

## Documents in the Archives of Ragusa on Magellan's Voyage

STOYAN GAVRILOVIC\*

FROM 1519 THE INTIMATE secretary of the Emperor Charles V, the Hapsburg king of Spain, was a Dalmatian from the island of Curzola, a Catholic cleric and diplomat educated at the universities of Bologna and Padua. His name in its Romanized form was Jacopo Bannisio<sup>1</sup> and in the original Slav form Jakov Banicevic.<sup>2</sup> He had previously served the Emperor's grandfather, Maximilian I, both in Germany and in the Caesarean embassy at the Papal Court in Rome, where he gained considerable reputation for his diplomatic skill and learning.<sup>3</sup> Throughout this period Bannisio maintained close relations with the Republic of

\* The author, a former Yugoslav Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs, first chairman of the United Nations Site Committee, and a distinguished scholar, died on February 2, 1965.

<sup>1</sup> Form used on the memorial stone tablet in the Tridentine Cathedral of which he was *decanus*. Cf. Giuseppe Gerola, "La Tomba del Bannisio a Trento," *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia* (Rome), 1929-1930, Vol. VIII (46), 496-500 (transcript).

<sup>2</sup> For biography, see: Dezelic, Velimir, "Banisio Jakov," *Znameniti i Zaslužni Hrvati te Pomena Vrijedna Lica u Hrvatsko Povijesti od 925 do 1925* (Famous and deserving Croats and persons worthy of mention in the history of Croatia from A.D. 925 to 1925), Zagreb, 1925, 17; Barada, Miho, "Banicevic (Banisius)" ("bishop of the ancient Cathedral of Gurk in Carinthia"), *Hrvatska Enciklopedija* (Croat Encyclopaedia), Zagreb, 1941, Vol. II, 189; Gancevic, Ante, "Banicevic Jakov (Bannicius, etc. Jacobus), humanist," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* (The Encyclopaedia of Yugoslavia), Zagreb, 1955, Vol. I, 336; Simeone Gliubich, "Banisio Giacomo, il Seniore di Curzola," *Dizionario Biografico degli Uomini illustria della Dalmazia*, Vienna, 1856, 19-21 (transcript); Kebler, Djuro, "Banicevic Jakov (Banisius)," *Narodna Enciklopedija Srpsko-Hrvatsko-Slovenačka* (Serbo-Croat-Slovene National Encyclopaedia), ed. by St. Stanojevic, Zagreb, 1928, Vol. I, 115.

<sup>3</sup> For illustrations of Bannisio's international stature and role, see F. M. Nichols, transl., *The Epistles of Erasmus*, New York, 1962, Vol. III, 121, 139, 159, Epistles 671, 681, and 692; Rousset's *Supplement au Corps Universel Diplomatique du Droit des Gens*, Item XIX, Vol. II, pt. I, 45, Amsterdam, 1739; W. M. Conway, transl. and ed., *The Writings of Albrecht Dürer*, New York, 1958, Ch. VII, 101-103, 207 (references in *Tagebuch der Reise in die Niederlande*, 1950-1951); Adolf Hauffen, (ed.), *Johann Fischarts Werke* (c. 1545-1591), Stuttgart, 1892, p. 3, Introd. XXII (dedication of Willibald Pirkheimer's work *Apologia seu Podagrae Laus*, Nuremberg, 1522).

Ragusa, the Eastern Adriatic maritime state with far-flung commercial interests,<sup>4</sup> and kept them informed about major world developments in an effort to show the Emperor's goodwill and encouragement to a privileged friend and ally.<sup>5</sup> In 1522, when the *Victoria* with Sebastián Elcano in command reached Spain after completing the historic voyage around the world, he sent to Ragusa in this same friendly and helpful gesture the information he had on the success of the Magellan expedition.

The first modern historian to notice Bannasio's dispatches was Josip Gelcic,<sup>6</sup> a scholar from Cattaro, at that time professor at the Nautical School and archivist in Ragusa, in charge of the records of the ancient Adriatic Republic which at the end of the Napoleonic wars lost its independence and became incorporated first with Austria and then, a hundred years later, with Yugoslavia. The documents found by him were brought to the attention of his brother Eugen,<sup>7</sup> director of the Nautical Schools in Cattaro and Lussinpiccolo, who published what information he had after making a profound and extensive study of all the contemporary sources on Magellan's expedition belonging to what might be conveniently called the Elcano group. These early and fragmentary findings were reported in Eugen Gelcic's paper "Zwei Briefe über die Maghellanische Weltumsegelung," in *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Classe, Band CXIX*, in 1889.<sup>8</sup> More recently another local historian, Jorjo Tadic, an equally well-known authority on the Archives of Ragusa, several generations

<sup>4</sup> N. Mirkovic, "Ragusa and the Portuguese Spice Trade," *The Slavonic and East European Review* (American Series, II), March, 1943, 134ff.

<sup>5</sup> For Ragusan privileges under Spanish Royal charters, see S. Gavrilovic, "Important References to Exploration, Science, Technology, and Hispanic American History in Yugoslav Archives," *Proc. Penna. Acad. Sci.*, XXXVIII (1962).

<sup>6</sup> T. Popovic, "Professor Josip Djeleic," *Zapisi, Casopis za Nauku i Knjizevnost* (Chronicle, Journal of Science and Literature), Cetinje, Dec., 1927, 321-384; Mastrovic, Ljubomir, "Gjelcic, Josip," *Znameniti i Zaslužni Hrvati te Pomena Vrijedna Lica u Hrvatskoj Istoriji od 925 do 1925*, p. 92; Krstic, Kruno, "Gjelcic," *Pomorska Enciklopedija* (Maritime Encyclopaedia), Vol. III, 167, col. 2; Sidak, Jaroslav, "Gelcic (Gjelcic, Djeleic)," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. III, 453, col. 1, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Genealogical data obtained through the courtesy of I. Zlokovic, Director of the Maritime Museum, Kotor (Cattaro). For E. Gelcic's biography see: Dezelic, Stanko, "Djeleic, Eugen (Gelcic)," *Narodna Enciklopedija Srpsko-Hrvatsko-Slovenacka*, Vol. I, 690; Mastrovic, Ljubomir, "Gjelcic, Eugen," *Znameniti i Zaslužni Hrvati te Pomena Vrijedna Lica u Hrvatskoj Istoriji od 925 do 1925*, p. 92; Babalic, Radoica, "Gjelcic," *Pomorska Enciklopedija*, Vol. III, 167, col. 2; Sidak, Jaroslav, "Gelcic," *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. III, 435, col. 1.

<sup>8</sup> Reprint (IV. Abh., 1-14) received through the courtesy of Professor Dr. Albin Lesky, Secretary, Phil. Hist. Class, Austrian Academy of Sciences.

younger,<sup>9</sup> also noticed Bannisio's dispatches and reported what he found, in less elaborate and less precise terms, in his article "Dva pisma o Magelanovom putovanju" (Two letters on Magellan's voyage), in *Jadranska Straza* (the Adriatic Sentinel), issue of September 1931, Vol. IX.<sup>10</sup> A brief reference to this material was made in an article by Vinko Foretic, director of the Archives of Ragusa, published in 1960.<sup>11</sup> The only other extant records are Bannisio's original texts, of which the present author obtained several photostatic copies through the courtesy of V. Foretic and other local archivists.

A close and systematic analysis of these various sources, based on the totality of the information they offer, shows that the Archives of Ragusa have five separate documents on the Magellan expedition. All of them are related to the sources in the Elcano group to which they add five units, namely, Bannisio's *observantiae*; Bannisio's text of Elcano's report, two versions; and Bannisio's text of Captain de Pons'<sup>12</sup> letter, two versions.

Following is a description of their characteristics, historical novelty, and historiographical interest. Where the text is written in the Serbo-Croat language, information on the contents is included.

#### Document No. 1: Bannisio's *observantiae*

The first document is a letter dated at Trent April 6, 1523, found by Tadic and published in *Jadranska Straza*. According to the explanation officially received from the Archives of Ragusa,<sup>13</sup> the original is "much damaged and hardly readable." Foretic describes it<sup>14</sup> as "somewhat damaged," as indeed it is<sup>15</sup> due to the dissolution of the ink and the resulting obliteration and blurring of the 450-year old script. The letter is written in Italian and is addressed to the Government of the Republic of Ragusa. Its full and

\* See *Ko je Ko u Jugoslaviji* (Who's Who in Yugoslavia), Vol. I, 1952, 715; *Mala Enciklopedija Prosvete* (Small Educational Encyclopaedia), Belgrade, 1959, 650 (professor of history, University of Belgrade; member of the Serbian Academy of Sciences).

<sup>10</sup> Transcript, 239-241.

<sup>11</sup> "Cinjenice i Pretpostavke: Veze starih Dubrovčana s novootkrivenim zemljama o njihovo iseljavanju," (Facts and hypotheses: Relations of the old Ragusans with the newly discovered lands and their emigration), *Matica, Iseljenicki Kalendar*, 1960 (The Queen-bee Emigrants' Calendar, 1960), Zagreb, pp. 142-153 (transcript).

<sup>12</sup> The form in use in Spain is Punzoli or Punzoroli, cf. *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada*, article on Magellan (Magellano), Tome XXXII, 58, col. 2. De Pons' other aliases are: de Poncero (Gelcie, 10), de Punzarol (Hildebrand, *Magellan*, New York, 1924, 146), etc.

<sup>13</sup> Letter No. 607, November 17, 1962, signature illegible.

<sup>14</sup> Letter No. 40/1, January 25, 1963.

<sup>15</sup> Doc. 1, photost. copy.

exact title inked on the *dorso* or perhaps on a separate wrapper in enlarged cursive letters reads: *Magnificis & Excellentibus Dominis meis observantiae Rectori & Civitatis Rhagusii dd.*<sup>16</sup> Its archival classification markings are Series LXXVI, now called *Diplomata et Acta*,<sup>17</sup> No. 286, 16th cent. The signature used, "de Bannissis," represents the form under which he was known at the Imperial Court with the prefix "de" attached to indicate the title of the hereditary nobility<sup>18</sup> obtained in 1513 under a diploma issued in his and his family's behalf by the Emperor Maximilian.

The major importance of this document from the point of view of the historical profession lies in the evidence which it offers proving conclusively that the author of documents 2, 3, 4, and 5 below and the originator of the whole series of Ragusan sources on the Magellan voyage in general and the Elcano episode in particular was the Imperial Secretary Bannisio. Eugen Gelcic, who did not have this key document, did not know who the author was. According to his paper in *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1889, the presumed author was some unidentified Ragusan diplomat, some consul or envoy (page 1, lines 9-10), and is referred to by Gelcic as the *Ragusanischer Gewährsmann* (p. 2, line 8), *unser unbekannter Verfasser* (p. 3, line 10), and so forth.

The document discovered by Tadic (c. 1931) thus throws a new light on and gives a completely new meaning and significance to these Ragusan sources.

The text<sup>19</sup> has 4 pages<sup>20</sup> comprising altogether 90 lines, of which Tadic succeeded in decyphering some. He does not say which, but an examination of the photostatic copy shows that he has decyphered 16 of 23 lines on the fourth page, namely lines 68-83. The decyphered portion of the damaged text of Bannisio's *observantiae* is published (*Jadranska Straza*) in Serbo-Croat under quotes. The English trans-

<sup>16</sup> "Rector" under the Ragusan aristocratic constitution was the head of state. In the original text the words *Excellen(tibus)* and *observan(tiae)* are ligatured. The abbr. *dd.* apparently stands for *domini*, cf. Viktor Novak, *Latinska Paleografija*, p. 295.

<sup>17</sup> Until a few years ago the legend was *Acta Sanctae Mariae Maioris* (abbr. ASMM). The series was so named by J. Gelcic because its most important state papers had at a time been kept in the reliquary of the Ragusan Cathedral dedicated to St. Mary. The serial number also dates from Gelcic and was formalized in Gelcic's catalogue published in 1910. Cf. V. Foretic, "Dubrovacki Arhiv" (The Archives of Ragusa), *Historijski Zbornik* (Historical Journal), 1951, Vol. IV (1-4), 209-215.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Erwin Panofsky, *Albrecht Dürer*, 3rd ed., Vol. I, Princeton University Press, 1948, 46, 110, 207, Item 382 (Coat-of-arms of Jacobus de Banissis).

<sup>19</sup> Doc. 1, photost. copy.

<sup>20</sup> 2 leaves, according to the letter from the Archives of Ragusa, No. 607/1.

lation of this authentic diplomatic record executed at the Court of Charles V at Trent seven months after Elcano's return to Spain is here cited verbatim.

I have been given to understand by the Reverend Father fra Ivan [Gucetic, Ragusan ambassador]<sup>21</sup> that your Excellencies are not informed concerning the voyage to India, the islands discovered by the Spaniards where spices of all kinds grow, and how they circumnavigated the earth before they could find them. Of 5 ships which sailed with more than 400 persons<sup>22</sup> only one returned<sup>23</sup> with 18 men. In order that your Excellencies may be able to grasp all this better, enclosed I am sending you copies of the reports and letters written to His Imperial Majesty, from which you will learn of wonders which are of the highest importance. The ship which came back brought in gold bullion, pearles, precious stone, and spices approximately 300,000 ducats. Another ship,<sup>24</sup> which is expected, carries the same amount of freight. His Imperial Majesty is now outfitting about 10 ships which he is sending to the Moluccas; that is what those Blessed Islands are called.

Document No. 2: Bannisio's Text of Elcano's Report,  
Gelic's Version

This document represents one of the two Ragusan state papers published verbatim by Eugen Gelic in the authentic Italian text in *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1899, pages 3-6, and processed by him in great detail by means of a precise comparative analysis including two other units of the Elcano source group still extant and known to him.<sup>25</sup> It contains an Italian translation of the report sent by Elcano to Charles V from San Lucar on September 6 (lost). The original translation is part of the official diplomatic documentation transmitted by the Imperial Secretary Bannisio to the Government of the Republic of Ragusa on the outcome and the meaning of the Magellan expedition as seen by the Emperor and his entourage in 1522. Its archival classification markings now are Series LXXVI, *Diplomata et Acta*, No. 27, fasc. 16th cent.<sup>26</sup> Foretic<sup>27</sup> describes the authentic text registered in

<sup>21</sup> The parenthesized words are added by Tadic. For Guetic (Gozze), cf. *Enciclopedia Italiana de Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* (1933), Vol. XVII, 602.

<sup>22</sup> 268 (Hildebrand, *Magellan*, New York, 1924, 144). The maximum number allowed under the Royal Capitulation executed at Valladolid, March 22, 1518, was 234. Cf. E. F. Benson, *Ferdinand Magellan*, New York, 1930, Article VII, 80.

<sup>23</sup> The *Victoria*.

<sup>24</sup> The *Trinidad*.

<sup>25</sup> Baldelli-Boni's version of Contarini's Italian text; Schmeller's version of Sedelius's Latin text.

<sup>26</sup> Letter from V. Foretic, No. 40/1. Gelic (p. 2, line 2) has somewhat different archival markings; in his time (Austrian period) these Ragusan records were kept in various local repositories (k.k. Bezirkshauptmannschaft), cf. M.

Ragusa under this number as a 1-leaf, well preserved archival record. The photostatic copy<sup>28</sup> shows that it consists of two translated items, item "A" and "B," of altogether 3 pieces of clean, entirely undamaged, and beautifully written Italian text, every word of which is readable with hardly any special effort, except perhaps the use of the magnifying glass because of its small and indeed minuscule type of letters. Bannasio's Italian text of Elcano's report, item "A," consists of 1¼ page (55 lines). The presumption is (Gelcic) that Elcano wrote his missing report to the Emperor in Spanish, as he undoubtedly did. The photostatic copy shows also that the authentic form of the Ragusan record has no signature, no archival annotations,<sup>29</sup> and no other express indications of any kind directly identifying the author, its period or date, its background history, or its place of origin and execution as far as the translated text is concerned.<sup>30</sup> At the present stage of Ragusan research, the data which are available to us on most of these points are derived from our knowledge that the record containing the text of Elcano's report was annexed to Bannasio's *observantiae*.

Another characteristic of the same record is even more significant. Foretic<sup>31</sup> refers to this "example" of Bannasio's Italian text of Elcano's Spanish report as the "newer version" and distinguishes it from another "example" to which he refers as the "still older version." The original archival record which I have before me,<sup>32</sup> if processed by means of a comparative survey involving all the various texts of these two respective versions available to us today,<sup>33</sup> shows several formal and other differences on which I shall say more in my analysis of the documents 3, 4, and 5 below in order to explain why and on what specific grounds I have defined this particular version, the "newer version," as the Gelcic version. Here I have to refer the reader only to the controversy raised by Gelcic<sup>34</sup> regarding the

Resetar, "Dubrovacki Arhiv" (The Archives of Ragusa), *Narodna Enciklopedija Srpsko-Hrvatsko-Slovenacka*, Vol. I, 658, col. 2.

<sup>27</sup> Letter No. 40/1.

<sup>28</sup> Docs. 2 and 3.

<sup>29</sup> The photostatic copy, docs. 2 & 3, received from the Archives of Ragusa does not show page 4. The archival classification markings cited by V. Foretic above, do not appear on pp. 1-3.

<sup>30</sup> There are only two irrelevant notes added to item "B," one at the beginning and the other at the end. Cf. Gelcic, page 2, line 17 (first note) and lines 5-7 (second note).

<sup>31</sup> Letters Nos. 40/1 and 40/3 (February 13, 1962).

<sup>32</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photost, copy, item "A."

<sup>33</sup> Gelcic's verbatim text, Tadic's condensed text (below), and the archival record.

<sup>34</sup> *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, p. 3. n. 2.

number of Europeans who returned on the *Victoria* to Spain in 1522 and to note briefly that the number cited in both these texts of which I speak in this section, the archival record and the published text, is 19 (xviii).<sup>35</sup> Apparently the number 19 (xviii) is cited only in these two texts. Another point which should be specially stressed and borne in mind here is that Gelcic did not have all the documents known to us today; the learned Cattaro scholar labored under the handicap of fragmentary and incomplete information and was unable to go further. On the basis of this evidence, combined partly with the statement in Bannisio's *observantiae* that 18 (xviii) and not 19 (xviii) Europeans returned on the *Victoria* to Spain and partly with other specific points which will be discussed later, I have come to the conclusion that the Gelcic version is not the original but a copy of the original of Bannisio's text, copy which was executed by some unknown Ragusan scrivener at some unknown date after it had been received from Trent. The date is limited to the 16th century by the cited archival markings (Foretic).

Document No. 3: Bannisio's Text of Captain de Pons'  
Letter, Gelcic's Version

This document represents the item marked "B" in the 1-leaf Ragusan record published by E. Gelcic (1889) *in extenso* and in the authentic Italian text in *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pages 7-8, with comment, pp. 9-14. Like Bannisio's text of Elcano's report, the text of the Italian translation of Captain de Pons' (Poncero) letter also is part of the official diplomatic information transmitted by the Imperial Secretary to the Government of the Republic of Ragusa in 1523 on the outcome of Magellan's mission. The letter is dated Tidore, December 21, 1521. In several other respects, too, this latter text has characteristics common to both. Its present archival markings are Series LXXVI, No. 27, 16th cent. Its 34 lines of perfectly readable and beautifully written Italian script preserved in the Archives of Ragusa<sup>36</sup> are not the original but a translation of the missing original written by de Pons in the Molucca Islands, East Indies, and brought by Elcano on the *Victoria* to Spain. They are evidently not even the actual text but a copy of the text sent by the Imperial Secretary in 1523 to the Ragusan Government. In its original form this letter, too, de Pons' letter, was written presumably in Spanish. Its present and not quite fully explained Italian edition, of which I speak here, appears in

<sup>35</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photostatic copy, page 1, line 1, and Gelcic, p. 3, line 18.

<sup>36</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photostatic copy.

the archival "example" which is referred to by Foretic<sup>37</sup> as "the newer version." In the absence of the name of the Ragusan scrivener who evidently copied the text and in the presence of Bannasio's own and authentic text which we now know the Archives of Ragusa also have (Tadic's version, below), it is classified by me as "the Gelcic version" after the family name of the two Cattaro scholars who were instrumental in making these long hidden historical documents known to us and generally showing the wealth and the possible value these unexplored and centuries-old archival repositories may have for those interested in medieval research. The details available today about the translated text are not based on a *prima facie* evidence but on the discovery recently made by Tadic (c. 1931) that the 440-year old Italian text of de Pons' letter is one of the "copies and reports" mentioned in and annexed to the key document in this Ragusan group, namely, Bannasio's *observantiae*. The uncertainty in which E. Gelcic labored was due to the fact that the two documents<sup>38</sup> are kept in the Archives as separate archival units of which one, de Pons' letter, was first noticed and published in 1889 and the second, Bannasio's *observantiae*, in c. 1931.

On the other hand, there are also points of special merit to be considered. Unlike the text of Elcano's report to Charles V, which is one of several copies providing the historian with the controlling instruments capable of checking on the validity of the information he already has,<sup>39</sup> Bannasio's text of de Pons' letter from the point of view of the historical profession has a different meaning and interest. It is the only copy known to exist and so the only one capable of providing the historian with additional information besides giving him additional means of interpretation. It constitutes a completely new item on the list of contemporary authorities on the Magellan voyage and more particularly a totally new addition to the Elcano source group. Every bit of information and knowledge which it offers in terms of historical facts or in terms of historiographical advantage means a unique and independent evidence. Gelcic<sup>40</sup> in his comment stresses de Pons' innovations pointing out the data which this eye-witness account provides on the change of command in the Magellan squadron through replacement of Portuguese officers<sup>41</sup> by Spaniards<sup>42</sup> upon arrival in Portuguese waters.

<sup>37</sup> Letters Nos. 40/1 and 40/3.

<sup>38</sup> Series LXXVI, *Diplomata et Acta*, Nos. 27 and 286.

<sup>39</sup> Contarini's Italian copy, etc.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. p. 10, lines 15-26, and footnote 3; p. 13, lines 7-9; p. 14, lines 26-28.

<sup>41</sup> Carvalho.

<sup>42</sup> Espinoza, Elcano, de Pons (Poncero).

Gelcic also observes (p. 10, lines 24-26) that these data are not available anywhere else (*in anderen Quellen ganz verschwiegen*).

Another point of difference concerns the person to whom the letter was sent. Elcano's report is addressed to "the August and Illustrious Majesty";<sup>43</sup> de Pons' letter with its indistinct mode of address ("Noble señor") gives no direct information on this point. To whom he wrote is a puzzling question<sup>44</sup> to which the text of the letter offers only clues of indirect nature.

#### Document No. 4: Bannisio's Text of Elcano's Report, Tadic's Version

Here we have the text found in 1931 by Tadic and reported by him in his article in *Jadranska Straza* in the form of a summary of the main points of the Italian original with a few verbatim extracts given in a Serbo-Croat translation. Tadic's text appeared 42 years after the findings made and the information published by Gelcic. Two questions arise here from the point of view of the historical profession:

- 1) Is this a new archival record of Bannisio's text of Elcano's report?
- 2) What does it add to the knowledge which we already have from the record of Bannisio's text published *in extenso* by Gelcic?

Tadic does not give a straight answer to the first question. Some of the statements which he makes leave the reader under the impression that the record or the records which he found, records containing both Bannisio's text of Elcano's report and his text of de Pons' letter, are those same records which Gelcic discovered and published before him. "Both these letters,<sup>45</sup> he says (p. 240, footnote 2), "are published by Eugen Gelcic in the Proceedings of the Viennese Academy of Sciences for the year 1888."<sup>46</sup> However, Tadic's description of the conditions of the archival record which he found and used,<sup>47</sup> in comparison with the knowledge which we have about the condition of the record found by Gelcic,<sup>48</sup> shows quite clearly and irrefutably that those are two separate and distinct documents. Indeed, a comparison of all the various data which are available to us today

<sup>43</sup> Charles V.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Gelcic, p. 10, lines 3-9.

<sup>45</sup> Both these *documents*—docs. 4 and 5.

<sup>46</sup> The year given by the Academy is 1889—statement based on reprint received from Dr. Lesky, p. 14.

<sup>47</sup> Mislaid, according to letters from V. Foretic, see below.

<sup>48</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photostatic copy.

on this point shows that the difference is striking. Tadic in his article (p. 239) says about the condition of the record which he found and reported:

This letter<sup>49</sup> as well as another one about which I shall speak later,<sup>50</sup> is in a very poor condition. At the slightest touch its paper disintegrates, while the black ink has damaged it very much. It would be necessary to photograph both letters and preserve them most carefully, for they will soon disintegrate completely.

Foretic in one of his letters<sup>51</sup> says: "According to statements made by Professor Jorjo Tadic, our Archives have these two reports in yet another and still older example, in a very bad condition." In another paragraph of the same letter he adds: "We shall search for the older example of these reports. If we find them, namely, when we find them, we shall decide whether they can be photographed or transcribed." On the other hand, the earlier photostatic copy<sup>52</sup> received from the archives of Ragusa, as we have seen already, shows that the record found and reported by Gelcic is in perfect condition. The description given by Gelcic (p. 2, line 15) of the record he held in his hands<sup>53</sup> (*Beide Briefe weisen ferner die gleiche Handschrift auf*) indicates no doubt that there was nothing wrong with this text. Gelcic would have said so and probably could not have provided his fellow-historians with his faultless transcript, if it had not been so.

In our quest for an answer to the second question, we are handicapped by the incomplete and largely paraphrased presentation of the information on the content of the Ragusan text of Elcano's report provided by Tadic from the greatly damaged and perhaps only partly transcribed text which he had.<sup>54</sup> However, we are here *mutatis mutandis* in the same situation in which we were in our discussions in an earlier section. A comparison between Tadic's condensed Serbo-Croat translation<sup>55</sup> and Gelcic's complete and precise verbatim text<sup>56</sup> discloses certain material differences, the most significant of which is related again to the controversial number of Magellan's men who returned on the *Victoria* to Spain. Tadic in his

<sup>49</sup> This *text*—Bannasio's Italian text of Elcano's report, Tadic's version, doc. 4, now mislaid.

<sup>50</sup> Doc. 5.

<sup>51</sup> No. 40/1.

<sup>52</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photost. copy.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Now mislaid.

<sup>55</sup> *Jadranska Straza*, 240.

<sup>56</sup> *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 3-6.

Serbo-Croat translation rendered here into English cites the version he found of Bannisio's Italian text of Elcano's Spanish report on this point as follows:

May Your August Majesty be advised of the arrival of our group of but 18 men and one of five ships which your August Majesty sent to discover the spice islands, etc.

The same number, as we know, is cited in Bannisio's *observantiae*. Gelcic's number and the number in the photostatic copy obtained from Ragusa,<sup>57</sup> as we also know, is 19 (xviii). So several conclusions follow therefrom. The first is that here again we have to note that there are distinct variations of text and information among these various groups of documents and to conclude on this count as well that what we have here are two separate and distinct sources. The second is that the controversial point, namely, number 19 (xviii), occurs again only in the "newer texts," texts which evidently were copied in Ragusa. The third conclusion is that the controversy is obviously caused through an error inadvertently made by the Ragusan *scribanus* in the "newer" text and therefrom transferred also to Gelcic's text. Gelcic, who did not have Bannisio's *observantiae*, raised the issue in the course of his broadened comparative tests involving not only the number in the Ragusan copies but also in all the other units of the Elcano source group known and available to him. Had he had the copy found later by Tadic, he would have seen that what is at stake here is not a controversy on a point of historical fact but a local orthographic error which evidently occurred in Ragusa in the preparation of the hand-made duplicate.

Another material difference of some significance from the point of view of the historical profession occurs at the end of the text. Tadic's Serbo-Croat citation (p. 240) based on the archival record which he had in his hands reads in an English translation as follows:

At the end of the letter<sup>58</sup> Elcano requested the Emperor that in consideration of the labor, sweat, hunger, cold, and heat which these men endured in Your service, you may be pleased to give them a quarter of one twentieth part (*cetvrtinu od 1/20*) of everything that they brought with them.

Gelcic's paper<sup>59</sup> and the archival record on which it is based<sup>60</sup> define the amount of the Emperor's award proposed by Elcano as *quarta parte di loro cosse et centellada*. So there we have another

<sup>57</sup> Docs. 2 and 3.

<sup>58</sup> At the end of the *report*—Doc. 4.

<sup>59</sup> Page 6, lines 8-11.

<sup>60</sup> Docs. 2 and 3.

controversy and another confirmation showing that these two texts, Bannasio's Italian text of Elcano's Spanish report in the "older" and the "newer" versions, are not the same even in terms of content. A comparison between them with reference to the various other texts and versions which occur in the Elcano source group and elsewhere leads us to the following conclusions: Tadic's text on the question of the amount of the Emperor's reward does not resemble any of the units in the Elcano group discussed in the Viennese Academy in 1889. It shows a resemblance to the version currently in use in the Spanish literature, namely, *la cuarta parte de la veitena de cuanto traían, la cual correspondía al rey*.<sup>61</sup> Another question which comes to mind concerning Tadic's text is: How does it compare with the Emperor's known ideas on the subject of reward as expressed in Article VI of the Royal Capitulation issued at Valladolid in 1518? Is the language used in harmony with the spirit of the contract under which the voyage was undertaken: "twenty per cent of the profits resulting from the first voyage, after expenses have been paid?"<sup>62</sup> Gelcic's text, an exact copy of the authentic archival record,<sup>63</sup> formally resembles neither any of the units of the Elcano group mentioned above nor any of the other texts and versions<sup>64</sup> and is very far from the wording used in Tadic's text. So the difference which we have here between the two Ragusan texts may again be an error and the error may well be in the same duplicate.

A further point to be answered is raised by the following statements made by Tadic (p. 240): "Elcano's letter was enclosed in this letter<sup>65</sup> on a separate piece of paper." Further in his report he says: "Together with this letter<sup>66</sup> Jakov Korculanin<sup>67</sup> sent to the Ragusan Government also a second letter."<sup>68</sup> So the question is: Was this first "letter" written and transmitted by Bannasio on a separate piece of paper, separate in relation to the text of de Pons' letter, or was it written together with this second letter on a single piece of paper?

Questions such as these can only be answered after the authentic archival records containing the "still older" version is received.

<sup>61</sup> *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada*, article on Elcano, Tome XIX, 497.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Benson, 80.

<sup>63</sup> Docs. 2 and 3, photostatic copy, item "A," lines 46-48.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Contarini's text in *Raccolta di Documenti e Studi pubblicati dalla R. Commissione Colombiana*, Rome, 1892, III/1, 101-104 (*quarta et vintesima delle sue cose et delle sue portate*).

<sup>65</sup> Bannasio's *observantiae*.

<sup>66</sup> Together with this report, Doc. 4.

<sup>67</sup> Bannasio—Jacob of the island of Curzola.

<sup>68</sup> Doc. 5, below.

Document No. 5: Bannisio's Text of de Pons' Letter,  
Tadic's Version

The last of this series of documents is Bannisio's text of de Pons' letter found by Tadic. The text is preserved in the Archives of Ragusa and reported in summary form in a Serbo-Croat translation in Tadic's article in *Jadranska Straza* (1931). The 16th century record Tadic had in his hands is described by him (p. 239) as heavily damaged. Students interested in the history of Spanish discoveries and explorations and more particularly in Magellan's voyage will find its accessibility for research pregnant with archival and other difficulties and limitations. Like Bannisio's text of Elcano's report belonging to the group discovered by Tadic (the "older group"),<sup>69</sup> the damaged example of de Pons' letter cannot evidently be equated with the perfect and well preserved "newer" example,<sup>70</sup> and must accordingly be classified as a distinct text representing the Imperial Secretary's original translations. However, what its exact status is in terms of content as far as the primary source is concerned is not possible to say. The same is true in several other respects. Like the first text, the "older" version of de Pons' letter is known to be in the Archives of Ragusa<sup>71</sup> but here again it cannot be said what its archival identifications are nor indeed where it is.<sup>72</sup> On the other hand, we have some fragmentary information about its content from Tadic's Serbo-Croat version in *Jadranska Straza*. In an English translation Tadic's summary report with its scanty citations from the original reads as follows:

Ponce<sup>73</sup> sent his letter *via* the *Victoria* to some highly placed personage in Spain<sup>74</sup> to whom he described the happenings through which they lived after Magellan's death. He praises the attitude of the ruler of Tidore and certain other Molucca islands and tells about the enormous wealth of these parts. We found an island where there is a lot of gold and cinnamon,<sup>75</sup> so much so that for a piece of iron they gave us 20 pounds of cinnamon or gold. The letter ends: I am not saying anything else in this letter, but am asking you to take care of my son who is on this ship [i.e. on the *Victoria*].<sup>76</sup> I am sending you a parrot and if it should not live I shall bring you another one. I have nothing more to say to your lordship. May our Lord guard you.

<sup>69</sup> Doc. 4, above.

<sup>70</sup> Doc. 3, above.

<sup>71</sup> Statements by Tadic and Foretic, above.

<sup>72</sup> Foretic's letters Nos. 40/1 and 40/3.

<sup>73</sup> De Pons.

<sup>74</sup> Unknown, cf. Gelcic, 10, lines 3-9.

<sup>75</sup> The Serbo-Croat text uses the Latin *canela*.

<sup>76</sup> Added by Tadic.

Photostatic copies of the authentic archival record of documents nos. 4 and 5 defined as Tadic's older version so as to distinguish it from the Gelcic version are unobtainable at present. Foretic in his letter<sup>77</sup> says: "We have not yet been able to trace these two reports in the still older version."

It is my hope that students engaged in Hispanic American research will find this material of some assistance. I also hope that this group of five original documents will soon be completed and made available in a special collection of annotated facsimiles.

<sup>77</sup> No. 40/3.