NADA ZEČEVIĆ

THE GENOese CITIZENSHIP OF CARLO I TOCCO
OF DECEMBER 2, 1389

The Genoese citizenship, granted to Carlo I Tocco and his regent mother Magdalen by the authorities of the Republic of Genova (December 2, 1389) is a document the existence of which is widely accepted in the scholarly circles despite the fact that the details of its contents have still remained largely unknown. Attempting to contribute to a better understanding of the circumstances under which the grant was issued, the first part of this paper brings the transcription of the entire document, as well as an analysis of its political and legal context. The paper’s second part deals with the document’s palaeographic, diplomatic, and sigillographic features as well as with its prosopographic and topographic details.

(I)*

The beginning of the rule of Carlo I Tocco (b. c. 1374 — d. July 1429) is generally considered a “dark” period.1 The remaining sources, mostly confusing and anachronistic, allow few certain conclusions about this episode of the history of the

* Due to technical reasons, the second part of the paper which contains the results of various segments of documentary analysis (paleography, diplomatic, sigillography, prosopography and toponymy), will be published in the next volume of Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta (vol. 42).

Neapolitan family that governed the Ionian islands and Epiros in the late Middle Ages. One of these certain notions is that Carlo inherited the familial domain upon the death of his father, Leonardo I, most probably around 1375. As Carlo was of minor age between c. 1375 and 1390, the government was controlled by his Florentine mother, Magdalene Buondelmonti. Governing a domain must have been a hard task for the widow because of her foreign origin, but also because of the extraordinary political position in which the Tocco domain was left after Leonardo's death. With closest neighbours that showed only but hostile attitudes — especially strong reactions came from the Navarese company, Venice and Albanians led by the Spata kindred — Magdalene had to find her own means of preserving the domain for her eldest son. Among the methods she relied upon while accomplishing her task was her net-

---

2 Direct documentary sources referring to this Tocco period are few. Among the narrative works, the most important information is yielded by the Tocco Chronicle, see Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia di Anonimo, ed. G. Schirò, Roma 1975 (=CroToc), book 1, chapter 5, verses 57–86, p. 224–6; 1, 6, 87–93, 226; 1, 8, 107–14, 228; 1, 10, 120–133, 228–30; 1, 5, 57–86, 224–6; 1, 9, 115–119, 228; 3, 20, 1012–1019, 292. Also, see I. K. Bogniatides, Συμβολή τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς Ιστορίας τῆς Τιετρού, Ημερολογικά χρόνια 1 (1926), 79. Laonicos Chalcocoetides, Historiarum libri X, in Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae (CSHB), ed. I. Bekker, Bonn 1843, book 4, pp. 205–211, and id., Historiarum demonstrationes I-II, ed. E. Dárko, Budapest 1922, book 4, vol. 1, pp. 197–9. The difficulties in modern attempts at a full understanding of the Albanian attacks on the Tocco territory were noted by D. Zakynthos, Le despotat gréc de Morée, vol. 1, Paris 1932, p. 131, i ibid., n. 3.

3 As there is no direct documentary reference to Leonardo's death, its chronology has been differently calculated by modern scholars, covering a wide period between 1364 and 1382. The years 1374 and 1375 seem to have been most commonly accepted; see e.g. Miller, The Latins, 332, n. 2; A. T. Luttrell, Venizeta in Epirus and its Lords, Rivista di studi bizantini e neoeleonici 11 (n. s. 1) (1964) 141; J. Chrysoostomides, Italian Women in Greece in the late Fourteenth and Early Fifteenth Century, Rivista di studi Bizantini e Slavi 2 (1982) 123.

4 CroToc, 1, 1, 4–7, 220.

5 In this period, the Buondelmonti family was considered a representative of the “ancient” Guelph circles of Florence some of which were expelled during the Chiibeline reaction at the end of the thirteenth century. Magdalene's mother Lappa was the natural sister of Niccolò Acciaioli, the man who financed and actually ruled the Neapolitan throne during the 1330s. For more details on him, see C. Ugurgieri Della Berardenga, Gli Acciaioli di Firenze nella luce dei loro tempi (1160–1834), 2 vols., Firenze 1962. For the connections between Florence and the Kingdom of Naples, see D. Abalafia, Southern Italy and the Florentine Economy, 1265–1370, in id., Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean 1100–1400, London 1987 (Variorum), no. VI, pp. 377–388. On Magdalene, see Chrysoostomides, Italian Women, 122–125.

6 In general, modern scholars consider this to have been the period 1375–1385; see G. Schirò, Prologomeni 1, in id., CroToc, p. 27, id., Il Ducato di Leucade e Venezia fra il XIV e XV secolo, Atti dell’ Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti: Classe di scienze morali, lettere ed arti 132 (1973–4) 597; P. G. Rontogiannnes, Ιστορία τῆς γνωσοῦ Λευκάδος, vol. I, Athens 1980, 320. An opinion that the Albanians kept attacking the Tocco territory until 1389 was given by C. Gasparis, Il patto di Carlo I Tocco con il Comune di Genova (1389–1390): una conseguenza delle incursioni albanesi, in Or Alassio στο Μεσαίωνα: The Mediaeval Albanians, Athens 1998 (=Gasparis, Il patto), 254.

work of useful private-political alliances. At the end of the 1380s, Magdalene added the Republic of Genova to the circle of her friends, which had largely featured the Florentines. The widely known fact that on December 2, 1389, the authorities of the Genoese republic granted citizenship to Magdalene and her young son Carlo prompted some modern scholars to define this relationship in the light of a "pro-Genoese" policy of the Tocco family.8

Although the Tocco citizenship in Genova is a widely accepted fact among scholars, the details of this event have remained largely unknown until the present day. The contents of the granting instrument seems to have been known to several researchers dealing with the family archive, but the document itself has never been published or adequately analysed.9 Such a situation created grounds for various speculative interpretations of the entire act, especially of the circumstances that had led to its conclusion.10 For instance, the instrument of the Genoese citizenship granted to the Tocco was directly — but with no reference to particular details — mentioned in several fourteenth-century documents.11 Analysing one of them (the ratification of the Tocco citizenship grant dated to October 7, 1390),12 Charalambos Gasparis concluded that the Tocco citizenship in Genova should be explained with the family's need for protection from the Albanians, and possibly for their counter-attack. Such an interpretation, however, although logical and hardly refutable because of the lack

8 R. Cessi, Venezia e i regni di Napoli e Sicilia nell’ultimo trecentenno del secolo XIV, Archivio storico per la Sicilia Orientale 8/III (1911) 323–325; 348. On Carlo’s age, see below, n. 24.

9 A short note on the contents of the documents was given by A. Allocati, Archivio di Stato di Napoli: Archivio Privato di Tocco di Montemiletto, Roma 1978, p. 25, no. 35. The contents of the document must have been known to the famous scholar and director of the Neapolitan State Archive, Riccardo Filangieri, who, probably through his personal connections — his family was aligned to the Tocco — enabled the transfer of the family archive from the private hands of a side Tocco branch to the funds of the Archivio di Stato in 1949. Among the modern scholars acquainted with the Tocco archive are Anthony T. Luttrell (see id., Guglielmo de Tocco, Captain of Corfu: 1330–1331, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 3 [1977] 45–56), Michele Bénaitéau (v. supra, n. 1), Valeria del Vasto (v. supra, n. 1), Paolo Petta (see id., Despoti d’Epiro e principi di Macedonia: Esuli albanesi nell’Italia del Rinascimento [Lecce 2000]) and Momčilo Spremić (as from the latter’s kind information). The fact that the pact of 1389 did not attract a significant scholarly attention is undoubtedly the result of the scholarly interest into other Tocco branches or the Tocco connection with other important regional factors.

10 Gasparis, Il patto, 250.

11 Gasparis, Il patto, 252, assumes that the ratification act had one copy. The two Venetian documents that mentioned the pact of December 1389 can be found in the regestum form in Thiriet, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 764 (December 30, 1389), p. 184 and ibid., no. 787, p. 189 (April 11, 1390) (the full form of the same document in AAV 1: 2, no. 413, p. 117).

12 E.g. Gasparis, Il patto, 255: “omnia et singula federa, promissiones, juramenta et obligationes promissa, facta et conventa per predicatum Jordanum eorum nuncium [...] et quendamque alia contenta et expressa in dicto publico instrumento [i.e. in the citizenship instrument of December 2, 1389].”
of documentary evidence about the Spata advancement during the 1380s, disregarded several other possibilities. For example, the Tocco might have desired Genoese protection because of other powers in their neighbourhood. One of these powers, the Ottoman Empire, was swiftly approaching the family’s domain — in 1385 the Turks marched into Albania, in 1387 they occupied Thessaloniki, and only a few months before the Tocco citizenship was granted, they defeated the Serbs in the battle at Kosovo Polje (June 15, 1389). Another political power that might have also initiated Magdalene’s turn to the Genoese was the Venetian Republic. During the early 1380s, the Venetians were on the verge of an open conflict with Magdalene, and it would not be surprising for the widow to turn towards the Genoese in order to ensure defence in the case of a full-scale Venetian attack. The Genoese, for their part, might have incited this orientation of the Tocco, for the family’s loyalty would give them an important post in their own struggle with the Venetians for influence in the Eastern Mediterranean. As is commonly known, the Genoese enjoyed a number of privileges granted to them in 1155 by the Byzantine Emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180), confirmed in 1267 by Michael VIII Palaeologus (1259–1282) and in 1352 by John VI Kantakuzenos (1347–1354). During the second half of the fourteenth century, this position was menaced by the Venetians — not long before the Tocco became Genoese citizens, the Genoese had put an end to one of their open conflicts with the Republic of St. Mark (1375–1381). Finally, the reception of the

14 For tension between Venice and Magdalene, see Thirtel, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 645 (May 15, 1383), p. 157 and AAV 1: 2, p. 280. Venetian claims to the island of Leukas were justified by a short period when the island was governed by one of their subjects, Gratianna Zorzes (v. C. Hopf, Γρατιανά Ζώρζης, Ακτένης Λευκάδος, transl. I. Romanos, Corfu 1870). For a documentary confirmation of the existence of these claims even in the period of the Tocco government, see Thirtel, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 558 (March 20, 1375), p. 138.
15 Among the recent titles on this issue, see E. Basso, Genova, un impero sul mare, Cagliari 1994.
Tocco among the Genoese citizens coincides in time with a period of peace which the authorities of the Ligurian Republic and its colonies ensured with several powerful rulers in the East (the Bulgarian Ivanko, the Tartars and Sultan Murad I). This suggests that the Tocco loyalty, adding to the general stability in the East, was one of those desirable conditions that allowed the Genoese involvement in other regions of their interest, namely northern Africa.

In order to contribute to a better understanding of the Tocco citizenship in Genova, and, consequently, of the “dark” stage of the family’s history, in my paper I shall return to the original document and provide its analysis. This document is kept in the family archive (Archivio di Tocco di Montemiletto), which was donated to the Neapolitan State Archive (Archivio di Stato di Napoli) by a side family branch in 1949. Marked as “Archivio di Tocco di Montemiletto, Privilegi, busta 1, no. 33,” and dated December 2, 1389, the parchment containing the act measures 33.5 × 48.9 cm, and is in relatively good condition. According to its light colour, the parchment can be classified as an Italian-Spanish type, also typical for a notable difference in colour and material structure between the document’s obverse and reverse sides. As can be clearly seen in the reverse, the parchment was folded twice; the traces of

17 For a reference to the agreement with the Bulgarian ruler Ivanko, see below, n. 30. For the Genoese treaty with the Tartars, see C. Desimoni, Trattato dei genovesi col Chan dei Tartari nel 1380–81, Archivio Storico Italiano, series IV, tomus XX (1887) 161–165. For the Genoese settlement with the Ottomans, see K. Fleet, The Treaty of 1387 between Murad I and the Genoese, Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 56/1 (1993) 13–33. A detailed analysis of the Genoese politics in the Eastern Mediterranean in this period can be found in G. G. Musso, Navigazione e commercio Genovese con il Levante nei documenti dell’Archivio di Stato di Genova, Rome 1975, especially pp. 63–97.

18 Stricto sensu, none of these treaties can be compared with the Tocco citizenship grant, firstly because of the different motives and circumstances that had led to their composition, and secondly because of formal differences between the documents. On the importance of these treaties for Genova see S. Epstein, Genoa and the Genoese 958–1528, Chapel Hill 1996, 244 (=Epstein, Genoa).

19 I here take the advantage of this occasion to express my gratitude to the Director of the Archive, Dr. De Negri, for her kind advice and authorisation for the publication of this document. I am also grateful to Ms. Di Nocera and Mr. Tedeschi of the Department for photo-reproductions of the Neapolitan State Archives for providing me with several copies of this document, as well as to others members of the archival staff for their kind assistance during my research in the archive. My research in this archive 2001–2002 was funded by the Central European University for which I express my deepest gratitude. I am also indebted to Prof. Duro Tošić (Historical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade) and Prof. László Veszprém (Medieval Studies Department, CEU, Budapest) for their advice on certain palaeographic issues. My gratefulness further goes to Matthew Sugg of the Department of Medieval Studies at Central European University (Budapest) for checking the English in this paper. Finally, I thank to Ms. Aleksandra Pavlović (Interlibrary loan service of the University Library “Svetozar Marković” in Belgrade) for her assistance in acquiring the literature necessary for this research.

20 The last direct member of the “Greek” Tocco died in an accident at the beginning of the twentieth century. The family’s legacy was transferred through the female line to the Italian noble families of Gorga and Soderini.

21 The notes written by hand on the reverse of the parchment suggest that the document was differently classified according to some earlier organisation of the archive. The documents of the “Greek” branch seem to have been added to an already existing archive after the fusion of the “Greek” and the “Neapolitan” branch in the seventeenth century. For more on the history of the archive, see Allocati, Archivio privato, 11–12.

22 G. Čremošnik, Studije za srednjevjekovnu diplomatiku i sigilografiju Južnih Sloven (Studies for the medieval diplomatcs and sigillography of the Southern Slavs), Sarajevo 1976, 22–23.
overlapping are also visible from the obverse of the parchment, although not as clearly as from the reverse.

The contents of the instrument reveals several important elements of the granting procedure. As seen from a Tocco letter quoted in the exposition of the instrument, the initiative for granting the family with the Genoese citizenship came from Carlo, or more precisely, from his regent mother. This quoted letter also shows that the Tocco request for citizenship was submitted a few years earlier (October 13, 1385), which further suggests a conclusion about the procedure’s long duration. In addition, it is important to note that the Tocco request for citizenship, issued, as early as 1385 challenges the existing modern assumptions about the beginning of the Tocco-Genoese negotiations in 1388. Another important set of information emerging from the grant instrument concerns the identity and competencies of the person who negotiated the citizenship on behalf of the Tocco. This person was “Jordanes Catanzarus”, no doubt a member of the prominent south-Italian family Catanzaro mentioned during the 1370s in connection with Carlo’s father. Moreover, it is important to note that “Jordanes Catanzarus” was specially authorised to represent the Tocco case before the Genoese authorities, and it seems that his diplomatic activities in Genova were performed in accordance with oral instructions of his masters.

The particular terms and conditions of the citizenship were specified in the disposition of the instrument: the Tocco were received among the citizens of Genova,

23 On this, see the text of the document, Ins. 6–26.

24 The priority of Magdalene’s position in decision-making has been suggested by the intitulation of the addressati in the citizenship instrument (see Ins. 27; 32; 43; 48; 57; 61), where first her name was mentioned and after this Carlo’s. The situation changed by the time of the ratification document of October 7, 1390 (see Gasparis, II patto, 254–257), which indicates that Carlo came to mature age before this period. My analysis of the chronology referring to Carlo’s age (Zečević, The Tocco of the Greek Realm, 83, n. 241) suggests that he was born around the end of May/beginning of June 1374.

25 The Tocco letter sent to Genova in 1385 coincides with the Spata offensive against Epirus in 1384–1385, see Croioan, 29, 94 (December 1384–January 1385); 32, 96 (before 1386). There is no direct documentary confirmation that the Albanian groups went astray towards the Tocco domain, but if this had indeed happened, then Gasparis’ explanation of the Tocco citizenship in Genova as caused by the Albanians would be further supported. For a different indication emerging from the citizenship instrument, see text of the document, Ins. 29–30.

26 F. Thiriet, La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Âge, Paris 1959, 358 (=Thiriet, La Romanie; Gasparis, II patto, 251.

27 Cf. Gasparis, II patto, 254, where this envoy was referred to as “Jordanum vocatum Cadenzanus”. A reference about a close relationship of the Tocco with the Catanzaro (“Catanzano”) family can be found in The Letter of Leonardo I Tocco to Lappa Accaioli (May 28, 1374), in Luttrell, Aldobrand, 277: “In Calavria fummo alla Roccella, et loco trovando lo Conte, e la Contessa di Catanzano con tutti i loro figli a stare per la gratia di Dio bene, salvo che Pietro di Catenzano, che ne venne a scontrare, et a riceverne: Incontrone, et con lui era Simoncino, et Andrea, et assai honorata Compagnia, et grande: Assai consolatione havemmo con Madama di Catanzano, e grande allegrezza fece di nostra venuta con fame assai carezze” [...].

which, consequently, allowed them to receive the Genoese protection. As this condition was formulated generally, with no precise reference to the identity of their enemies — just as in the Tocco demand quoted in the exposition of the document — it may be concluded that Magdalene Tocco counted to protect the domain from all of her enemies, not just from the Albanians as suggested by Gasparis in his interpretation of the ratification document.29 Further on, the grant stated that from the point of taxes and exemptions, the Tocco could regard themselves equal to other citizens of Genova. In return, their representative promised that the Tocco and their subjects would behave just like any other “good, true and loyal” Genoese, which specifically meant that they would receive in their domain, “with good will and beneficence”, all Genoese envoys, ambassadors and other citizens. In addition, the Tocco obliged themselves to: supply the above-mentioned Genoese visitors with food and other necessary articles; take part in the preservation and defence of the Genoan Republic and its property and, consequently, participate in any Genoese military action east of Sicily (under the condition that they were not required to refuse loyalty to their supreme suzerains, the Angevin rulers of Naples) by sending a completely furbished galleon (or money necessary for this) for a period of three months per year;30 pay taxes required by the Genoese authorities just like other Genoese citizens; ratify the grant as soon as possible.31

The quoted terms seem to have mostly followed the existing Genoese practice of citizenship granting. Similarly to the situation in other maritime republics of the time,32 the Genoese administration received oaths of loyalty from the local lords — diminishing, at the same time, their feudal rights, but offering, in return, protection during the frequent struggles of these lords against their hostile neighbours. This system, probably developed as early as the first half of the twelfth century, required the new Genoese citizens to reside in the city for three-months every year (in case of war even longer),33 as well as to actively participate in the city’s defence from any kind of hostile attack.34

30 See the instrument, In. 53. According to the treaty with the Bulgarian ruler Ivanko of 1387, the authorities of the Genoese colony in Pera required the Bulgarians to place a ship (or money for one) at their disposal for six months. For this treaty, see S. de Sacy, Mémoire sur un traité fait entre les Genois de Péra et un prince de Bulgarès, Mémoires de l’Institut Royal de France: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres 7 (1824) 292–343; И. Дуиевич, Договоръ на добруджанския кнъз Иванко съ генуезите отъ 1387 г., in id., Стара Българска книжина, vol. II, Sofia 1944, pp. xxviii; 185–197; 394–5 (=Dujčev, Ivanko).
31 Prompt ratification was also specifically mentioned as a condition in the ratification document of October 1390; see Gasparis, Il patto, 255.
32 For references to Venetian citizenship see below, n. 39. Among the most recent results of the investigations about the conditions and procedure of citizenship granting in other maritime republics of the time, especially useful (for the case of Ragusa) are those by Z. Janevović-Römer, Diversified Differences: Ethnic and Religious Minorities in Medieval Dubrovnik, communication presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Segregation, Integration and Assimilation in Medieval Towns (20–22. February 2003, Central European University, Budapest).
33 It is important to note that the Tocco were not required to reside within the city for three months, as were many other new Genoese citizens.
34 G. Day, Genoa’s Response to Byzantium 1155–1204: Commercial Expansionism and Factionalism in a Medieval City, Chicago 1988, 49 (=Day, Genoa’s Response) considers the treaty with Marquise Alderamo of Ponson (1135) to be the first Genoese pact of this kind.
From the Tocco perspective, at first sight the alignment with the Genoese might seem a somewhat unusual matter. First, the Republic of Genova became yet another among their supreme masters, which, in a formal sense, was undesirable. Second, the alliance with the Genoese meant an alignment with the Ghibeline (“popular,” pro-German) party that ruled the city at the time. This, given the existing Tocco preferences towards the traditional Guelph circles of power in the Apennines and further on (pontifical Curia, Neapolitan Angevins, Acciaioli), was, again, hardly a desirable model of political behaviour.

The evidence of the political practices of the time shows, however, that Magdalene acted in a manner that was, above all, useful. The Tocco family governed the Ionian islands first and foremost as the representatives and vassals of the Guelph-oriented Angevin court in Naples. Of course, the family’s vassalage to the Angevin court did not follow the ideal dual bond ‘vassal-King’ — during the rule of Carlo Robert (1309–1343), the Tocco obliged themselves to serve also the King’s brother, Philip of Anjou, who held the titles of Prince of Taranto (1294–1331), Despot of Romania (1294–1315), Prince of Achaea (1307–1313) and Emperor of the Latin Empire (1313–1331). As Philip’s titles were transferred to his offspring during the fourteenth century, throughout this period the Tocco had two suzerains among the Neapolitan Angevins, one being the ruler himself, another being a younger member of the ruling family. This kind of subjection, similar to the complex vassalage examples noted by Marc Bloch, was additionally amended by Magdalene’s husband Leonardo who, for himself and his posterity, obtained the status of a Venetian citizen (1361), strengthening at the same time also the connections with other

35 Less than a month after the granting of Genoese citizenship to the Tocco, the Venetians openly protested on this matter before the Genoese Doge. With an unusually sharp tone, the Venetians directly stated that the subjection to two republics at the time was not legally justified; see Thiriet, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 764 (December 30, 1389), p. 184. Cf. Thiriet, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 787 (April 11, 1391), p. 189 and AAV 1: 2, no. 413, p. 117.

36 Archivio di Stato di Napoli, Archivio di Tocco di Montemiletto (=ASN, ATM), Privilegi, busta 1, perg. no. 4 (November 20, 1322 in Naples).

37 As is widely known, Philip was the younger son of King Charles II of Anjou. His first title came from his marriage to Thamar, the daughter of the Despot of Epirus; his second title was granted to him by his father, while the third was acquired through his marriage to Catherine of Valois. Details of the chronology and nature of his titles can be found in Longnon, Empire Latin, 283–300; A. E. Latou, Constantinople and the Latins: the Policy of Andronicus II 1282–1328, Cambridge, MA 1972, 37–57, and 260; A. M. Talbott, Philip I of Taranto, in The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, Oxford 1991, vol. 3, p. 1652. The direct subjection of Carlo’s ancestor Guillelmo Tocco to Philip was documented in several charters, e.g. ASN, ATM, Privilegi, busta 1, perg. no. 1 (August 10, 1322, in Naples).

38 The Tocco were recorded as the vassals of King Robert in ASN, ATM, Privilegi, busta 1, perg. no. 4 (November 20, 1332, in Naples); Prince Philip in ibid., perg. no. 8 (October 27, 1347, in Naples); Prince Robert in ibid., perg. no. 9 (October 30, 1347, in Naples); Queen Joan I in ibid., perg. no. 10 (November 1, 1347, in Naples).

39 I libri commemoriali della Repubblica di Venezia, Regesti, ed. R. Predelli, Venezia 1883, vol. 3, 1, 6, no. 295 (February 19, 1361), p. 329, i E. A. Tsitselas, Керуаллинкок сопмьукс: сюмьолоа еїς тην Ιεράρχην καϊ λαογραφιαν еїς νησου Κερуαλληνας, vol. 2, Athens 1960, pp. 91–92 (February 18, 1361). The Venetians referred to this citizenship on several occasions later; see Thiriet, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 764 (December 30, 1389), p. 184, and ibid., no. 829 (April 15, 1393), 197–8. Apart from being granted Venetian citizenship, Leonardo I Tocco affirmed his position in this maritime republic also
Guelph circles of power, namely with the pontifical Curia and the powerful Acciaioli of Florence.\textsuperscript{40} There is no doubt that such a policy of loyalty to various political factions was commonly practised in the West at the time, and that due to this practice Leonardo established the \textit{de facto} independence of his domain.\textsuperscript{41} Ironically, after Leonardo's death Magdalene's connection with the Guelphs — although strongly based upon her private liaisons with the Florentine circle — lost a great deal of its primary significance. The Guelphs were in crises several times during the late 1370s and early 1380s, as the pontificate was overburdened with the issues of the "Great Schism", Charles III (1382–1386) and Jacques de Baux fought for the Neapolitan throne and supremacy over the Principality of Achaea,\textsuperscript{42} while the Acciaioli were involved both in the pontifical disputes and an internal fight for power in Florence featured by the Ciompi revolution and the troubles between the guild regime and the conservatives.\textsuperscript{43} Loyal to Charles III,\textsuperscript{44} Magdalene directly felt the consequences of this situation as her domain was attacked by the Navarese who were in the service of de Baux.\textsuperscript{45} In such circumstances, her alliance with the ruling Genoese Ghibelines, even though it implies an unusual ideological turn (unusual from the perspective of

t through personal lineage, for instance with the marriages of his daughter Petronella: in 1372 to Niccolò dalle Carceri (Duke of Naxos and Aegean Archipelago), a in the early 1390s to Niccolò Venier, the son of the Doge Marino Venier.


\textsuperscript{42} On the struggle for the Neapolitan throne see Longnon, \textit{Empire Latin, 333–335, and É. Léonard, Les Angevins de Naples, Paris 1954, 446–9. Jacques de Baux died on July 7, 1383, transferring his rights to the Principality of Achaea and the Latin Empire to his cousin, Louis I of Anjou (1382–1384), the son of the French King, Jean the Good. It is important to note that the struggle attracted the attention of other powers in the region, especially of the pontificate, which itself was divided at the time (Charles III was the favorite of Pope Urban VI while his rival enjoyed the favor of Clement VII).


\textsuperscript{44} CroToc, 1, 219–27, 220–222, suggests that Magdalene visited Naples not long after the death of her husband, and that she contracted the King to have her ruling position confirmed; yet it does not say anything about her role in the Angevin struggle for the throne. There is, however, a clear documentary confirmation that the close Neapolitan kin of Magdalene's late husband was loyal to Charles III during the struggle (ASN, ATM, Atti notarili, busta 4, perg. no. 162 [August 12, 1383 in Naples]).

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Luttrell, Aldobrando, letter no. 2, (April 24, 1382) (to Lorenzo Acciaioli), cap. 2, p. 293; letter no. 3 (June 15, 1382), (to Lorenzo Acciaioli), cap. 2, p. 296. Before February 1383, the Tocco county of Cephalonia was conceded by de Baux to John Lascaris Kalopheros. Not much later, before August 22, 1383, Louis I of Anjou, the successor of Jacques de Baux, declared the Tocco traitors, and proclaimed the confiscation of their entire Greek domain, which he donated to the family of the Grimaldi. The confiscation, however, never took place, due to his defeat in the struggle for the throne in Naples.
the fixed party loyalties of many Italian families of the time), should be perceived, above all, as a “pragmatic” means of survival.

At this point, however, an enquiry into the Tocco citizenship in Genoa can easily fall again into the field of speculation as there is no evidence that the important procedure details and circumstances revealed by the instrument of December 2, 1389, were ever really enacted. Magdalene and Carlo I Tocco did become the citizens of the Republic of Genova, and their status was indeed ratified on October 7, 1390. Yet no document directly confirms that the Tocco ever received any kind of serious military help from the Genoese, sent any kind of tribute to the Ligurian Republic, resided there, or received in their insular domain a significant number of the Genoese. Instead, less than three years after the ratification of the Tocco citizenship grant, the Venetian documentation revealed that the son of Magdalene Tocco attempted to enter the circle of the Genoese rivals in the Republic of St. Mark. In such a context, the instrument of December 2, 1389 — although a most important source for the issues of the Genoese and Tocco diplomatic, chronology, prosopography and documentary practices — can be seen only as a ceremonial document with no real political significance.

TEXT

Edition criteria:

The orthography of names follows the forms quoted by the original text. The transcription keeps the use of the graphemes as in the original document: “j” meaning “i”; “ü” meaning “v”; “v” meaning “u”; the original orthography of the diphthong “ae” (“e”) has been kept in the transcription; the syllabled form “-ti” has been kept as the form “-ci” appearing in the original text. The numbers in the text mark the beginning of the original lines (with the exception of the first); the same principle is followed for the designation of the subscription lines that are counted separately.

46 This Tocco political “pragmatism” was noted by Miller, The Latins, 487.
47 The reasons for which the citizenship grant was never enacted cannot be assessed with precision. On one hand, one could simply conclude that this was not required by the actual political situation. On the other hand, it is equally probable that the grant’s enactment was actively obstructed by the Venetians. An allusion to this emerges from a document in Thiriés, Régestes, vol. 1, no. 803, (September 7, 1391), in which the Venetian authorities openly indicated their attempts to “detach” Carlo from the Genoese — ironically enough, with the help of Magdalene Tocco.
48 The presence of Genoese merchants on the Tocco island of Cephalonia was recorded by Jean Froissart, in his Chroniques, in Ouvres de Froissart, vol. 16, ed. K. de Lettenhove (Bruxelles: Closson, 1875), 53: “et que plusieurs fois les marchans de Venise et de Jennes et des autres terres qui là arrivoient et qui y séjournoient ung temps pour les fortunes qui sur la mer estoient […]”). This reference, however, was made almost a decade after the Tocco were granted citizenship in Genoa (1397), and it does not contain any particular detail that would define the presence of the Genoese merchants as a direct result of the implementation of the Tocco citizenship grant.
49 Commemoriali, 8, no. 387, cap. 166 (168) (January 9, 1393), p. 216. Ibid., 388, s.d. (c. January 1393), c. 166 (168), conditions Carlo’s rapprochement to Venice with the termination of his subscription to Genova.
- "abcd" = less legible letters.
- "....." = letters that exist but can not be read.
- " .. " = signs written by the notary.
- "/abcd/" = letters added by the notary in an interline.
- "+abcd+" = language error.

deliberacione Officiij Octo proisionis parcium | 34| Ciuitatis Etcetera caperetur sapiatur dictum Jordanum presentem nominibus quibus supra et per ipsum prefatos Magnificos dominam Magdalenam et dominum karolum eiusdem domine Magdalene primogenitum eorumque | 35| et iiberoq eorum heredes et successores ac ipsorum et cuiuslibet eorum subdictorum in Ciues Ciuitatis Janue et in numero et gremio ceterorum ciuium Janue aggregauerunt et aggregant. Et sub protectione | 36| et defensione virorum Magnifici et Illustris domini domini .. duci et consilij et communis Janue Aduerserunt et advenuerunt ita quod decreto habeantur teneantur et reputentur pro veris et fidelibus ciuius Janue | 37| tam in ciuitate Janue quam in quacumque alia mondi parte. Et quod decretou vtantur et gaudeant et vti et gaudere possint et placant decretou et singulis honoribus priuligijis immunitatibus et | 38| facultatibus que sunt in Ciuitate Janue et quibuscumque terris et locis communis Janue quibus vtantur et gaudent et vti et gaudere soliti sunt ceteri Ciues Janue. Mandantes statuentes et decernentes quod decreto | 39| per quoscunque Officiale et Rectores in quarumque muni parte constitutos et per quoscunque Januenses seu qui pro Januensis appellantur et reputentur prefati Magnifici domina Magdalenae et dominus karol|40|ius et eorum et alterius eorum heredes et successores ac subdicti tractentur reputentur habeantur et defensantur tampro veri et fideles Ciues Janue et prout et sicut ceteri Ciues Janue tractantur | 41| reputantur et defensantur. Dominus Jordanus nominibus quibus supra gractanter et benigne acceptans omnia et singula supradicta volens eidem irurata et comissa pro dictis eius dominos adimplere et obseruare | 42| promisit et solempniter continerit prefatis Magnifico domino domino .. duci et .. Consilio ac michi notario infrascripto tamquam publice persone officis publico stipulantibus et recuperentibus nomine et vice communis Janue et omnium et | 43| singulorum quorum inest interit uel in futurum poterit interesse quod prefati Magnifici domini Magdalenae et karolus et Ipsorum et cuiuslibet eorum subdictorum erunt decetero boni veri et fideles ciues |44| Janue et pro bonis veris et fidelibus ciuius Janue se gerent tractabunt et reputabunt verbo et facto in quacumque mondi parte et iurabuntur et perseverabunt sub protectione et +defensione + et defensione |45| prelibati Magnifici domini domini .. ducis Januensium Consilij et communis Janue. Nuncios et Ambassatores dicti communis Janue et presidencium eidem communi et personas quorumcumque Januensium et qui pro Januens|46|ibus reputentur et tractentur benigne gractanter et fauorabiler tractabant et in terris portubus Jnsulis et locis communis receptabunt tam in mari quam in terra et ipsis existentibus in dictis |47| locis uel aliquo eorum prebebunt victualia et alia opportuna et necessaria quibus prefati Januenses indigenter pro ipsis Januensium partibus. Jpsisque sanos saluos et Ilesos et ipsorum bona in dictis lo|48|cis et quolibet eorum conseruaiunt et bona fide et pro posse ipsorum Magnificorum dominorum Magdalene et karoli subditorum quod suorum contraomnem personam corpus Collegiit seu Vniuersitatem |49| Januenses prefatos defendent et tuebuntur. Et eciam soluent et subibunt omnia et singula onera communis Janue quocumque nomine conservantur qua per dictum commune Janue seu .. presidentes dicto communi imponentur sicut ceteri |50| ciues Janue facient. Item promisit dictus Jordanus nominibus quibus supra prefatis Magnifico domino domino duci supra consilio et michi dicto notario
stipulantibus et recipientibus nominibus quibus supra [51] eorum prefati Magnifici
domi Mahdalenae et karolus et ipsorum et cuuslibet eorum subdistorum facient
decetro pacem et guerram pro communi Janue et ad voluntatem et requisitionem
dicti communis seu presidentium dicto [52] communi contra quoscumque contra quos
dicti communis seu presidentes dicto Communi guerram facient et cum
quibuscumque pacem seu treguem facient bona fide et pro posse. Item quod dabunt
ad seruitias cuuscumque [53] guerre dicti Communi seu presidencium dicto
communi vnam galeam armatam pro mensibus tribus quolibet anno expensis ipsorum
dominorum .. Comitisse et ducisse ac .. Comitis et ducis siue pecuniam [54]
necessariam pro stipendis dictis galeis pro dictis tribus mensibus ad dictas seruitias
cuiusque guerre dicti communis Janue quodcunque commune Janue voluitur pro
dicto tempore et vbicunque a Sicilia inclusiue vtra [55] versus orientem. Salus et
exceptato quod non obstantibus supra dictis non teneantur facere guerram seu
aliaquam offenseionem reale uel personalem contra Serenissimam dominam
dominam Margaritam [56] dei gratia Jerusalemij Sicilie et Vngarie Reginam nec con-
tra Serenissimum dominum +Vencaeslaun+ primogenitum eiusdem et natur Jlustris
principis quondam domini domini Regis karolij consortis ipsius nec contra
sub[57]dictos seu vassalos ipsorum. Item promisit dictus Jordanus nominibus quibus
supra quod prefati Magnifici domini Magdalenae et karolus expresse ratificabunt et
approbabunt omnia et singola in presenti instrumento [58] et predictus Jordanus
promisus per vnum aut publica instrumenta cum promissionibus juramentis
obligacionibus raciationibus penarum advertisementibus et aliis cauelliis debitis et
neecessariis [59] instrumentis per proxime venturos. Jurans ad Sanctissima euangelia
tactis scripturis dictus Jordanus nominibus et presentibus nominibus quibus
suprascriptis stipulatis intrari etc. Prefatis Magnifico domino domino [60] duce
Januensium et consilio et communis iamdiceto notario notario stipulantibus et
recipientibus nomine et vice dicti communis Janue et omnium et singularum quorum
interest intererit uel interesse poterit predicta omnia et singola habeantur perpetuo et
tenere et [61] quod dicti Magnifici domini Magdalenae et karolus eorumque et cuisque
ipsorum/ subdistorum et quilibet eorum habeant perpetuo et tenebunt rata grata et
firma accedentur complebuntur et obseruabuntur omnia et singola suprascripta per
dictum Jorda[62]num dictis nominibus promissa et quorum non facient uel venient
aliaus res cum animo uel ingenio qui dici uel excogitari possit de Jure uel de facto
Sub ypoteca et obligatione bonorum suorum dictis nominibus presenecium et
futu[63]rorum. Et de predictis mandauerunt prefati Magnificus dominus .. dux et ..
Consilium dictus Jordanus dictis nominibus rogaut confici debere publicum
instrumentum presentis Antonii de Credencia notarri publici et ipsorum
Magnificorum domini .. [64] duces consilij et communis Janue cancellarium
infrascriptum. Actum Janue in sala parua Cancellarie veteris palacij ducalis in qua
discumbit fanulus praefati Magnifici domini .. ducis. Anno dominice natiuitatis
Mille[65]simotrecentessimo octuagessimono. Jndizione duodecima. secundum
cursum Janue. die Jouis huius mensis decembres vespera hora vigissimatercia.
Presentibus testibus ad hec vocatis specialiter et rogatis Alde[66]brando de Conuersia
Conrado Mazurro Petro de Burgilio et Masimo de Judicibus notarijs et dicti comunis Janue Cancellarijs.
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Нада Зечевић

ЋЕНОВСКО ГРАЂАНСТВО КАРЛА I ТОКО (2. XII 1389)

(I)

У фокусу рада налази се документ о грађанству у Ћенови које су власти ове поморске републике 2. XII 1389 дале Карлу I Токо и његовој мајци, регенткињи Магдалени. Овај документ, вековима чувању у породичном архиву, у модерно време није привукао пажњу научних кругова, што је довело до тога да се о његовим детаљима може шпекулисати иако се постојање самог документа не доводи у питање. Како би се документ о Току грађанству у Ћенови што боље разумео, у првом делу рада доноси се транскрипција његовог текста, као и анализа политичко-правних прилика које су довеле до његовог настајања. Међу посебно значајним приликама потребно је истаћи настојање Магдалене Токо да
обезбеди ђеновску заштиту од свих евентуалних непријатеља, те ђеновску аспирацију на Токо домен, посебно значајну у контексту борбе ове републике са Венецијом за интересе сфере на Истоку. Поменута анализа такође указује и на баланс Токо регенткиње, не само између две међусобно супротстављене поморске републике, него и између гвелфских и гибелинских центара моћи на Апенинском полуострву. Недостатак документарних података о стварној примени одредби из документа о грађанству од 2. XII 1389. наводи на закључак да се ради о церемонијалном акту без стварне политичке вредности.