



ACTA HISTRIAE

32, 2024, 4



UDK/UDC 94(05)

ISSN 1318-0185
e-ISSN 2591-1767



Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko - Koper
Società storica del Litorale - Capodistria

ACTA HISTRIAE

32, 2024, 4

KOPER 2024

ISSN 1318-0185
e-ISSN 2591-1767

UDK/UDC 94(05)

Letnik 32, leto 2024, številka 4

**Odgovorni urednik/
Direttore responsabile/
Editor in Chief:**

Darko Darovec

**Uredniški odbor/
Comitato di redazione/
Board of Editors:**

Gorazd Bajc, Furio Bianco (IT), Flavij Bonin, Paolo Broggio (IT), Stuart Carroll (UK), Àngel Casals Martínez (ES), Alessandro Casellato (IT), Dragica Čeč, Lovorka Čoralić (HR), Darko Darovec, Marco Fincardi (IT), Darko Friš, Aleksej Kalc, Borut Klabjan, Urška Lampe, Amanda Madden (USA), John Martin (USA), Robert Matijašić (HR), Aleš Maver, Darja Mihelič, Edward Muir (USA), Jeppe Büchert Netterstrøm (DK), Žiga Oman, Egon Pelikan, Luciano Pezzolo (IT), Jože Pirjevec, Claudio Povolito (IT), Marijan Premović (MNE), Colin Rose (CA), Luca Rossetto (IT), Vida Rožac Darovec, Tamara Scheer (AT), Polona Tratnik, Boštjan Udovič, Marta Verginella, Nancy M. Wingfield (USA), Salvator Žitko.

**Uredniki/Redattori/
Editors:**

Žiga Oman, Urška Lampe, Boštjan Udovič, Jasmina Rejec

**Prevodi/Traduzioni/
Translations:**

Cecilia Furioso Cenci (it.), Žiga Oman (angl.)

**Lektorji/Supervisione/
Language Editors:**

Žiga Oman (angl., slo.), Cecilia Furioso Cenci (it.)

**Izdajatelj/Editori/
Published by:**

Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko - Koper / Società storica del Litorale - Capodistria® / Institut IRRIS za raziskave, razvoj in strategije družbe, kulture in okolja / Institute IRRIS for Research, Development and Strategies of Society, Culture and Environment / Istituto IRRIS di ricerca, sviluppo e strategie della società, cultura e ambiente®

Sedež/Sede/Address:

Zgodovinsko društvo za južno Primorsko, SI-6000, Koper-Capodistria, Garibaldijeva 18 / Via Garibaldi 18, e-mail: actahistriae@gmail.com; https://zdjp.si/en/p/actahistriae/

Tisk/Stampa/Print:

Založništvo PADRE d.o.o.

Naklada/Tiratura/Copies:

300 izvodov/copie/copies

**Finančna podpora/
Supporto finanziario/
Financially supported by:**

Javna agencija za znanstvenoraziskovalno in inovacijsko dejavnost Republike Slovenije / Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency

**Slika na naslovnici/
Foto di copertina/
Picture on the cover:**

Skalne poslikave v Hekimdere pri vasi Çiçekli v okrožju İlkizdere v provinci Rize v Turčiji / Pitture rupestri a Hekimdere, vicino al villaggio di Çiçekli, nel distretto di İlkizdere della provincia di Rize in Turchia / Hekimdere Rock Depictions near the village of Çiçekli in the İlkizdere district of the Rize province in Türkiye (foto/photo: Okay Pekşen, 2022).

Redakcija te številke je bila zaključena 15. decembra 2024.

Revija Acta Histriae je vključena v naslednje podatkovne baze / Gli articoli pubblicati in questa rivista sono inclusi nei seguenti indici di citazione / Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in: CLARIVATE ANALYTICS (USA): Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI), Social Scisearch, Arts and Humanities Citation Index (A&HCI), Journal Citation Reports / Social Sciences Edition (USA); IBZ, Internationale Bibliographie der Zeitschriftenliteratur (GER); International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS) (UK); Referativnyi Zhurnal Viniti (RUS); European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS); Elsevier B. V.: SCOPUS (NL); DOAJ.

To delo je objavljeno pod licenco / Quest'opera è distribuita con Licenza / This work is licensed under a Creative Commons BY-NC 4.0.



Navodila avtorjem in vsi članki v barvni verziji so prosto dostopni na spletni strani: <https://zdjp.si>.
Le norme redazionali e tutti gli articoli nella versione a colori sono disponibili gratuitamente sul sito: <https://zdjp.si/it/>.
The submission guidelines and all articles are freely available in color via website [http: https://zdjp.si/en/](https://zdjp.si/en/).



VSEBINA / INDICE GENERALE / CONTENTS

Okay Pekşen & Yasin Topaloğlu: A New Rock	
Art Area in Anatolia: Hekimdere Rock Depictions	459
<i>Una nuova area di arte rupestre in Anatolia: le pitture rupestri di Hekimdere</i>	
<i>Novo območje skalne umetnosti v Anatoliji: skalne upodobitve v Hekimdere</i>	
Marija Mogorović Crljenko & Danijela Doblanović Šuran:	
Households in the Rovinj Census of 1595/6	495
<i>Le famiglie secondo il censimento di Rovigno del 1595/6</i>	
<i>Gospodinjstva po rovinjskem popisu prebivalstva iz let 1595/1596</i>	
Jurij Perovšek: Kulturnobojni značaj Jutra v dvajsetih	
letih 20. stoletja – kritični premisleki	521
<i>La lotta culturale di Jutro negli anni venti del XX secolo –</i>	
<i>riflessioni critiche</i>	
<i>The Cultural-Struggle Character of Jutro in the 1920s –</i>	
<i>Critical Reflections</i>	
Gorazd Bajc, Tomaž Hvala & Darko Friš:	
Prispevek k biografiji Franca Snoja – ameriška leta, 1941–1943	559
<i>Contributo alla biografia di Franc Snoj – il periodo americano, 1941–1943</i>	
<i>Contribution to the Biography of Franc Snoj – American Years, 1941–1943</i>	
Tomaž Čelig: Prispevek k poznavanju sovjetskih vojaškopoličnih	
groženj in pomoči Zahoda Jugoslaviji v obdobju 1948–1951	607
<i>Contributo alla conoscenza delle minacce politico-militari sovietiche e</i>	
<i>dell'assistenza dell'Occidente alla Jugoslavia nel periodo 1948–1951</i>	
<i>Contribution to the Understanding of Soviet Military-Political</i>	
<i>Threats and Western Aid to Yugoslavia in the Period 1948–1951</i>	
Petra Grabovec, Špela Chomicki & Tomaž Kladnik:	
Dogajanje na območju Halož v obdobju vojne za obrambo	
suverenosti Republike Slovenije leta 1991	631
<i>Gli avvenimenti nella regione di Haloze durante la guerra per</i>	
<i>la difesa della sovranità della Repubblica di Slovenia nel 1991</i>	
<i>Events in the Haloze Region During the War for the Defence of the</i>	
<i>Sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia in 1991</i>	

Milena Dževerdanović Pejović: Maritime Archetypes of Montenegrin Women: Heroism and Solitude	657
<i>Gli archetipi del rapporto tra la donna montenegrina e il mare: eroismo e solitudine</i>	
<i>Pomorski arhetipi crnogorskih žensk: junaštvo in samota</i>	

POROČILA

RELAZIONI

REPORTS

Veronika Kos: Symposium Report on <i>Violence, Justice and Reconciliation in the Mediterranean of the Three Religions: Peacemaking in the Christian, Muslim and Jewish Context (16th–19th Century)</i> , 14–15 November 2024, Rome	683
---	-----

Angelika Ergaver: Conference Report on <i>Facing Foreigners in Urban Early Modern Europe: Legislation, Deliberation, Practice</i> , 27–29 November 2024, Maribor	687
---	-----

HOUSEHOLDS IN THE ROVINJ CENSUS OF 1595/6

Marija MOGOROVIĆ CRLJENKO

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Faculty of Humanities, Aldo Negri 6, 52100 Pula, Croatia
e-mail: mmogorov@unipu.hr

Danijela DOBLANOVIĆ ŠURAN

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Faculty of Humanities, Aldo Negri 6, 52100 Pula, Croatia
e-mail: ddoblanovic@unipu.hr

ABSTRACT

This paper continues the analysis of the first known census of Rovinj from 1595/6. It examines the size and type of households, as well as the number of children within them. Households were analyzed in terms of their composition and number. The analysis revealed that the most common households were simple ones, consisting of a married couple (or a widow/widower) and their children, while multiple households with two married couples living under the same roof were very rare. Additionally, the census included household support staff and animals. The paper explores which households had specific types of support staff, the relationship between the presence of auxiliary staff and the animals related to a household, and whether auxiliary staff were more common in council families or others.

Key words: Rovinj, Istria, census 1595/6, population

LE FAMIGLIE SECONDO IL CENSIMENTO DI ROVIGNO DEL 1595/6

SINTESI

Il presente contributo continua l'analisi del primo censimento noto di Rovinj/Rovigno del 1595/6. Esso esamina le dimensioni e il tipo di nuclei familiari, nonché il numero di bambini al loro interno. Le famiglie sono state analizzate in termini di composizione e numero di membri. Lo studio ha rivelato che i nuclei familiari più comuni erano quelli semplici, composti da una coppia sposata (o da un/a vedovo/a) e dai loro figli, mentre erano molto rare le famiglie multiple, comprendenti due coppie sposate che vivevano sotto lo stesso tetto. Inoltre, il censimento include il personale ausiliario e gli animali. Vengono analizzati diversi tipi di relazione: la presenza di personale ausiliario nelle varie famiglie, il rapporto tra il personale ausiliario e gli animali e la presenza di personale ausiliario nelle famiglie dei consiglieri rispetto alle rimanenti.

Parole chiave: Rovigno, Istria, censimento del 1595/6, popolazione

INTRODUCTION¹

Rovinj/Rovigno is situated on a stretch of land that was once an islet off the gentle Istrian coast, later connected to the mainland by a dike. Together with Pula/Pola and Poreč/Parenzo, Rovinj served as a vital stop along the Adriatic crossing from Venice, forming part of the maritime route down the Eastern Adriatic toward the Mediterranean. By the late fifteenth century, Rovinj was thriving and expanding in every way, experiencing demographic growth from the Late Middle Ages through to the end of the early modern period (Mlacović, Mogorović Crljenko & Doblanović Šuran, 2019, 158).

In the first part of our study (Mogorović Crljenko & Doblanović Šuran, 2024), we gave a description of the oldest known population census of Rovinj from 1595/6, talked about its credibility, analyzed the structure of households, the number of children, domestic staff in households, and the animals (species, number, and owners) that were recorded in the mentioned census. In this work, also based on data from the Rovinj census of 1595/6, we analyze the origin of the population based on surnames, i.e. adjectives appearing in the mentioned census, then the titles of household heads, households of councilor families and names of household heads.

Let us recall that in the nineteenth century the census was stored in the Municipal Archives of Rovinj (*Archivio Municipale di Rovigno*) under the title *Rovigno 1595 Descrittione di tutti gli abitanti di Rovigno et di animali* (Benussi, 1886, 138). Today, this census, along with others from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is preserved in the State Archives in Rijeka (DARI-284, book (hereafter: b.) 1. The census consists of 56 numbered pages, with this note written on the last page: *Tratta dal Volume civile del N. H. S. [nobil homo signor] Giacomo Minotto fu podestà Precessore esistente in questo pubblico Archivio di Rovigno. Florio Spongia Nodaro Pubblico e Vice Archivista*. The first 60 entries are dated 1595 and the rest of the census is dated March 31, 1596. However, it is certain that the census (i.e., the rest of the census) could not have been conducted in a single day, so it is more likely that the census lasted for a time and that in the end the date of its completion was recorded.²

HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND COMPOSITION

In the census were recorded 539 households, and the analysis will show what kind of households prevailed in Rovinj at the end of the sixteenth century.

Although the birth-rate was high in the pre-modern period, with maximum advantage taken of women's fertile years, households were ultimately not very large. This was primarily due to the high mortality rate for both infants and

1 This paper was co-funded by the Croatian Science Foundation under project no. IP-2019-04-2055 "Topography of Power: Eastern Adriatic Cities in Medieval Spheres of Power" (TOPOS) and Institutional project of Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Faculty of Humanities: "Population of Rovinj in the Early Modern Period."

2 Cf. the Introduction in Mogorović Crljenko and Doblanović Šuran (2024).

young children, particularly during their first and up to their fifth year of life. Raising children to adulthood was generally challenging, because many diseases, particularly those affecting the stomach and intestines, such as severe diarrhea, posed significant threats. These health issues often led to widespread mortality, exacerbated by poverty and hunger. Miroslav Bertoša noted that raising a child was often an expensive “investment” and that the death of a child caused less trauma than the death of a head of livestock, whose loss could jeopardize an entire family’s survival (Bertoša, 1995, 722–723; 2002, 315–316). This situation was also evident in Rovinj, as indicated by the Rovinj baptismal and death registers from that period (Drandić, 2020). The census data reveals that Rovinj families were not very large: 61.2% of households had 2–5 members, 32.3% had 6–9 members, and only 2.8% of households had more than 10 members (cf. Tables 3 and 4). A similar trend is observed in the 1596 census for Novigrad/Cittanova, Brtonigla/Verteneglio, and Tar/Torre (Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 67–68). It is important to note that household members included not only blood relatives but also domestic staff.

The census of 1595/6 reveals various household structures that align with the standard classifications of nuclear, extended and multiple families, as well as single and unstructured households. Within these broad categories, several subcategories may be distinguished. Among nuclear households, there are those consisting solely of a married couple, those with a married couple and their children, and those of widowers or widows with their children. Each of these can further be divided into households with and without domestic staff. Similarly, the census identifies extended households. These include households consisting of a married couple with children and other relatives (in most cases with the married couple and their children lives also the head of the household mother or his brothers and sisters, nephews, etc.), a married couple without children but with other relatives, a widower or widow with children and relatives, and a widower or widow without children but with relatives. Each of these configurations can also include domestic staff. Multiple households are also recorded, consisting two married couples with or without children, or a married couple with or without children living with a widower or widow with children. Finally, the census lists single households and unstructured households.

An analysis of household structure in Rovinj at the end of the sixteenth century reveals that nuclear families predominated, account for 77.7% of households. Among these nuclear families, the most common configuration was a married couple with children, and possibly domestic staff. Extended families accounted for 13.7% of households, while multiple families (2.6%), single households (3.7%), and unstructured households (2.2%) were extremely few (Tables 4 and 5). This household structure aligns with the broader Mediterranean context. A nuclear family, consisting of one married couple and their children, and occasionally servants, was typical among the lower social strata, particularly craftsmen and merchants. Conversely, the multiple family was ideal among the upper social classes, who aimed to preserve their patrimony.

In such families, sons inherited the family business, often based on consistent sources of wealth, such as trade. Among poorer commoners, including artisans, merchants, and sailors—who generally relied on their own labor—the nuclear family structure was prevalent (Janeković Römer, 1994, 21–29).

Hajnal proposed a cultural division of European space based on demographic behavior and family and household formation (Hajnal, 1965; 1982, 449–452). He identified two primary marriage patterns: a “Western” or “European” model and an “Eastern” or “non-European” model (Hajnal, 1965). In the European model, the nuclear family is predominant, and individuals marry later. This pattern is most common in northwestern Europe, including the Scandinavian countries (excluding Finland but including Iceland), the British Isles, the Netherlands, northern France, and German-speaking regions (Hajnal, 1982, 449–450).

Peter Laslett analyzed family structure typologies within a spatial framework, dividing Europe into four macro-regions: Western, West-central, Mediterranean, and Eastern (Laslett, 1983, 513–563; Sovič, Thane & Viazzo, 2016, 3). In the 1990s, these geographical determinants were completely overcome. David Kertzer concluded that “the whole enterprise of branding major areas of Europe as having a particular type of household system” was ultimately misleading (Kertzer, 1991, 155–179). Čapo Žmegač emphasised that

the proposed regional generalizations simplify reality by overlooking complexities and differences in space (regional differences), in time (different historical periods) and in socio-economic circumstances (within regions) (Čapo Žmegač, 1996, 187).

It should be noted that French family historians and historical demographers have never regarded geography as a distinguishing factor in their analyses (Čapo Žmegač, 1996, 187–188). The example of Dubrovnik is both important and significant in this case. Although Dubrovnik functioned as a micro-region, it exhibited a diversity of family models that challenges the geographical criteria proposed by Hajnal and Laslett. Differences in family structures are evident across various dimensions: urban versus rural areas, islands versus mainland, social and economic status (nobility, craftsmen, farmers), and religious affiliation (Catholics, Orthodox, Jews) (Stipetić & Vekarić, 2004, 108–109). Family structure varies with time and demographic trends, is influenced by economic factors, and represents only one phase in the family life cycle (Herlihy & Klapisch-Zuber, 1985, 290–319; Janeković Römer, 1989, 173). For instance, in the household of 26-year-old Antonio Sponza, his wife and son lived with him, along with his mother and his 16-year-old brother (DARI, b. 1, Census 1595/6, p. 32). At the time of the census, this household was an extended family, which may have been a multiple family unit when Antonio’s father, Francesco, was alive. In a few years, however, following his mother’s passing or his brother’s marriage, it could become either a simple or multiple family household again.

The Rovinj census 1595/6 clearly reflects the predominance of nuclear

households in Rovinj, characterized by spouses and their children living under the same roof. Most two-member households were nuclear families; in 50.9% (28 out of 55) of cases, they consisted of spouses, while 40% consisted of a widower or widow with one child (18 widows and 4 widowers). Households with 3 to 6 members were the most common, accounting for two-thirds (67.2%) of all households and accommodating 62.5% of the individuals recorded in the census. Three-member households often represented the initial stage of family life, although they could also indicate various other stages of family development. This is suggested by the average age of the heads of three-member households, which is almost five years younger than the average age of all household heads. The census typically recorded the age of male household heads, with the overall average age being approximately 41.3 years, while for three-member households, it was 36.8 years. A significant proportion of three-member households consisted of spouses with one child (63%, or 52 out of 82), widowers with children (9.75%, or 8 out of 82), and widows with children (20.7%, or 17 out of 82). Among four-person households, the most common configuration was spouses with children (62.2%, or 61 out of 98), followed by widows with children (23.5%, or 23 out of 98), and widowers with children (3 out of 98).

Two-thirds of five-member households consisted of spouses with children (63 out of 95) or one spouse with children (11 widows and one widower). The census recorded a slightly more than a dozen (11.6%, 11 out of 95) extended families (in addition to spouses and the household head's mother, brother, sister, or mother-in-law).

The nuclear family also prevailed in six-member households, where 62% (54 out of 87) consisted of spouses and their children) and 12.6% widows and widowers with children (8 widows, 3 widowers) and possible servants.

Seven-member households also mostly consisted of nuclear families, spouses and children or surviving spouses and children (75.7%: 2 widowers with children and 26 couples with children). Almost 80% of eight-member households also consisted of nuclear families: 3 widows with seven children and 20 married couples with children and possible servants (23 out of 29). Among the nine-member households, only one was multiple (the owner and his wife with children, the owner's son with his wife and children), while the rest were nuclear, with spouses and children (17) and sometimes servants (3 cases). It is interesting to note that there are fewer female household heads as the number of household members increases (Tables 2 and 7).

Censuses from this period are exceptionally rare. However, those that have been preserved and analyzed indicate a similar trend across other Istrian areas, where nuclear families were predominant. For instance, they accounted for a significant portion (90,9%) in Novigrad in 1596 (DAPA-4, b. 41, f. 675–681; Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 30–31, 67–68) and 77.7% in Savičenta in 1613 (Doblanović, 2017, 123). Jasna Čapo Žmegač (1996, 191) suggested that socio-economic differentiation likely explains the prevalence of simple (nuclear) households among urban

populations, while complex households were more common in nearby villages. Yet, Savičenta stands out from this pattern, as nuclear families dominated both in the town center and in the surrounding villages on the Grimani family's rural Venetian estate (Doblanović, 2017, 123).

In towns and cities along the eastern Adriatic coast, previous research indicates that nuclear families were predominant especially among members of the lower social strata, small craftsmen and merchants (Janeković Römer, 1994, 22–25; Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 67–68). Occasionally, multiple-family households appeared among the upper classes—for instance, in Dubrovnik and certain Istrian cities like Poreč (Janeković Römer, 1989, 173–175; 1994, 25–39; Uljančić, 2019, 64). However, most common citizens lived in nuclear families. Given that the commoners in Istrian towns worked as farmers, fishermen, and various types of craftsmen, it is challenging to attribute the prevalence of nuclear families to any specific economic activity (Mlacović, Mogorović Crljenko & Doblanović Šuran, 2019, 163; Mogorović Crljenko, 2019, 190–197).

It is clear that in medieval and early modern Istria, the population was predominantly poor, meaning that most people—from the upper social classes to the lower—had to work to earn their livelihood (cf. Bertoša, 1995, 304–413, 722–724; Mogorović Crljenko, 2012a, 107–122, 249–250). This implies that people could not rely on inherited wealth to sustain them and instead depended on their own labor.

This is indirectly supported by the institution of the Istrian marriage pattern, which was the most common form of marriage, alongside the coexisting Slavic pattern and, to a much lesser extent, the Venetian marriage pattern. This practice was outlined in the statutes of Istrian towns (municipal codes). In the Istrian marriage pattern, the couple agreed on the property each would bring into the marriage. They managed this property together during the marriage (neither spouse could sell any property, particularly real estate, without the consent of the other), and upon the death of one spouse, the surviving spouse inherited half of the deceased's property (cf. Margetić, 1970, 279–308; 1996, 64–99; Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 15–38; 2012b, 21–29).

It is also worth noting that the households with animals (149) were predominantly simple family structures (spouses and children, spouses without children or widows with children), only they mostly had support staff (111 out of 149 were nuclear families), as shown below.

Children

Despite the high child mortality rate, children accounted for a significant portion of the population in the pre-modern period, and Rovinj was no exception. Determining the threshold age to classify someone as a child or adult during this period is crucial. Typically, this would constitute the point at which children come of age, allowing them to marry or become emancipated. Accord-

ing to canon law, girls reached this age at 12 and boys at 14. Secular codes generally aligned with these ages, as evidenced by most Istrian statutes (municipal codes), which set the age of majority for girls between 12 and 14 and for boys at 14 or 15. Some statutes stipulated these ages as the minimum for marriage, but stated that young people could not dispose of assets until a later age, with some statutes setting this at 18 (Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 85–88). An earlier census for Novigrad from 1538 lists only men, starting from the age of 15 onwards (DAPA-4, b. 41, f. 309–312). Consequently, the age range between 14 and 18 can be seen as a transitional phase. During this period, individuals living in a household with their parents who were not yet emancipated, i.e., not yet married, were still considered children.

According to the census, children under the age of 10 constituted nearly a third (29%) of Rovinj's population. Children aged 10 to 13 accounted for 10.4%, and those aged 14 to 17 accounted for 9.6%. Therefore, 39.6% of the population was under the age of 14, and nearly half (49.1%) were under the age of 18. The census data for Novigrad, Brtonigla, and Tar from the same year (1596) show similar results. In Novigrad, children made up 45.85% of the population, in Brtonigla 48.16%, and in Tar 45.16% (Mogorović Crljenko, 2006, 88). However, in these records, children are not categorized by age or gender but are listed collectively in a column labelled *putti*. Consequently, it is impossible to determine the percentages of children in different age groups or whether this information pertains to those under 14 or under 18. For comparison, in Tuscany during the first half of the fifteenth century—about 150 years before the Rovinj census—children under the age of 15 made up 36% of the population (Klapisch-Zuber, 1987, 98–99).

Domestic staff

Servants were recorded in 7.2% of households from the 1595/6 census. Servants and the number of animals in the household were closely related. The households that had the most servants also had the most animals. Among the households in which there were servants (39), in as many as 77% (30) of the cases these were also those that had animals. *Famigli* were the most common. In households without livestock, they are not recorded, that is why we can assume that *fameglio* refers to shepherds. They were listed with 23 households, where there were 50 in total. Their age was declared in 39 cases, and on average they were 24.5 years old. The youngest was 9 and the oldest 46 years old. About 64% of the animals recorded in the census are associated with households that had shepherds. As many as seven of them are listed in the list along with *ser* Pietro Longo's household, which consisted of him, his wife and five children, and they had 800 sheep (*animali minuti*), 3 mares, 7 cows and 6 young bulls (*manzi*).

Ser Bernardin Vendrame's household consisted of himself and his wife and seven servants: 6 *famegli* and one *massara*. They were the second larg-

est household with 3 mares, 4 bulls and 560 sheep. In that case, the *famegli* were certainly shepherds. In terms of the number of animals, the household of Pietro Iotta, son of the late *ser* Domenico, followed. His household consisted of himself and his wife, their three children, and four *famegli* who took care of 2 horses, 2 young bulls and 520 sheep. In addition to his wife and daughter, *ser* Zuanne Gambelo also had four *famegli* in his household who took care of 50 horses and 110 cows.

In the census, 10 housemaids/maids (*massera*) were also recorded in the households of *ser* Zuanne Ciprioto, *ser* Bernardino Vendreame, *ser* Bortolo Da Fasana, *ser* Gabriele di Vescovi, son of the late *Piero*, *ser* Antonio Albanese, *miser* Zuanne Da Capodistria, *ser* Iacomo Lussino, *miser* Giusto Sponza, Pietro Calafà and Antonio Fachinetto. Eight of the 10 household heads who had housemaids/maids were recorded as *ser* or *miser*, and the other two were the notary Facchinetti and, given the surname, a master shipwright (Calafà). Maids were rarely recorded with their age (4). When the age was listed, they were between 16 and 22 years old. They were not the only domestic staff in three households. Thus, *ser* Zuanne Ciprioto, in addition to a 16-year-old girl as a maid, also had two *famegli* aged 13 and 22. In the household of 60-year-old *ser* Bernardin Vendrame and his wife, a 22-year-old girl worked as a maid, and they also had 6 shepherds between the ages of 9 and 40 who took care of 14 *quarnara* of sheep (560 sheep), four young bulls and three horses. There was also a servant (*servitor*) in the household of Antonio Albanese and his wife in addition to the maid. Sometimes the maids were the only women in the household. For example, *miser* Giusto Sponza (52 years old) and his four sons between the ages of 17 and 23 had a maid whose age was not specified.

The census also includes three households, those of *miser* Marco Cipriotto, Tomasin Biondo and Domenego Veniero, in which there were apprentices (*garzon*). The age of two is given: 14 and 16 years. The trades of the aforementioned household heads are not known. Only Marco Cipriotto is recorded as a *mistro*. Also noteworthy is that the household of Tomasin Biondo included, besides his two sons and a 14-year-old apprentice, two more young people (*un zovane et un altro*) without any indication of their relationship or role in the household. They were probably also apprentices, since no livestock was listed in this household.

Fanti were recorded in five households. One each in the households of Domenego Di Rocco and Matia Zaccaria, two in the household of Simon Malusa and three each in the households of *miser* Zuanbattista Basilisco and Tomaso Zonta. Only this latter household was associated with numerous livestock (4 horses, 4 young bulls, 18 cows and 160 sheep), while other households had few or no livestock at all. For example, Domenego Di Rocco had none at all, while Basilisco had a single horse. The boys probably performed numerous other tasks besides those pertaining to livestock. In one household, the female version of *fante*, *fantesca*, was also recorded. This was a 16-year-old girl who was a member of the household of the

Medelin spouses, which also included a married couple with the surname Bronzin (Nadalín and his wife with a child).

Working as a servant or laborer in a household in the early modern period was a common phase in the lives of many young people. As young people, regardless of social status, and only at an early age, become servants, they are labeled with the phrase life-cycle servants, although among them still predominate those from poorer backgrounds and from large families who had many siblings, or those who were orphans or abandoned as children (Čapo Žmegač, 1996, 181; Hajnal 1982, 473; Laslett, 1977, 24–35, 45–47; Janeković Römer, 1994, 40–42, 111–125; 2012, 18–19; Stojan, 2003, 261–288; Budak, 2021, 261–288; Andrić, 2018, 192–202; Kralj-Brassard, 2013, 238; Ladić, 2011, 69–70, 78–79). The sources sometimes speak very candidly about such practices. For example, Mattio Sincovich from Motovun moved to Savičenta and was a *fameio* to Iuri Sabglic. He was accused and had to defend himself before the captain in Savičenta for illegally felling trees. When asked why he came from Motovun to the Savičenta area, he said that he was from a large family, that he had many brothers, and that he came to Sabglic who was alone (*Io mi son partito del territorio di Montona perche siamo assai fratelli et pur assai in famiglia, et son venuto a star con il ditto mio Missier perche l'è solo*). He also said that he had negotiated with Sabglic and almost agreed to stay with him for ten years, after which he should receive a third of his property, but that they had not concluded a contract since then (*Io non sto altrimenti con lui per fameglio, ma son statto a parlimento con lui, et quasi accordato con lui a starvi dieci anni, et che poi io habbia il terzo di tutto il suo, ma anchora non habbiamo fatto il scritto dell'accordo*) (ASVe, Grimali e Barbarigo, b. 40, Charges against Mattio Sincovich, 1568).³ It is also evident from the Rovinj census of 1595/6 that the councilor families did not necessarily have a great deal of support staff or many animals, nor were they necessarily wealthy. Most of them did not have animals or only had a small number. It is possible that they were engaged in some other business, trade or seafaring, which was not recorded in the census. It is also likely, at least according to the value of monetary wedding gifts (*basadego*), that many were not wealthy, but only preserved their reputation (Mogorović Crljenko & Doblanović, 2015, 256–263; Mogorović Crljenko, 2019, 190–205). On the other hand, the more affluent included certain newcomers and citizens who engaged in certain trades, commerce, seafaring or owned animals.

Animals in the census

Out of the 539 households enumerated, 149 of them (27.6%) possessed domestic animals, including horses, mares, donkeys, bulls (*manzi*), cattle (*bovini*), cows (*vacche*), and sheep. The total number of animals recorded was 4,767. Additionally, the term *animali minuti* is sometimes mentioned in the sources,

3 The above-mentioned archival materials have not been organized, so the folios are not numbered.

referring to small livestock, while *animali grossi*, referring to large livestock, was rarely recorded. *Animali minuti* are typically listed by the designation of *quarnari*, suggesting sheep, which were traditionally counted in flocks of forty. When small livestock are mentioned without specifying the unit of measure, it is likely a reference to flocks consisting of both sheep and goats, even if goats are not explicitly mentioned.

The census recorded 173 horses/mares, 40 donkeys, 219 young bulls (*manzi*), 15 head of cattle (*bovini*),⁴ 681 cows and 3,084 small animals or small livestock (402 recorded as *pegore* and 2,835 as *animali menudi*). Small livestock accounted for almost 68% of the total number of animals in the census. By way of comparison, small livestock accounted for 92% of the total in the Zadar area (Zadar, Nin and Novigrad) in the 1560s (Fabijanec, 2015, 71). Slightly more than 10% of households (67/539 or 12,4%) had a horse (59) or mare (9). Most often, it was approximately one (45 or 67.2%) or two horses or mares (14 or 21%). Two households had a significantly larger number of horses/mares: *ser* Zuanne Gambello had 50 horses while Tomasin Bodi had 28 mares. Six other households had between 3 to 5 horses or mares. Some, like Pietro Longo (3 mares and 800 sheep) or Bernardino Vendrame (3 horses and 560 sheep) also had many sheep. Horses probably accompanied the flocks of sheep and served as a means of transport when the summer highs occurred, i.e., when the flocks returned home in the fall. Donkeys were rarer. There were 37 households (33 with one and 4 with two donkeys). In 27 households, a donkey was the only animal connected to the recorded household. Tommasini stated of them that they were used (by the poor) to transport wood and water: *Per la necessità dei poveri si allevano molti asini che portano legna, ed acqua nelle terre; muli di raro ne ho veduti* (Tomasini, 1837, 89).

There were a total of 215 young bulls (*manzi*) distributed in 93 households. Most often (65) there were two to a household. Oxen (*bovini*) were recorded in only seven households, usually one or two, while Domenego Medelin had five.

There were significantly more cows (*vacche*): a total of 601 in 16 households.⁵ *Ser* Zuanne Gambello had the most (110), who also had 50 mares and 160 sheep. Domenego Gambello, son of the late Domenego, Domenego Bodi and Nicolo Bodi each had 80 cows and 4 young bulls (*manzi*). Domenego Segala had 60 cows, two horses, two bulls (*bovini*) and 100 sheep, and *donna* Filippa Gaiarduzza, who lived in a household with three sons, had 54 cows, 2 horses and two bulls (*bovini*).

Cows were also significant to households of Nicolo Medelino (40), *ser* Iseppo Rota (25), Bernardino Medelino (20), *miser* Francesco Pergolis (18), Tomas Zonta (18), who also had 160 sheep, four horses and four young bulls (*manzi*), Francesco Ferrarese (10), *ser* Piero Longo (7), who also owned a huge flock of sheep (800), Mattio Branovichio (6) and Mattio da Pedena (3). In addition to the household of *ser*

4 This probably refers to oxen.

5 In one case, 4 *animali grossi* are recorded in a household. They were counted among the cows.

Nadalin Sponza, four large animals (*animali grossi*) were recorded.⁶

Sheep are very useful domestic animals that produce milk, cheese, meat, fat, wool and hides. It may be said that a household which had sheep also had a steady source of food as well as raw materials to make clothing and footwear. They also had something to trade. In his records of Istria in the mid-seventeenth century, Bishop Tomasini confirmed that:

Maggior utile cavano dalle pecore, e capre, poichè oltre li frutti hanno il formaggio, e le lane. Il formaggio non sanno far bene, nè durerebbe mescolando il latte di capre con quel di pecore, e per altra cagione non val cosa veruna, e si guasta. Non cavano buttiro nè altre poine, ed in alcun luogo alcune salate si fanno assai bene nella primavera. Tosano due volte le pecore, d'aprile e di s. Michele. La loro lana è grossa e resta nel paese per far panno di griso per gli abitanti, non riescendo per Materazzi (Tomasini, 1837, 88).⁷

Little milk was consumed in the Middle Ages but cheese, both fresh and dried, was, in considerable quantities. Most cheese was made from sheep or goat milk. It was only in the eighteenth century that bovine milk assumed primacy in Northern and Western Europe and became more highly valued than goat and sheep milk (Pastoureau, 2011, 140). According to the 1595/6 census, sheep were specifically registered in Rovinj in conjunction with five households, while in another 13 cases *animali menudi* were recorded. Massimo Montanari stated that behind sheep, goats and pigs are concealed by that term (Montanari, 2012, 37). Writing about *animali minuti*, Bishop Tomasini noted: *Li minuti sono pecore, capre, castrati e porci* (Tomasini, 1837, 87). However, we may justifiably assume and conclude that in the Rovinj census sheep are concealed behind term *animali menudi/minuti* when the unit of measurement is recorded as *quarnaro* herds, but when the latter is not explicitly stated, then it refers to sheep and goats. However, goats as such are not listed separately.⁸ For example, Ivan of Buzet (*Zuanne da Pinquente*) was recorded as having *anemali menudi quarnara 5*, while *ser* Pietro Longo had *animali minuti quarnara 20* and Bernardino Vendrame had only *quarnara 14* without any mention of sheep or *animali minuti*.

Data on animals from the 1595/6 census are an indicator of a household's assets. Combined with other sources, they provide insight into the status of a person in society. For example, the aforementioned Piero Longo married Col-

6 Tomasini (1837, 87) writes that *animali grossi* are *bovi, vacche, vitelli e cavalli*.

7 "They derive the greatest profit from sheep and goats, as in addition to the produce, they obtain cheese and wool. However, they do not know how to make cheese well, nor would it last when mixing goat's milk with sheep's milk, and, for other reasons, it is of no value and spoils. They do not produce butter or other dairy products, although in some places, some salted cheeses are made quite well in the spring. Sheep are sheared twice, in April and on St. Michael's Day. Their wool is coarse and remains in the area to make gray cloth for the inhabitants, as it is not suitable for finer textiles" (Tomasini, 1837, 88).

8 Very often, due to legal regulations, goats were counted among the sheep.

Iota Sponzalin on November 5, 1570, to whom he gave 12 ducats as a wedding gift. The Rovinj Register of Marriages recorded five weddings in which the brides were their daughters. The first, Francesca (February 21, 1590) married *ser* Francesco Ferarese, son of *ser* Luca, and no wedding gift was recorded. Zaneta married Piero Ive, son of *ser* Hieronimo, on August 6, 1598. She received 15 scudi (*scudi*) as a wedding gift. Euphemia married Giacomo Iotta on February 26, 1604 and received 5 ducats as a wedding gift, and Antonia married Zuanne Rota on September 2, 1610 and received as much as 20 ducats from *miser* Iseppo. The last wedding was that of *donna* Francesca, and her father, *ser* Piero Longo, had already died by then. It is not stated that she was a widow, but since a daughter named Francesca had already married in 1590, it may be assumed that this was the same person. She married Zuane Vidotto and received 10 ducats as a wedding gift.

From the Rovinj Register of Deaths, we learn that the son of Pietro Longo (Griguor) was buried on May 23, 1590, and 12 lire were paid for his burial. Pietro's wife died on September 30, 1591, and for her burial and masses later offered for the salvation of her soul, the local cathedral chapter received a donation of 12 lira and 8 small *soldi*, which was a rather generous sum compared to the contributions for other deceased people.⁹ In addition to the children and wife of *ser* Pietro Longo, the burial of persons from the ranks of the servants in his household was also recorded. Thus, on November 14, 1591, it was recorded that *unus iuvenis famulus ser Petri Longo ad meliorem vitam migravit* and the cathedral chapter received 4 lire. It is not indicated here how old the *famulus* was, but the amount donated indicates on the one hand the attitude toward servants, as well as the reputation of *ser* Pietro Longo's family.

CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

The census of 1595/6 stands as the oldest known enumeration of Rovinj's population, providing a detailed list of household heads, their spouses, children and servants, as well as the domestic animals owned by each household. It recorded a total of 539 households, with women serving as household heads in 99 cases (18.3%). But certain segments of the population, such as members of the Venetian administration and clergy, were not encompassed by the census.

The census of 1595/6 reveals a detailed picture of household structures in Rovinj, showing that nuclear families were predominant. Despite high birth rates, households were generally small due to high infant and child mortality. The census

9 The oldest Rovinj Register of Deaths (1551–1601) is not a real Register of Deaths, rather, it is a list of funeral proceeds. In addition to the names of the deceased, funeral revenues were recorded in it. Thus, it shows that two lire were mainly paid for children and 6 lire for adults, although sometimes twice as much (12 lira). The latter, 12 lire, were mainly paid for the burial and salvation of craftsmen (*Mistro* Zuanne Pelizer, March 21, 1590, *Mistro* Mathio Moscarda detto Murer, May 13, 1590) (DAPA-429, Rovinj Register of Deaths (1553–1601)). The Register is also available online at familysearch.org.

indicates that 61.2% of households had 2–5 members, 32.3% had 6–9 members, and only 2.8% had more than 10 members. Nuclear families, typically consisting of a married couple with children, were most common (77.7%). Extended families accounted for 13.7% of households, while multiple families, single households, and unstructured households were relatively rare. This household structure aligns with broader Mediterranean trends, where nuclear families were typical among poorer commoners, and multiple families were more common among the upper social classes.

Out of the 539 households enumerated 27.6% possessed domestic animals, including horses, mares, donkeys, bulls, oxen, cows, and sheep, with a total of 4,767 animals recorded. Small livestock, referred to as *animali minuti*, made up almost 68% of the total animals, significantly more than large livestock. The census revealed that households with horses were rare, but some, like *ser* Zuanne Gambello and Tomasin Bodi, had large numbers. Donkeys were less common and mainly used by poorer households for transporting wood and water. Bulls and oxen were present in a few households, while cows were more significant, especially in some prominent families. Sheep provided essential resources such as milk, cheese, meat and wool, making them valuable for trade and self-sufficiency. There was a strong correlation between households with servants and those with a significant number of animals. Servants were recorded in 7.2% of households. *Famigli* (likely shepherds) were the most common, associated with 23 households that had a total of 50 servants. These households held 64% of the recorded animals, indicating the critical role of shepherds in managing livestock. Housemaids (*massera*) were also noted, typically in wealthier households, and sometimes were the only female members. Apprentices (*garzon*) were listed in three households, and *fanti*, young male servants, were recorded in five. Servitude was a common stage in the lives of many young people, particularly those from poorer backgrounds. The census reveals that council families did not always have many servants or animals and were not necessarily wealthy, contrasting with some affluent newcomers engaged in trade or seafaring. The data from the census offer insights into the social status and wealth of households, highlighting the economic and social importance of livestock in Rovinj during this period. This census is an extremely valuable source of data on the population of Rovinj. Together with the censuses from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which are currently undergoing analysis and which contain data on the locations of the households mentioned herein, it may provide a more complete picture of the Rovinj's population in the early modern period.

GOSPODINJSTVA PO ROVINJSKEM POPISU PREBIVALSTVA IZ LET 1595/1596

Marija MOGOROVIĆ CRLJENKO

Univerza Jurja Dobrile v Pulju, Fakulteta za humanistične znanosti, Aldo Negri 6, 52100 Pulj, Hrvatska
e-mail: mmogorov@unipu.hr

Danijela DOBLANOVIĆ ŠURAN

Univerza Jurja Dobrile v Pulju, Fakulteta za humanistične znanosti, Aldo Negri 6, 52100 Pulj, Hrvatska
e-mail: ddoblanovic@unipu.hr

POVZETEK

Prispevek nadaljuje analizo prvega znanega popisa prebivalstva Rovinja iz let 1595/1596. Proučuje velikost in vrsto gospodinjstev ter število potomcev po zakonskem paru. Gospodinjstva so bila analizirana glede na njihovo sestavo in število. Analiza je pokazala, da so bila najpogostejša enodružinska gospodinjstva sestavljena iz zakonskega para (ali vdove/vdovca) in njihovih otrok, medtem ko so bila gospodinjstva z dvema poročenima paroma, ki sta živela pod isto streho, zelo redka. Poleg tega je popis vključeval služinčadi in živali. Članek raziskuje, katera gospodinjstva so imela posebne vrste služinčadi, razmerje med prisotnostjo pomožnega osebja in živalmi, povezanimi z gospodinjstvom, in ali so bili posli pogostejši v svetniških družinah ali drugih. Pomožno osebje je bilo zajeto v 7,2 % gospodinjstev. Med gospodinjstvi s služinčadjo in tistimi z velikim številom živali je obstajala močna povezava. Od 539 naštetih gospodinjstev jih je 27,6 % posedovalo domače živali, vključno s konji, kobilami, osli, biki, voli, kravami in ovci. Drobnna živina, imenovana animali minuti, je predstavljala skoraj 68 % vseh živali. Podatki popisa živali ponujajo tudi vpogled v družbeni položaj in bogastvo gospodinjstev ter izpostavljajo gospodarski in družbeni pomen živine v Rovinju v tem obdobju. Popis Rovinja iz obdobja 1595/1596 je izjemno dragocen vir podatkov o prebivalstvu; v kombinaciji s popisi iz 17. in 18. stoletja, ki so še v postopku analize, lahko zagotovi popolnejšo sliko o prebivalstvu Rovinja v zgodnjem novem veku.

Ključne besede: Rovinj, Istra, popis prebivalstva 1595/6, prebivalstvo

APPENDICES

Table 1: Household members according to the 1595/6 census.

Household heads	539
Their wives	377
Sons	734
Daughters	678
Mothers	33
Brothers	24
Sisters	26
Nephews	11
Nieces	16
Sisters-in-law	5
Brothers-in-law	4
Mothers-in-law (<i>madonna</i>)	11
Daughters-in-law	8
Grandchildren	15
Other relatives	58
Domestic staff	75
	2,614

Table 2: Number of household members according to the 1595/6 census.

Household members	Households	%	Total of people in these households	Of these women as carriers of households
1	20	3.7	20	9
2	55	10.2	110	19
3	82	15.2	246	18
4	98	18.2	394	23
5	95	17.6	475	14
6	87	16.1	522	12
7	37	6.9	259	1
8	29	5.4	232	3
9	22	4,1	197	0
10	5	0.9	50	0
11	5	0.9	55	0
12	2	0.4	24	0
13	0	0	0	0
14	1	0.2	14	0
15	1	0.2	15	0
	539	100%	2,614	

Table 3: Number of household members according to the 1595/6 census.

Households members	Households	%
1	20	3.7
2 and 3	137	25.4
4 and 5	193	35.8
6 to 9	174	32.3
more than 10	15	2.8

Table 4: Types of households according to the 1595/6 census.

	Household composition	Number	household composition + domestic staff	Number	Total of households	%
Simple or nuclear family	Married couple without children	28	Married couple without children + domestic staff	5	33	6.1
	Married couple with children	271	Married couple with children + domestic staff	23	294	54.5
	Widowers and widows with children	89	Widowers and widows with children + domestic staff	3	92	17.1
		388		31	419	77.7
Extended family	Married couple with children + relatives	30	Married couple with children + relatives + domestic staff	4	34	6.3
	Married couple without children + relatives	3	Married couple with children + relatives + domestic staff	2	5	0.9
	Widower/widow + children + relatives	15	Widower/widow + children + relatives + domestic staff	0	15	2.8
	Widower/widow without children + relatives or other people	20	Widower/widow without children + relatives or other people + domestic staff	0	20	3.7
		68		6	74	13.7
Multiple or joint family	Two married couples (with or without children)	2	Two married couples (with or without children) + domestic staff	2	4	0.7
	Married couple with or without children and widower/widow with children	10	Married couple with or without children and widower/widow with children + domestic staff	0	10	1.9
		12		2	14	2.6
Solitaires		20			20	3.7
No family (solitaires and relatives or other people)		12			12	2.2
		500		39	539	100%
		92.8%		7.2%		

Table 5: Composition of households with regard to relationship to the household head.

	Total	Men	Women	Unknown
Households heads	539	440	99	
Their wives	377	0	377	
Their children	1413	734	679	
Mothers	33	0	33	
Siblings	50	24	26	
Nephews and nieces	27	11	16	
Brothers/sisters-in-law	9	5	4	
Daughters-in-law	8	0	8	
Mothers-in-law (<i>madonna</i>)	11	0	11	
Grandchildren	15	9	6	
Other relatives	57	23	32	2
Domestic staff	75	64	11	
	2,614	1,310	1,302	2

Table 6: Children in households according to the 1595/6 census. This table was compiled on the basis of data from the list such that it does not include those children whose age is unknown or, for example, five daughters recorded as being under the age of 19. When the census indicates that a household head has four sons under the age of 14, one is included in the 14–17 group, and the rest in the 10–13 group, although they may have been under 10. However, since there are only a few such cases, 2 involving sons and 2 daughters, such a procedure does not significantly affect the final results.

	Less than 10			10 to 13		14 to 17	
	Men	Women	Unknown	Men	Women	Men	Women
Children	398	324		120	125	112	120
Siblings	2	3		5	5	7	2
Grandchildren	4	4	3	1	4	1	0
Nephews and nieces	3	4		3	5	2	4
Other relatives	5	8		1	3	0	2
Domestic staff	1			2		0	
	413	343	3	132	142	122	128
	761			274		250	

Table 7: Household size according to the 1595/6 census.

Households members	With domestic staff (number of households)	Without domestic staff (number of households)	Total	Men as household heads	Women as household heads
1	0	20	20	11	9
2	0	55	55	36	19
3	4	78	82	64	18
4	4	94	98	75	23
5	5	90	95	81	14
6	5	82	87	75	12
7	4	33	37	36	1
8	5	24	29	26	3
9	3	17	20	20	
10	2	4	6	6	
11	3	2	5	5	
12	2	1	3	3	
14	1	0	1	1	
15	1	0	1	1	
	39	500	539	500	99

Table 8: *Animals in households according to the 1595/6 census.*

	Number	Households with these animals	Average per household
Horses	127	58	2.2
Mares	45	9	5
Donkeys	41	38	1.1
Young bulls	215	93	2.3
Cattle	15	7	2.1
Cows	594	14	42.4
Large animals (<i>animali grossi</i>)	4	1	4
Sheep	402	5	80.4
Small animals (<i>animali minuti</i>)	2,955	13	227.3
	4,398		

Table 9: Number of animals according to the 1595/6 census.

Number of animals	Households with this number of animals	Notes
1	40	65% of these were donkeys and horses (26 donkeys and 7 horses)
2	40	82.5% of households had 2 young bulls (33)
3	24	87.5% had 2 young bulls and a horse or mare (21)
4 to 10	16	152 animals in total; 58 or 38% are young bulls, about 14% were horses and mares
10 to 19	2	2 donkeys, 18 cows and 12 sheep
20 to 29	3	29 mares, 2 donkeys, 2 young bulls, 20 cows and 20 sheep
30 to 39	2	5 horses, 35 cows, 6 young bulls, 25 small animals
40 to 49	1	2 young bulls, 6 cows, 40 sheep
50 to 59	1	2 horses, 2 oxen and 54 cows
60 to 69	0	
70 to 79	3	3 horses, 2 mares, 4 young bulls, 70 cows, 70 sheep and 70 small animals
80 to 89	6	501 animals, of which 240 small animals and 240 cows
100 to 199	5	756 animals: 57 horses, 188 cows, 100 sheep and 280 small animals
200 to 299	1	200 sheep and 2 young bulls
300 to 399	2	627 animals: 40 cows, 280 sheep and 300 small animals
400 to 499	0	
500 to 599	2	98% small animals
600 to 699	0	
700 to 799	0	
800 to 899	1	98% small animals
	149	

Table 10: Households in which domestic staff is listed according to the census of 1595/6.

Surname, Name (father's name)	Wife	Children	Mother	Siblings	Other relatives	<i>servitor</i>	<i>famegli</i>	<i>massera</i>	<i>garzon</i>	<i>fanti</i>	<i>fantesca</i>	Domestic staff in total	Animals in total
Calafà, Pietro	yes	4						1				1	
Miser De Capodistria, Zuanne	yes							1				1	
Di Rocco, Domenego	yes	3								1		1	
Ser Da Fasana, Bortolo	yes	2						1				1	
Mistro Cipriotto, Marco		1							1			1	
Ser Lussin, Iacomo	yes							1				1	
Venier, Domenego q. Venier	yes	4	1						1			1	
Biondo, Tomasin		2			2				1			1	
Bodi, Nicolo	yes	4			2		2					2	84
Miser Basilisco, Zambattista	yes	10								3		3	1
Ser Ferrarese, Antonio	yes	5					1					1	1
Sponza, Nicolo q. Gabriel	yes	6					1					1	1
Fachinetto, Antonio	yes							1				1	1
Ser Albanese, Antonio	yes					1		1				2	2
Ser Sponza, Christofooro q. Biasio	yes	4					1					1	2
Di Vescovi, Zuanne q. Piero	yes	2					1					1	2
Malusà, Simon	yes	2								2		2	2
Di Vescovi, Gabriel, q. Piero	yes	4						1				1	3

Sponza, Cristofolo q. Francesco	yes	3					1					1	3
Miser Sponza, Giusto		4						1				1	3
Gambello, Domenego	yes	1					1					1	4
Zaccaria, Mattio	yes	1								1		1	4
Ser Bichiachi, Zuanne	yes	2					1					1	5
Ser Ciprioto, Zuanne	yes	4					2	1				3	5
Ser Lanzeto ?, Zuanne	yes	4	1	1			3					3	7
Ive, Antonio	yes	3			2		1					1	7
Mismas, Astolfo	yes	5					1					1	26
Ser Rota, Iseppo	yes	7					2					2	34
Ferrarese, Luca	yes	1					2					2	74
Gambello, Domenego q. D.	yes	7					1					1	86
Ser Medelin, Nicolo		6			1		3					3	93
Medelin, Domenego	yes						2				1	3	126
Ser Gambello, Zuanne	yes	1					4					4	160
Zonta, Tomaso	yes	1	1	2	3					3		3	186
Da Pinguento, Zuanne	yes	1					2					2	202
Iotta, Piero q. ser Domenego	yes	3					4					4	524
Ser Vendrame, Bernardin	yes						6	1				7	567
Ser Longo, Piero	yes	5					7					7	816

SOURCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrić, Tonija (2018):** Život u srednjovjekovnom Splitu. Svakodnevica obrtnika u 14. i 15. stoljeću. Zagreb – Split, Hrvatski institut za povijest – Odsjek za povijest Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu.
- ASVe – Archivio di stato di Venezia (ASVe),** Grimani e Barbarigo.
- Benussi, Bernardo (1886):** Abitanti, animali e pascoli in Rovigno e suo territorio nel secolo XVI. Atti e memorie della Società istriana di archeologia e storia patria, 2, 1, 121–156.
- Bertoša, Miroslav (1995):** Istra: Doba Venecije (XVI. – XVIII. stoljeće). Pula, Zavičajna naklada “Žakan Juri”.
- Bertoša, Miroslav (2002):** Izazovi povijesnog zanata. Lokalna povijest i sveopći modeli. Zagreb, Antibarbarus.
- Budak, Neven (2021):** Na dnu društvene ljestvice. Robovi i služinčad na istočnoj jadranskoj obali. Zagreb, Leykam international.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna (1996):** Konstrukcija modela obitelji u Europi i povijest obitelji u Hrvatskoj. Narodna umjetnost 33, 2, 179–196.
- DAPA-4 – Državni arhiv u Pazinu (DAPA),** Općina Novigrad (fund HR-DAPA-4).
- DAPA-429 – Državni arhiv u Pazinu (DAPA),** Zbirka matičnih knjiga, (collection HR-DAPA-429).
- DARI-284 – Državni arhiv u Rijeci (DARI),** Općina Rovinj (fund HR-DARI-284).
- Doblanović, Danijela (2017):** Žrvanj života. Stanovništvo Savičente od početka 17. do početka 19. stoljeća. Zagreb, Srednja Europa.
- Doblanović Šuran, Danijela & Marija Mogorović Crljenko (2019):** Uvod. In: Doblanović Šuran, Danijela & Marija Mogorović Crljenko (eds.): Matična knjiga krštenih Župe Umag (1483.–1643.). Pazin, Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 13–42.
- Drandić, Matija (2020):** La popolazione di Rovigno nella seconda metà del XVI secolo. Atti del Centro di ricerche storiche – Rovigno, 50, 2–85.
- Fabijanec, Sabine Florance (2015):** Uloga životinja u gospodarskome životu srednjovjekovnih dalmatinskih komuna. In: Mogorović Crljenko, Marija & Elena Uljančić-Vekić (eds.): Animalia, bestiae, ferae: O životinjama u povijesti na jadranskom prostoru. Poreč, Zavičajni muzej Poreštine – Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli – Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 69–100.
- Hajnal, John (1965):** European Marriage Patterns in Perspective. In: Glass, David Victor & David Edward Charles Eversley (eds.): Population in History: Essays in Historical Demography. London, E. Arnold, 101–143.
- Hajnal, John (1982):** Two Kinds of Preindustrial Household Formation System. Population and Development Review, 8, 3, 449–494.
- Herlihy, David & Christiane Klapisch-Zuber (1985):** Tuscans and Their families. A Study of the Florentine Catasto of 1427. New Haven – London, Yale University Press.
- Janeković Römer, Zdenka (1989):** Pristup problemu obitelji i roda u stranoj i domaćoj medijevistici. Historijski zbornik, XLII, 171–182.

- Janeković Römer, Zdenka (1994):** Rod i grad. Dubrovačka obitelj od 13. do 15. stoljeća. Dubrovnik, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku – Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu.
- Janeković Römer, Zdenka (2011):** O napuštanju, udomljivanju i posvajanju djece u srednjovjekovnom Dubrovniku i Dalmaciji. In: Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (ed.): Filii, filiae...: položaj i uloga djece na jadranskom prostoru. Zbornik IV. istarskog povijesnog biennala. Poreč, Zavičajni muzej Poreštine – Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli – Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 15–32.
- Kertzer, David I. (1991):** Household History and Sociological Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17, 155–179.
- Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane (1987):** Women, Family and Ritual in Renaissance Italy. Chicago – London, University of Chicago Press.
- Kralj-Brassard, Rina (2013):** Djeca milosrđa. Napuštena djeca u Dubrovniku od 7. do 19. stoljeća. Zagreb – Dubrovnik, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku.
- Ladić, Zoran (2011):** Na razmeđu djetinjstva i zrelosti. O naučnicima-šegrtima u kasnosrednjovjekovnim istočnojadranskim komunama. In: Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (ed.), Filii, filiae...: položaj i uloga djece na jadranskom prostoru. Zbornik IV. istarskog povijesnog biennala. Poreč, Zavičajni muzej Poreštine – Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli – Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 69–96.
- Laslett, Peter (1977):** Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations: Essays in Historical Sociology. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Laslett, Peter (1983):** Family and Household as Work Group and Kin Group: Areas of Traditional Europe Compared. In: Wall, Richard, Robinm, Jean & Peter Laslett (eds.): Family Forms in Historic Europe. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 513–563.
- Margetić, Lujo (1970):** Brak na istarski način. *Vjesnik historijskih arhiva u Rijeci i Pazinu*, XV, 279–308.
- Margetić, Lujo (1996):** Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno obiteljsko i nasljedno pravo. Zagreb, Narodne novine.
- Mlacović, Dušan, Mogorović Crljenko, Marija & Danijela Doblanović Šuran (2019):** Istrian and Dalmatian Towns – Urban Space and the Elites: The Cases of Rovinj and Rab (Middle Ages and Early Modern Period). *Povijesni prilozi*, 38, 56, 157–180.
- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija & Danijela Doblanović (2015):** Stanovništvo Rovinja prema najstarijoj matičnoj knjizi vjenčanih (1564. – 1640.). *Povijesni prilozi*, 34, 49, 239–274.
- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija & Danijela Doblanović Šuran (2024):** Origin of the Population and Councillor Families in the Rovinj Census of 1595/6. *Acta Histriae*, 32, 2, 271–296.
- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (2006):** Nepoznati svijet istarskih žena. Zagreb, Srednja Europa.
- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (2012a):** Druga strana braka. Zagreb, Srednja Europa.

- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (2012b):** The Position of Woman in Istrian Marriage Pattern (15th–16th century). In: Bellavitis, Anna, Filippini, Nadia Maria & Tiziana Plebani (eds.): *Spazi, poteri, diritti delle donne a Venezia in età moderna*. Verona – Bolzano, QuiEdit, 21–29.
- Mogorović Crljenko, Marija (2019):** Vjenčani dar kod rovinjskih obrtnika na prijelazu 16. u 17. st. (1564–1633). In: Mogorović Crljenko, Marija & Elena Uljančić-Vekić (eds.): *Artisani et mercatores: o obrtnicima i trgovcima na jadranskom prostoru*. Zbornik 8. istarskog povijesnog biennala. Poreč, Zavičajni muzej Poreštine – Sveučilište Jurja Dobrile u Puli – Državni arhiv u Pazinu, 190–205.
- Montanari, Massimo (2012):** Alimentazione e cultura nel Medioevo. Bari, Editori Laterza.
- Pastoureau, Michiel (2011):** Bestiari del Medioevo. Torino, Einaudi.
- Sovič, Silvia, Thane, Pat & Viazzo Pier Paolo (2016):** The History of European Families: Old and New Directions. In: Sovič, Silvia, Thane, Pat & Pier Paolo Viazzo (eds.): *The History of Families and Households. Comparative European Dimensions*. Leiden – Boston, Brill, 1–19.
- Stipetić, Vladimir & Nenad Vekarić (2004):** Povijesna demografija Hrvatske. Zagreb – Dubrovnik, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku.
- Stojan, Slavica (2003):** Vjerenice i nevjernice. Zagreb – Dubrovnik, Zavod za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Dubrovniku.
- Tomasini, Giacomo Filippo 1837 [17th century]:** De commentari storici-geografici della provincia dell'Istria libri otto con appendice. Marenigh, Giovanni (ed.). Trieste, Società di Minerva.
- Uljančić, Elena (2019):** U modi. Kultura odijevanja porečkih plemenitih građana (1650.–1720.). Zagreb, Srednja Europa – Zavičajni muzej Poreštine.