura originale tolga valore alle varianti delle copie, pure sono date, ogni qual volta presentino: o una diversa forma di nome proprio, o una costruzione sintattica più corretta, o un dato di fatto comunque osservabile, le letture diverse dei codici già singolarmente indicati più sopra.”

\textsuperscript{35} The problems of Pastorello’s apparatus are demonstrated by a recently published edition of Piero Giustiniani’s Latin chronicle of Venice, partly based on the \textit{Extensa}. According to the editor of Giustiniani’s chronicle, the author would have used a version close to that in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, lat. 5842, a fifteenth-century copy of \textit{Extensa} (Fiori 2014, CXII–CXIV). Most of the passages supporting the argument are, however, also present in the Turin ms. contrary to the information given by Pastorello’s apparatus. The passage regarding the election of Domenico Gradenigo may be found on f. 66r, the notice on the voluntary submission of Dubrovnik in 1251 on f. 124r of the Turin ms. Even the third passage quoted by the editor was probably to be read in the Turin ms. before the fire. On the severely damaged leaf, which would have contained the text in question, the last word of the penultimate line of the chapter ends in \textit{–em}. The last words of the passage reads in Pastorello’s edition “ad pristinam subiectionem pie recepti sunt” (Dandolo 1938a, 304). The ending \textit{–em} close to the end of the chapter may only be explained by the presence of the addition in the Turin ms. Without this addition, the chapter would have ended in the words “annulo et pastorali baculo, congruis temporibus, uti valeat”. As the part of the f. 91, which would have presented the fourth passage quoted by the editor, perished in the fire, it is impossible to verify its contents.

\textsuperscript{36} Here are some other examples: Dandolo 1938a, 58,31 virgo quedam nobilis \textit{T} (= Turin ms.) virgo quedam, 59,2 processit \textit{T} procedit, 59,3 adiacentem marg. contiguum \textit{T} contiguum, 61,5 quibus nunc repatriantibus \textit{T} quibus repatriantibus, 73,21 arcerato marg. obturato \textit{T} obturato, 81,1 in ecclesia \textit{T} in ipsa ecclesia, 81,7 Elias episcopus sancte eiusdem \textit{T} episcopus sancte eiusdem, 81,26 incesu \textit{T} incursu, 82,14 per inmissionis tue veneramde (sic) confrenter breviarium, consentientibus \textit{T} per immissio [lacuna] consentientibus. This list is based on a comparison between the parts of the \textit{Extensa} present in the \textit{Chronica Venetiarum}.

\textsuperscript{37} The Caresini chronicle was mentioned in two descriptions made before the fire, i.e. Peyron, \textit{Appendice al Pasini} and Sanudo 1900, 361–362.

\textsuperscript{38} Some of the leaves containing Caresini’s chronicle were subsequently misplaced. The correct order is presented in note 17 above. Only one leaf of the third codicological unit has been recovered. The leaf, situated at the end of the present volume (f. 116), has a passage
though written in a different hand (littera hybrida), has a decoration (pen-flourished blue and red initials) and layout (in two columns) similar to those in the codicological unit containing the Extensa. The two units seem thus to have been conceived as being transmitted together.

The Turin ms. is one of the most important witnesses of Caresini’s chronicle. It presents a word in Venetian vernacular (açovade) in the middle of the Latin narrative, a distinctive variant shared by three other key copies, Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. X, 237 (fifteenth century), Venice, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Provenienze Diverse 142c (fifteenth century) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 5874 (fifteenth century). Pastorello identifies the text of the Marc. lat. X, 237 as the source of the Venetian translation of Caresini’s chronicle.39

Furthermore, Pastorello derives the text present in the Paris manuscript from an early copy revised by the author. This revised text had a lacuna, which would have been reproduced by the scribe of the Paris manuscript only. Pastorello was later able to identify the source of this copy in the Cor-
rer manuscript, briefly described in her edition of the *Extensa*. The lacuna, in fact, also occurs in the Correr manuscript, highlighted by a marginal note similar to that in the Paris manuscript. 40 This lacuna closely links these copies to the Turin ms., which shows a gap in the same place, similar in dimensions to the lacuna of the Paris and Correr manuscripts (from two to three lines). 41 The Turin and the Paris manuscripts also seem to preserve the same revised version of Caresini’s chronicle, different from the text in Marc. lat. X, 237. 42

The Caresini apparatus registers, however, a number of variants connecting the Paris manuscript with the other copies and separating it from the Turin copy. 43 These readings should be verified, since the apparatus was compiled according to principles observed by Pastorello in editing the *Extensa*. Consequently, it does not indicate if part of a copy is missing. This also concerns the Paris manuscript, which is partly damaged. The apparatus does not give the exact location of the unreadable or missing parts. 44

The Turin ms. also contains part of the *Brevis* covering the period from the end of the *Extensa* (a. 1280) to the beginning of Caresini’s chronicle (a. 1342). 45 This section, unsurprisingly placed between the *Extensa* and Caresini’s chronicle (f. 93r–94r), was copied by the same scribe as Caresini’s chronicle. The presence of the section in the Turin manuscript is particularly important, because the *Extensa* circulates with the same texts in a number of manuscripts. A similar triad of Venetian chronicles is transmitted by the Paris and Correr manuscripts and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vati-

---

40 Venice, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Provenienze Diverse 142c, 159v deficiu(n)t hic due line.
41 Pastorello 1922, XVI–XIX. The lacuna belongs to a passage relating the death sentences passed on the leaders of the Cretan rebellion of 1363–1364. In the Turin ms. the lacuna occurs at the end of the inner column on f. 97r.
42 The Turin ms. was compared to the extracts from the other versions presented in Pastorello 1922, XVIII–XIX.
43 For example Caresini 19,2 laedere non valuit T minime ledere valuit, ib. 24,9 Thadeus Justiniano T Thadeus, ib. 33,16 Vir Hugo T Egregius Vir Hugo, 33,20 domina Valentina T Illustrissima Valentina.
44 The Paris manuscript belong to a seventeenth-century bibliophile Raphaël Trichet du Fresne (1611–1661), librarian to Queen Christina of Sweden at the time of her abdication (Pastorello 1922, XVII). Du Fresne’s collection contained c. 22000 volumes including 107 Greek and 91 Latin manuscripts (Callmer 1977, 74–76 and Delisle 1868, 269–270). In 1662 the collection was sold to the Royal Library in Paris. According to Élisabeth Pellegrin (1986, 202 & 208), the Paris manuscript would have been in the library of Pierre Michon Bourdelot, Queen Christina’s physician when Trichet du Fresne was working for the Queen. Bourdelot’s library was sold to Christina in 1654 (Nilsson Nylander 2011, 59–60).
45 In Muratori’s edition (see note 10 above) the extract has the title “Andreae Danduli tomus secundus incipit cum continuatione Raphayni Caresini D. Benintendio Ravagnino Magno Cancellario Venetiarum”.
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can, lat. 5286 (fourteenth century) and lat. 5842 (fifteenth century). A series of later copies also contain the three texts.

**Conclusion**

The study of Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria, J.IV.7 gives important new information on the early circulation of Andrea Dandolo’s *Chronica per extensum descripta*. Its layout and decoration highlight the three-tiered structure of the text more clearly than the oldest extant copy, Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. Z. 400 (=2028). Moreover, the partial rubrication of the Turin ms. shows an interest towards material pertaining to the local history.

The comparison between the Turin manuscript and the *Chronica Venetiarum* attributed to Benintendi de’ Ravagnani indicates that the two texts are closely connected. Consequently, the *Chronica Venetiarum* cannot derive from the Marciana manuscript, the assumed working copy of the *Extensa*. The study of these texts has also revealed a series of Turin readings unregistered in the modern edition. It is necessary, therefore, to examine at least the Turin manuscript when studying texts connected to the *Extensa*.

The Turin manuscript also contains one of the key copies of Caresini’s chronicle, quite obviously linked to the manuscripts Venice, Biblioteca del Museo Correr, Provenienze Diverse 142c and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 5874. The combination of texts in the Turin manuscripts furthermore suggests that it is the archetype of several later copies. Hence, a thorough analysis of the later copies would probably uncover plenty of new data on the reception of Dandolo’s historical works.
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