

Nebojša Porčić
Faculty of Philosophy
Čika Ljubina 18–20, Belgrade, Serbia
nebojsa.porcic@f.bg.ac.rs

THE DUBROVNIK CORPUS OF SERBIAN IMPERIAL DOCUMENTS AS A SOURCE FOR CHANCERY RESEARCH*

Abstract: The Dubrovnik corpus of documents issued by Serbian medieval rulers of the Nemanjić dynasty provides the best available avenue of approach to the still inadequately treated issue of the Nemanjić chancery. This analysis focuses on documents issued in the final period of Nemanjić rule, after King Stefan Dušan assumed the imperial title (1346–1371). It confirms that documents were produced in accordance with a clearly defined typology by a regular, organized staff. Very proficient in supplying the various types of documents with appropriate external and internal features, these individuals also proved capable of adapting earlier document-making tradition to the demands presented by the rise of the Serbian rulers to imperial status. However, certain aspects of the production process seem to have remained underdeveloped (apparent lack of proper formularies and registers of outgoing items). This opened the way for greater involvement of addressees, a factor that should be taken into account in further research.

Keywords: Serbia, Middle Ages, diplomatics, documents, chancery, emperor Dušan, emperor Uroš.

* Рад је настао као резултат истраживања на пројекту Министарства просвете и науке Републике Србије: *Средњовековно наслеђе Балкана: институције и култура* (ев. бр. 177003) и представља текст саопштења изложеног на 23. међународном конгресу византијских студија (Београд, 22–27. августа 2016), у оквиру тематске седнице *Chanceries and Documentary Practices in Southeast Europe (13th–15th centuries)*, прерађен и допуњен у складу с резултатима до којих се дошло у међувремену.

Modern researchers of Serbian diplomatics have at their disposal a total of about 220 documents issued by the ten members of the Nemanjić dynasty who successively ruled Serbia from the late 1160s to 1371. Averaging just over one document per year, this corpus obviously presents a very limited basis for the study of the Nemanjić chancery. However, that general conclusion does not apply equally to the whole two-century period. About 160 documents, almost 73% of the total, were issued by the three monarchs who ruled the Nemanjić state through the last five decades of its existence – King Stefan Dečanski (1321–1331), his son Stefan Dušan (1331–1355), and Dušan's son Uroš (1355–1371). In fact, 93 of these later Nemanjić documents were issued during the dynasty's last 25 years (1346–1371), after Dušan proclaimed himself *emperor of the Serbs and the Greeks*.

Although this concentration of documents in the imperial period evidently offers much better conditions for chancery research, a closer inspection reveals that the situation is not as favorable as it may seem. For one thing, as many as 26 of the 93 available units cannot be considered as illustrative of an autochthonous Serbian imperial chancery practice because they were originally composed in Greek or Latin, purposefully imitating Byzantine and Western document-making traditions.¹ Secondly, the fate of the Serbian empire, which in just one generation descended from the peak of power into political collapse accompanied by the disappearance of the ruling dynasty, made the documents of the two Serbian emperors an attractive subject of forgeries and interpolations, resulting in unsatisfactory or questionable diplomatic status of many preserved units.² Last but not least, there are the problems with source material availability. Existing published collections of Serbian medieval documents, dating mostly from the 19th and early 20th century, are all incomplete and generally offer insufficient descriptive information,³ while the

¹ This is amply demonstrated for the 23 Greek documents by A. СОЛОВЈЕВ – В. МОШИН, *Грчке повеље српских владара*, Београд 1936 [A. Solovjev – V. Mošin, *Grčke povelje srpskih vladara*, Beograd 1936], LXXXVIII–XCIII.

² Cf. Б. ФЕРЈАНЧИЋ – С. ЋИРКОВИЋ, *Стефан Душан*, Београд 2005, 316–317 [B. Ferjančić – S. Ćirković, *Stefan Dušan*, Beograd 2005].

³ The situation is only partly amended by the more recent catalogues of Л. СЛАВЕВА – В. МОШИН, *Српски грамоти од Душаново време*, Прилеп 1988 [L. Slaveva – V. Mošin, *Srpski gramoti od Dušanovo vreme*, Prilep 1988], and Д. СИНДИК, *Српска средњовековна акта у манастиру Хиландару*, *Хиландарски зборник* 10 (1998) 9–132 [D. Sindik, *Srpska srednjovekovna akta u manastiru Hilandaru*, *Hilandarski zbornik* 10 (1998) 9–132]. The journal *Стари српски архив* (=ССА) [*Stari srpski arhiv*], launched in 2002 and dedicated to publishing new editions and

documents themselves are difficult to come by – of the 67 Serbian-language units, eight have been lost or destroyed in the first half of the 20th century and 25 are preserved in the limitedly accessible collections of four different monastic communities on Mount Athos, mostly in the Serbian monastery of Hilandar. That leaves only 34 units available to scholars in archival institutions, but even these are somewhat dispersed, with one document located in Venice, two in Belgrade (in different institutions), three in Zagreb, and the largest single concentration of 28 documents in the Dubrovnik State Archives.

As a result of these and other factors, a systematic comprehensive study of the Serbian imperial chancery hasn't yet been written. Instead, scholarly treatment of preserved imperial documents has largely focused on discussing individual items, often with the aim of resolving controversies over their authenticity,⁴ and using imperial document-making practice

commentaries of individual Serbian medieval documents, has so far covered 44 imperial units. Due to similarities between titles, when referring to document editions articles from this journal will be quoted by author, volume and page only.

⁴ Examples include K. JIREČEK, Dohodak stonski, koji su Dubrovčani davali srpskome manastiru Sv. Arhandela Mihajla u Jerusalimu i povelje o njemu cara Uroša (1358) i carice Mare (1479), *Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*, Berlin 1908, 527–542; A. СОЛОВЈЕВ, Два прилога проучавању Душанове државе. I. Повеље цара Душана о метохији Св. Петра Коришког, *Гласник Скопског научног друштва* (=Гласник СНД) 2 (1927) 25–36 [A. Solovjev, Dva priloga proučavanju Dušanove države. I. Povelje cara Dušana o metohiji Sv. Petra Koriškog, *Glasnik Skopskog naučnog društva* (=Glasnik SND) 2 (1927) 25–36]; В. МОШИН, Повеља цара Душана о селу Лушцу, *Југословенски историјски часопис* 5 (1939) 104–119 [V. Mošin, Povelja cara Dušana o selu Lušcu, *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis* 5 (1939) 104–119]; ИДЕМ, Повеље цара Душана и Јована Paleologa Pantelejmonovom manastiru, *Zgodovinski časopis* 6–7 (1952–1953) 402–416; Р. МИХАЉЧИЋ, Прилог српском дипломатару. Повеље и писма цара Уроша и кнеза Војислава Војиновића упућене Дубровнику, *Прилози за књижевност, језик, историју и фолклор* (=Прилози КЈИФ) 39, 3–4 (1973) 226–234 [R. Mihaljčić, Prilog srpskom diplomataru. Povelje i pisma cara Uroša i kneza Vojislava Vojinovića upućene Dubrovniku, *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* (=Prilozi KJIF) 39, 3–4 (1973) 226–234]; ИДЕМ, Даровнице властеоске породице Вукославић, *Историјски гласник* (=ИГ) 1–2 (1976) 99–106 [Idem, Darovnice vlasteoske porodice Vukoslavić, *Istorijski glasnik* (=IG) 1–2 (1976) 99–106]; *Споменици за средновековната и поновата историја на Македонија* (ур. В. Мошин – Л. Славева) III, Скопје 1980, 323–454 [*Spomenici za srednovekovnata i ponovata istorija na Makedonija* (ur. V. Mošin – L. Slaveva) III, Skorje 1980, 323–454]; В. МОШИН, Повеље цара Стефана Душана о Арханђеловом манастиру у Јерусалиму и о манастиру Св. Николе на скадарском острву Врађини, *Археографски прилози* 3 (1981) 7–36 [V. Mošin, Povelje cara Stefana Dušana o Arhandelovom manastiru u Jerusalimu i o

as a source for various aspects of Dušan's "hierarchical leap".⁵ In both cases, researchers primarily focused on the Athonite document corpus, because it largely consists of documents which the medieval rulers deemed most important – grants of land and privileges to ecclesiastic institutions. However, from the diplomatic standpoint, these units are quite troublesome. Issued to deal with local matters of land possession whose details were not widely known and then kept as legal proof in the same institutions for whose benefit they were created, they became the prime targets of post-Nemanjić forgeries and interpolations, resulting in a disproportionately high number of units whose diplomatic status is questionable or

manastiru Sv. Nikole na skadarskom ostrvu Vranjini, *Arheografski prilozi* 3 (1981) 7–36]; С. МИШИЋ, Повеле цара Стефана Душана манастиру Светог Петра Коришког из 1355. године, *ИГ* 1–2 (1993) 121–134 [S. Mišić, Povelje cara Stefana Dušana manastiru Svetog Petra Koriškog iz 1355. godine, *IG* 1–2 (1993) 121–134]; С. ЋИРКОВИЋ, Хиландарски игуман Јован (Проблем аката српске царске канцеларије), *Осам векова Хиландара*, Београд 2000, 59–70 [S. Ćirković, Hilendarski iguman Jovan (Problem akata srpske carske kancelarije), *Osam vekova Hilandara*, Beograd 2000, 59–70]; Д. ЖИВОЈИНОВИЋ, Карејске хрисовуље Стефана Душана, *Историјски часопис* 50 (2003) 33–52 [D. Živojinović, Karejske hrisovulje Stefana Dušana, *Istorijski časopis* 50 (2003) 33–52]; Ж. ВУЈОШЕВИЋ, Архијевичка хрисовуља цара Стефана Душана, *Иницијал* 1 (2013) 241–254 [Ž. Vujošević, Arhijevička hrisovulja cara Stefana Dušana, *Inicijal* 1 (2013) 241–254], and commentaries accompanying document editions in *ССА*.

⁵ Г. ОСТРОГОРСКИ, Автократор и самодржац, *Глас Српске краљевске академије* 164 (1935) 95–187, esp. 153–157 [G. Ostrogorski, Avtokrator i samodržac, *Glas Srpske kraljevske akademije* 164 (1935) 95–187]; М. ДИНИЋ, Српска владарска титула за време царства, *Зборник радова Византолошког института (=ЗРВИ)* 5 (1958) 9–19 [M. Dinić, Srpska vladarska titula za vreme carstva, *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta (=ZRVI)* 5 (1958) 9–19]; Г. Острогорски, *Простагме српских владара*, Прилози КИФ 34, 3–4 (1967) 245–257 [G. Ostrogorski, *Prostagme srpskih vladara*, Prilozi КИФ 34, 3–4 (1967) 245–257]; Љ. МАКСИМОВИЋ, Грци и Романија у српској владарској титули, *ЗРВИ* 12 (1970) 61–78 [LJ. Maksimović, Grci i Romanija u srpskoj vladarskoj tituli, *ZRVI* 12 (1970) 61–78]; S. M. ĆIRKOVIĆ, Between Kingdom and Empire: Dušan's State 1346–1355 Reconsidered, *Byzantium and Serbia in the 14th Century*, Athens 1996, 110–120; N. OIKONOMIDES, Emperor of the Romans – Emperor of the Romania, *Ibidem*, 121–128; С. МАРЈАНОВИЋ-ДУШАНИЋ, *Владарска идеологија Немањића. Дипломатичка студија*, Београд 1997, esp. 36–41, 81–96, 174–180 [S. Marjanović-Dušanić, *Vladarska ideologija Nemanjića. Diplomatička studija*, Beograd 1997]; Љ. МАКСИМОВИЋ, Српска царска титула, *Глас Српске академије наука и уметности* 384 (1998) 173–189 [LJ. Maksimović, Srpska carska titula, *Glas Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti* 384 (1998) 173–189]; С. ПИРИВАТРИЋ, Улазак Стефана Душана у царство, *ЗРВИ* 44/2 (2007) 381–409, esp. 391–397 [S. Pirivatrić, Ulazak Stefana Dušana u carstvo, *ZRVI* 44/2 (2007) 381–409].

inadmissible for chancery research.⁶ Moreover, since all these characteristics are also shared by the pre-imperial Nemanjić documents preserved on Mount Athos, a researcher relying primarily on the Athonite corpus would find it difficult to establish the historical perspective necessary for reconstructing institutional phenomena such as the chancery.

In contrast, the Dubrovnik corpus – which can be said to include 29 units due to the Dubrovnik provenance of one of the Belgrade documents⁷ – deals with international relations between the Serbian emperors and the Dubrovnik city-state or its individual citizens.⁸ Preserved as part of Dubrovnik government records, these documents raise far fewer doubts regarding their diplomatic status, with the vast majority of them falling into the categories of original or official authentic copy.⁹ Also, even though their purpose was less prestigious than the endowment of

⁶ Thus, the first complete catalogue of Serbian-language documents of the Hilandar archives published by Dušan Sindik in 1998 (see note 3) has found only three certain originals among the 24 listed documents of the imperial period. Another five are evidently much later copies, but most of the others fall into the inconclusive category, including some whose diplomatic status has been left completely blank.

⁷ Similarly, the Athonite corpus can be expanded to 32 units, because six lost items as well as the other document now kept in Belgrade originally belonged to the Hilandar collection.

⁸ Documents of the Dubrovnik corpus will be referenced using numbers from #62 to #90, which match their designations in the comprehensive edition of Nemanjić documents preserved in Dubrovnik collections – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи српских средњовековних владара у дубровачким збиркама. Доба Немањића*, Београд 2017 [N. Porčić, *Dokumenti srpskih srednjovekovnih vladara u dubrovačkim zbirkama. Do ba Nemanjića*, Београд 2017], with color images. Basic information on individual documents, including references to an open-access online collection of images, is provided in Table 1 at the end of this paper. The document kept in Belgrade is #76.

⁹ Cf. Table 1. In most cases, these conclusions are so self-evident that they were established already by the first publishers in the 19th century. In fact, the only unit of seriously questionable authenticity (#69) concerns an ecclesiastical grant involving the monasteries of the Holy Archangels in Jerusalem, Saint Nicholas of Vranjina, and, finally, Hilandar, whose collection also includes one version of that document – for details, see В. МОШИН, *Повеље цара Стефана Душана о Арханђеловом манастиру*, 7–36; Ђ. БУБАЛО, *Средњовековни архив манастира Врањине (прилог реконструкцији)*, *ССА* 5 (2006) 265–269 [Ђ. BUBALO, *Srednjovekovni arhiv manastira Vranjine (prilog rekonstrukciji)*, *SSA* 5 (2006) 243–276]; Ж. ВУЈОШЕВИЋ, *Врањина и Св. Арханђели у Јерусалиму – још један осврт на традицију даровне повеље цара Стефана Душана*, *Историјски часопис* 66 (2017) 237–255 [Ž. Vujošević, *Vranjina i Sv. Arhandeli u Jerusalimu – još jedan osvrt na tradiciju darovne povelje cara Stefana Dušana*, *Istorijski časopis* 66 (2017) 237–255], and Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 114–116, 241–243.

monasteries for the salvation of the emperor's soul, they cover a much wider range of actions – from commercial treaties and territorial concessions to various agreements, financial transactions, negotiations, and notifications – resulting in a greater diversity of document types. Finally, the Dubrovnik corpus of pre-imperial Nemanjić documents, comprising more than 50 units, fully matches the quality of its imperial counterpart, thus providing both reliability and continuity to a presentation of the Serbian imperial chancery.

Despite strong positive indications, the hypothesis that the Dubrovnik corpus offers the best starting point for the study of the Nemanjić chancery in general, and its imperial period in particular, still needs to be tested through its capability to respond to the questions posed by the research process. A medieval ruler's chancery can perhaps be best defined as a regular courtly service dedicated to the production of documents. Its "regularity" is manifested in two ways – a regular way of shaping documents, and a regular composition and organization of the chancery staff. Therefore, an attempt to study a chancery through its documents – and in the Nemanjić case that is pretty much the only available approach – essentially consists of scanning the document corpus for reflections of these regularities. In this, the researcher should bear in mind that regularity in document production is the main precondition for a document-making service to be categorized as a chancery, while composition and organization primarily concern the formal framework through which that activity is realized, impacting the quality but not the nature of chancery activity.

At the time of Dušan's imperial accession, the shaping of Nemanjić documents was already well regularized into three basic types. Actions that were considered to be of the highest importance were recorded in the form of solemn charters. Their texts are distinguished by beginning with often lengthy and learned proems and by containing elaborate intitulations in the protocol,¹⁰ with equally elaborate signatures written in large majuscule red-ink ligatures at the end.¹¹ External characteristics are more difficult to determine due to the relatively small number of preserved originals, but it seems that there was an insistence on parchment even after paper had become readily available from the beginning of the 14th

¹⁰ For example, in Dušan's last royal document of this type: *I Stefan, servant of Christ, king of all Serbian and Maritime and Greek lands* – А. СОЛОВЬЕВ, *Одабрани споменици српског права од XIII до краја XV века*, Београд 1926, nr. 64 [A. Solovjev, *Odabrani spomenici srpskog prava od XIII do kraja XV veka*, Beograd 1926].

¹¹ In the above document: *Stefan, faithful in Christ the God, king of all Serbian and Maritime lands*.

century, as well as a tendency to write in script resembling the type used in books (Cyrillic uncial or *ustav*) and to apply metal seals appended beneath the text.

Non-solemn or plain charters began with notifications, their intituations were limited to the royal pronoun *kraljevstvo mi* (“my royal person”),¹² and the signatures, although again written in red-inked majuscule ligatures, were also abridged, containing only the name and the title.¹³ The texts were written in a less formal business script whose use in documents of this type gradually turned it into a recognizable style which has been aptly named the documentary or even chancery script.¹⁴ Also, although parchment was clearly the primary material for this type as well, sealing was performed with large-diameter pendent pieces made of wax.

While both types of charters were issued as open documents intended for public use, letters were folded to hide the contents, with addresses and small wax seals – obviously impressions from the signet ring – placed on the outside. Like plain charters, they used the business script and bore abridged red-ink signatures, but in a smaller, minuscule hand. Significantly, all preserved original letters from the start of the 14th century onwards are written on paper.¹⁵ As for the texts, they generally followed a simple pattern, again lacking a proper intitulation and beginning instead with an address and notification.¹⁶

These document-making concepts had been developed gradually through free blending of local tradition with Byzantine and Western influences. However, with Dušan’s assumption of the imperial title there arose an urgent need to adopt Byzantine imperial document features as one of the most important signs that the Serbian ruler had in fact risen to the highest level of the Byzantine commonwealth’s political hierarchy. Some of these features, such as red-ink signatures and gilded seals, had already been introduced into Serbian practice, but others were imperial

¹² Thus the usual notifying opening of Dušan’s royal plain charters: *it is written by my royal person for everyone to know*, etc.

¹³ In Dušan’s last royal charter to Dubrovnik: *Stefan the king* – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 228, #61.

¹⁴ Г. ЧРЕМОШНИК, Студије из српске палеографије и дипломатике, *Гласник СНД* 21 (1940) 1–8 [G. Čremošnik, Studije iz srpske paleografije i diplomatike, *Glasnik SND* 21 (1940) 1–8]; П. ЂОРЂИЋ, *Историја српске ћирилице*, Београд 1990³, 82–84 [P. Đorđić, *Istoriја srpske ćirilice*, Београд 1990³].

¹⁵ For a more detailed description see Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *ССА* 7 (2008) 18–19, with references to earlier works.

¹⁶ Dušan’s letter from 1340: *To my royal person’s beloved cousin ... so that you may know*, etc – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 223, #58.

prerogatives to which earlier Serbian rulers did not feel entitled. Chief among the latter were two other elements written in red ink – the *logos*-formula, a set word pattern inserted into the document text as a recognition sign, and the *menologem*, a short date formula consisting of the month and indiction which was used as the document's signature. These were particularly important as distinguishing marks in the characteristic Byzantine typology of documents, which at this time recognized two main groups – the solemn *chrysobulls*, supplied with *logos*-formulas, and the plain, menologem-bearing *prostagsms* – but then used intense formalization of textual and external features to introduce various subtypes.¹⁷ Thus, the task of Dušan's document-makers after 1346 was not merely to adopt the *logos*-formula and the menologem, but also to use that process of adoption to conduct a wider typological reassessment of existing Serbian practices.

Evidence available in the Dubrovnik corpus shows that such a reassessment was indeed carried out. Prior to 1346, Serbian documents that called themselves chrysobulls invariably belonged to the group of solemn ecclesiastic charters. Even when an occasional lay charter was considered important enough to be composed as a document of the solemn type – such as Dušan's grant of the Ston (Pelješac) peninsula to Dubrovnik in 1333¹⁸ – it was not accorded this ultimate title of honor.¹⁹ On the other hand, practically all of the most important Dubrovnik charters of the imperial period – Dušan's grand charter of privileges (#74), Uroš's charters regulating the status of the island of Mljet (#82, #83), his grants of privileges and territories (#86–#88), and the peace treaty of 1362 (#90) – use the name chrysobull or its Serbian equivalent, *zlatopečatno slovo*.²⁰

Promotion of the most important Serbian imperial lay charters into chrysobulls was obviously an import from Byzantium, where lay chryso-

¹⁷ Late Byzantine document-making has been systematically presented in the works of F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre. Erster Abschnitt: Die Kaiserurkunden*, München 1968, and N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, La chancellerie impériale de Byzance du 13e au 15e siècle, *Revue des études byzantines* 43 (1985) 167–195.

¹⁸ Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 209–213, #50.

¹⁹ The Hilandar corpus does contain two Dušan's royal "chrysobulls" issued to members of the lay nobility – С. МАРЈАНОВИЋ-ДУШАНИЋ – Т. СУБОТИН-ГОЛУБОВИЋ, *ССА* 9 (2010) 64–66; С. МИШИЋ, *ССА* 9 (2010) 76–79 – but in both cases the documents stipulate that the possessions in question will be bequeathed to Hilandar.

²⁰ The only document that might be considered an exception is the earliest charter of privileges issued by Uroš (#80), which is rather curiously called just *slovo*, perhaps because its brevity made it look too modest for a chrysobull.

bulls were a common occurrence.²¹ This is suggested by a “Byzantine” differentiation in signatures, with all of the chrysobulls bearing the elaborate onomastic signature, while the less important charters received the menologem. Another concession to Byzantine typology concerned the internal structure of the solemn charter. In Nemanjić document-making of the royal period it was practically mandatory for chrysobulls to have proems,²² but Byzantine practice was more relaxed.²³ The Dubrovnik corpus testifies that the new Serbian imperial lay chrysobulls shared the Byzantine view – of the seven available units, proems are absent in four (#74, #83, #88, #90).

Interestingly, three of the four Dubrovnik chrysobulls that lack proems (#74, #88, #90) also lack another feature of Byzantine chrysobulls – the *logos*-formula. Taken together, these traits may be seen as an indication of a typological subdivision between an upper and a lower class of chrysobulls. Models for divisions of that kind were available in contemporary Byzantine typology,²⁴ but in the Serbian case this might have had more to do with the traditionally lower regard for lay charters in comparison to their ecclesiastical counterparts, since the far more numerous Serbian imperial chrysobulls of the Athonite corpus offer few signs of such a categorization.²⁵ One point in which the Dubrovnik and Athonite corpus agree is the pattern of the *logos*-formula. The Byzantine model, consisting

²¹ Cf. the numerous examples from the list of sources used in M. C. BARTUSIS, *Land and Privilege in Byzantium: The Institution of Pronoia*, Cambridge University Press 2012, xv–xxiii.

²² Among some 30 Nemanjić royal chrysobulls, the proem is absent only in one early 14th century document whose composition displays particularly strong Byzantine influence – *Зборник средњовековних ћириличких повеља и писама Србије, Босне и Дубровника I* (eds. В. МОШИН – С. ЋИРКОВИЋ – Д. СИНДИК), Београд 2011, nr. 93 [*Zbornik srednjovekovnih ćirilčkih povelja i pisama Srbije, Bosne i Dubrovnika I* (eds. V. Mošin – S. Ćirković – D. Sindik), Beograd 2011].

²³ For example, among the almost two dozen Byzantine chrysobulls of the 13th and early 14th century published in *Archives de l’Athos XX, Actes de Chilandar I* (eds. M. ŽIVOJINOVIĆ – V. KRAVARI – C. GIROS), Paris 1998, the proem is present in only about one third.

²⁴ Cf. the χρυσόβουλλον and the χρυσόβουλλος ὀρισμὸς subtypes discussed by F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPOULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, 99–107, 127–128.

²⁵ Among the 25 chrysobulls of the Athonite corpus there are only three without proems, and at least two (if not all) of these are supplied with the *logos*-formula. The *logos*-formula is very widespread in this group, appearing in practically all of the units recognized as certain or potential originals. For a list of Athonite corpus documents mentioned in this paper with reference to editions and images see Table 2. The three chrysobulls without proems are Hil. 35, Hil. 42, and Lavra 2

of writing the word *logos* in three prearranged places in three different grammatical cases, evidently proved difficult to simply transplant into Serbian texts whose traditional composition was markedly different and far less formalized. Instead, there emerged a Serbian version of the formula in which the number of red-inked words ranged from two to five, and these included not only the Serbian counterpart of *logos* (*slovo*), but also the document name and the ruler's title.²⁶

As lay charters of higher importance rose to the rank of chrysobulls, often receiving the *logos*-formula, charters of lesser importance assumed the menologem as their distinguishing mark. In this case, the sample offered by the Dubrovnik corpus is modest because six of the 12 lesser charters have been preserved as registry-book copies which give no clue about the type of signature used in the original. Yet, of the six signatures that are available, five are menologems (#76, #75, #80, #84, #85), the sole exception being a safe conduct for Dubrovnik envoys (#89), which is signed with Uroš's full signature, perhaps because it is composed in the form of the emperor's oath. But introduction of the menologem did not stop there. Since its use in Byzantium also included signatures on the emperor's letters,²⁷ Serbian document-makers felt obliged to follow suit. As a result, all three original Serbian imperial letters of the Dubrovnik corpus bear the menologem (#70, #72, #81), and its presence is also indicated in the only copy that contains information about the signature (#78).

The adoption of the menologem in Serbian letters, attested exclusively in the Dubrovnik corpus, has one very interesting aspect – while the menologems in charters follow the usual Byzantine month-and-indiction

²⁶ In Dubrovnik document #82 the red words are *slovo* (three times), *car*, and *hrisovulj*, in #83 just *slovo* (twice), and in #86 and #87 *slovo* (twice), *car*, and *hrisovulj*. For some examples of the *logos*-formula in the Athonite corpus see images of Hil. 32, 36, 45, 48, 53, 54, and Lavra 1. For a recent discussion of the use of the *logos*-formula in Uroš's documents see Ђ. БУБАЛУ, Логос формула у хрисовуљи цара Стефана Уроша манастиру Лаври (1361), *ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΟΣ. Зборник у част Мирјане Живојиновић* (ур. Б. Миљковић – Д. Целебдић), књига I, Београд 2015, 323–338 [Ѓ. Bubalo, Logos formula u hrisovulji cara Stefana Uroša manastiru Lavri (1361), *PERIBOLOS. Zbornik u čast Mirjane Živojinović* (ur. B. Miljković – D. Dželebdžić), књига I, Београд 2015, 323–338]. The evolution and characteristic features of the use of red ink in Nemanjić documents are presented in Н. ПОРЧИЋ, „Царске шаре црвене“: о заступљености и обрасцима употребе црвеног мастила у документима Немањића, *ЗРВИ* 53 (2016) 255–273 [N. Požčić, „Carske šare crvene“: o zastupljenosti i obrascima upotrebe crvenog mastila u dokumentima Nemanjića, *ZRVI* 53 (2016) 255–273].

²⁷ F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, 91, 93, 112–115; N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *La chancellerie*, 192–193.

formula, those in letters limit themselves to stating the month. Also, menologems in charters imitate the large majuscule script of charter signatures, but in letters they use the smaller, more minuscule hand characteristic of letter signatures from the royal period. Evidence is too scarce to be conclusive,²⁸ but these differences strongly suggest that there was a conscious effort to somehow preserve the traditional distinction between charters and letters in Serbian document-making despite Byzantine models.

Traditions from the Nemanjić royal period prove particularly strong in the internal or textual aspect of Dubrovnik corpus documents. A good example is the date. In pre-imperial times, plain charters of the type preserved in Dubrovnik usually contained date formulas in the eschatocol, while letters went dateless. After 1346, when these charters began to be signed with the menologem, it could be expected that they would lose their date formulas in imitation of Byzantine prostagms, especially since Serbian letters provided a ready example. However, the use of date formulas continued and even became more regular.²⁹ Such saturation of the eschatocol with chronological information might have initially troubled Serbian document-makers, and it is possible that the transfer of the date formula to the beginning of the document in two early imperial charters (#4, #5) was an attempt to solve this problem.³⁰ If that was the case, the idea was evidently quickly abandoned, because in later charters date formulas returned to their traditional place in the eschatocol, alongside the newly adopted menologem.

Short-lived as it was, this transfer of the date formula to the beginning of the document remains the most serious attempt of textual structure rearrangement visible in the imperial documents of the Dubrovnik corpus. In letters, pressure for change was negligible because their composition in pre-1346 Serbia was practically identical to that used in Byzantium. The plain charters adopted the menologem, but resisted the expulsion of the

²⁸ Particularly confusing in this respect is the only menologem of the Athonite corpus (Hil. 46), which belongs to the letter type although the document itself is a charter. The Serbian adoption of the menologem and the two variants it developed in Serbian usage are treated in N. PORČIĆ, *The Menologem in Serbian Medieval Document-Making*, ПЕРИБОЛОС. Зборник у част Мирјане Живојиновић (ур. Б. Миљковић – Д. Целебџић), књига I, Београд 2015, 285–298 [*PERIBOLOS. Zbornik u čast Mirjane Živojinović* (ur. B. Miljković – D. Dželebdžić), knjiga I, Beograd 2015].

²⁹ The only exception in 12 cases is again #89. Document #76 also does not have a date formula, but that can be explained by the fact that its full date is mentioned in the main text.

³⁰ The two charters are preserved as copies without signatures, so it is uncertain whether they were in fact signed with menologems.

date, as well as the temptation to adopt the firm structure of Byzantine prostagms with their characteristic narrative beginning, sticking instead to the native tradition of starting with the notification.³¹ Finally, the charters that became chrysobulls followed two paths. Those that were left without a proem essentially differed from plain charters only in name, signature, the occasional *logos*-formula, and a fancier opening notification found in all three Uroš's examples.³² Those that did have proems modeled their structure not on corresponding Byzantine documents, but on Serbian solemn charters, easily distinguished from their Byzantine counterparts by the presence of an elaborate onomastic intitulation.

This apparent conservatism was probably of practical nature, since minimization of changes in document patterns was convenient both for the Serbian document-makers and their Dubrovnik addressees. But the situation was different with external document features. There, the practical need to remain within customary bounds was less significant. On the contrary, there was probably pressure to make the documents of the new emperor look imperial. In a way, the most significant textual changes – the introduction of the *logos*-formula and the menologem – were also changes in physical appearance due to the striking visual character of these features, but they were complemented by changes in some genuine external elements, such as script, writing material, and seals.

The scriptural duality that is seen in the royal period, when solemn charters were mostly written in book script, whereas plain charters and letters exclusively used business script, was largely abandoned. Instead, most of Dušan's imperial solemn charters whose external features may be considered authentic use the business script, and in Uroš's time this seems to have become the rule.³³ The incentive can again be attributed to Byzantium, where by this time all imperial documents were written in business script.³⁴ In the Dubrovnik corpus this change is not visible, as its

³¹ Thus in #63, #73, #71, #79, #80, with abbreviated variants in #75 and #76. There is, however, Uroš's #84, which (like Dušan's Hil. 38) begins with the translation of the typical opening of Byzantine dispositions (*it is the will and command of my imperial person*, etc), whereas #85, issued on the same occasion, provides a striking illustration of the persistence of old customs by combining this formula with the traditional notification – *so that all may know, it is the will of my imperial person*.

³² *With virtue and reason, through the truthfulness of the imperial word, my imperial person proclaims so that all shall know*, etc (#83, #88, #90). This apparently evolved from a type of proem used in Dušan's ecclesiastic charters, such as Hil. 32.

³³ Cf. Hil. 32, 35–38, 44, 46, and Pant. 1 and 3 (Dušan); Hil. 45, 48, 50, 52–54, and Lavra 1 and 2 (Uroš).

³⁴ F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, 31–34; N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *La chancellerie*, 175–176.

pre-1346 documents belong to types already associated with the business script, and it can only be noted that such practice was continued without exception in the imperial period for all document types – chrysobulls, menologem-signed charters and letters.

The Dubrovnik corpus has more to offer about a similar process concerning writing material. The pre-imperial tradition of writing charters on parchment and letters on paper subtly underlined the general difference in purpose between the two types – charters were permanent legal proof, and letters just a means of communicating current messages. Yet, imperial document-making readily did away with this functional symbolism, expanding the use of paper to all document types. In this case, it is not clear whether the incentive came from Byzantium, where use of paper had a long tradition in the imperial chancery,³⁵ but Serbian document-makers evidently took it very seriously. The most impressive body of proof comes from Dubrovnik, where all original Serbian imperial documents – chrysobulls, plain charters, and letters – are written on paper, marking an abrupt break with the previous period. The Athonite corpus supplements this by presenting a picture of gradual expansion of paper at the expense of parchment from near parity in Dušan's time to almost full dominance at the time of Uroš.³⁶

Widespread use of paper as the writing material for Serbian imperial documents is especially valuable to chancery research, as it opens the possibility of establishing links between different units based on watermarks. Unfortunately, six Dubrovnik corpus units – including all but one of Dušan's five originals – bear no visible watermark,³⁷ but those that do reveal some interesting information. Thus, Dušan's only watermarked document (#74) and four of Uroš's units issued in April 1357 (#83–#86) have highly similar marks in the form of a pear with two leaves,³⁸ whose

³⁵ Until the end of the 12th century the Byzantine imperial chancery appears to almost exclusively use paper, but by the time of Serbia's rise to empire the great majority of Byzantine chrysobulls were being written on parchment, with paper remaining the main (but not the only) material for lesser documents – N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *Le support matériel des documents byzantins, Actes du Colloque International du CNRS sur la paléographie grecque et byzantine*, Paris 1977, 386–389.

³⁶ Hil. 32, 35, 36, 44, Pant. 1 (Dušan); Hil. 45, 48, 52–54; Lavra 1, 2 (Uroš).

³⁷ Watermarks are missing on all three letters (#70, #72, #80) and on three brief charters (#75, #76, #89) because such short documents were written on fragments cut from larger sheets.

³⁸ *Vodeni znakovi XIII i XIV vijeka II* (eds. V. A. MOŠIN – S. M. TRALJIĆ), Zagreb 1957, ns. 4307, 4310–4312.

variants are encountered in Uroš's Hil. 45 and 53, as well as in numerous Serbian manuscripts of the period,³⁹ suggesting the common geographic and institutional provenance of these documents and, perhaps no less importantly, a long-term organized approach to the procurement of writing material. This is repeated on a smaller scale with variants of a design featuring two circles, which are again found in Uroš's Dubrovnik and Athonite documents and contemporary manuscripts.⁴⁰ However, the three remaining Dubrovnik watermarks (#82, #88, #90) have no parallels either among themselves or within the Athonite corpus. That fact alone is, of course, insufficient to cast serious doubts on their originality, but in view of the above evidence associating the chancery with certain watermarks it must be taken into account.⁴¹

One external feature that could not stay the same after the assumption of a new title was the seal. But the change was not limited to replacing the word *king* with *emperor*. In the Dubrovnik corpus, instead of the large pendent wax seals of the royal charters, all four imperial charters that have preserved this feature bear metallic, gilded seals.⁴² These, however, are not variants of Nemanjić gilded seals of the royal period found on Athonite chrysobulls. They follow a significantly changed design closely imitating Byzantine imperial seals in size, text layout and iconography, except for the reverse side, where the Byzantine representation of Christ is replaced by that of the Nemanjić patron, St. Stephen.⁴³ The Athonite charters con-

³⁹ *Vodeni znakovi* I, pp. 126–127.

⁴⁰ Documents #81 and #87. The Athonite units are Hil. 48 and 52, while the two-circle design of Hil. 54 is markedly different. Cf. *Vodeni znakovi* I, pp. 88–90, which doesn't list the two Dubrovnik specimens.

⁴¹ A good example is provided by #74, which, in addition to the original with the pear watermark, has a duplicate bearing a two-stalked flower watermark. That mark is unrecorded in other Serbian documents or, for that matter, contemporary manuscripts, but it is found in Dubrovnik and Split (*Vodeni znakovi* I, pp. 123), suggesting that this specimen is a copy of non-Serbian origin. The suggestion has been confirmed recently by the positive attribution of the handwriting to Dubrovnik's official Serbian-language scribe from the mid-14th century, Givè de Parmegano – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Старији препис велике повеље цара Душана Дубровнику, Иницијал 4* (2016) 173–174 [N. Porčić, *Stariji prepis velike povelje cara Dušana Dubrovniku, Inicijal 4* (2016) 167–185].

⁴² Documents #75, #76, #87, and #88. This type of seal is also recorded to have been present on one charter preserved as a copy (#79).

⁴³ Seals on #75, #76, and #87 are casts from the same mold and belong to Dušan, although the last document was issued by Uroš in the second year of his reign. The seal on #88, issued by Uroš in 1360, curiously bears on both averse and reverse an image of St. Stephen cast from a different mold than the previous three.

firm this exclusive use of Byzantine-like gilded seals and take the imitation further with specimens whose reverse bears the representation of Christ.⁴⁴ Wax seals seem to have survived only in the form of signet ring impressions on the back of letters – traces of this practice, which is also in full accordance with contemporary Byzantine usage,⁴⁵ can be seen on all three original documents of that type kept in Dubrovnik.⁴⁶

While providing a great deal of valuable information about imperial sealing practices, the Dubrovnik corpus also presents an interesting problem regarding the diplomatic status of three Uroš's charters whose original-like appearance is undermined by the lack of any traces of a seal. One of these is a chrysobull that records the grant of the island of Mljet to noblemen from Kotor (#82) and could therefore very well be a copy,⁴⁷ but the other two are plain charters issued directly to Dubrovnik (#80, #89).⁴⁸ For them, the explanation may again lie in the adoption of Byzantine models, as contemporary Byzantine imperial prostagms also bear no

⁴⁴ A point has been made that the Christ type was intended for use in the newly conquered Greek areas of Dušan's empire, while the St. Stephen type was meant for the old Serbian kingdom – Д. КОРАЋ, Повеља краља Стефана Душана манастиру Свете Богородице у Тетову. Прилог српској дипломатици и сфрагистици, *ZРВИ* 23 (1984) 147–155 [D. Korać, Povelja kralja Stefana Dušana manastiru Svete Bogorodice u Tetovu. Prilog srpskoj diplomatiki i sfragistici, *ZРVI* 23 (1984) 141–165]. For descriptions of Serbian imperial seals see А. СОЛОВЈЕВ, Два прилога проучавању Душанове државе. II. Печати на Душановим повељама, *Гласник СНД* 2 (1927) 36–46 [A. Solovjev, Dva priloga proučavanju Dušanove države. II. Pečati na Dušanovim poveljama, *Glasnik SND* 2 (1927) 36–46], and the richly illustrated Д. СИНДИК, Српски средњовековни печати у манастиру Хиландару, *Осам векова Хиландара*, Београд 2000, 229–239 [D. Sindik, Srpski srednjovekovni pečati u manastiru Hilandaru, *Oсам векова Hilandara*, Beograd 2000, 229–239].

⁴⁵ On the sealing of Byzantine imperial letters with wax signet-ring seals see N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, Quelques remarques sur le scellement à la cire des actes impériaux byzantins (XIII–XV^e s.), *Зборник Филозофског факултета* 14-1 (1979) 127 [*Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta* 14-1 (1979)].

⁴⁶ Documents #70, #72, #81. Dušan's oldest known imperial letter, preserved as a registry book copy (#62), is described as having been written on paper and bearing a seal of yellow wax with a silk ribbon – *Monumenta Ragusina* I (ed. G. GELCICH), Zagrabiae 1879, 212. The ribbon was evidently wrapped around the folded document and the seal stamped over it.

⁴⁷ This conclusion, supported also by the document's unique watermark at a time when most units bear the pear design, is accepted in the latest editions (cf. Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 266). However, F. ΜΙΚΛΟΣΙΧ, *Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, Vienna 1858, nr. 141, considered it an original.

⁴⁸ Document #80 is a confirmation of privileges, while #89 is the already mentioned safe conduct for Dubrovnik envoys. Both F. ΜΙΚΛΟΣΙΧ, *Monumenta Serbica*, ns. 134, 156, and Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 259, 279, accept them as originals.

visible traces of sealing.⁴⁹ However, gilded pendent seals are attested on three Dušan's menologem-signed charters – #75, #76, and #79, which might have been issued just weeks before Uroš's #80⁵⁰ – as well as on Uroš's own #84 and, probably, #85.⁵¹ With little hope of a definite answer, several explanations for this discrepancy can be proposed. One would be that the menologem-signed charters with seals (#75, #76, #79, #84, #85) were considered equivalent to the Byzantine type of χρυσόβουλλον σιγίλλιον, which usually bore a menologem signature and a gilded seal,⁵² whereas #80 and #89 were treated as simple prostagms. Another, that the difference reflects two simultaneously existing but divergent tendencies among Nemanjić document-makers – to continue the Nemanjić royal tradition of supplying plain charters with pendent seals (only now these were imperial metallic seals as opposed to wax seals of the royal period) and to fully accept the Byzantine prostagm model. Also, it is possible that #80 and #89 originally had seals but that these were subsequently removed along with the part of the document sheet to which they were attached.⁵³ Finally, and least probably, #80 and #89 might after all be only copies of some sort.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *Quelques remarques*, 125. Interestingly, until the second half of the 13th century, as well as in a lone example from 1439, this type of document carried a wax seal (*ibidem*, 123–128). Lack of traces of sealing among other 14th and 15th century specimens may be explained by the use of metal (lead) seals in a manner described by N. OIKONOMIDES, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, *Dumbarton Oaks* 1985, 8.

⁵⁰ It is widely accepted that Uroš issued #80 already in January 1356, just weeks after his accession to the throne. However, Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 260, allows the possibility that the document was in fact issued in January 1357.

⁵¹ Documents #75 and #76 are preserved as originals with seals, while the presence of a gilded seal is mentioned in the accompanying notes to the Dubrovnik chancery copy of #79. As for #84 and #85, F. MIKLOSICH, *Monumenta Serbica*, ns. 144, 142, listed them as copies due to their apparent lack of traces of sealing. However, recent direct examination has revealed positive traces of a metallic seal on #84 and probable traces of a pendent seal on #85 – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 268, 270.

⁵² F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, 125–127. The last recorded example of this type dates from 1342.

⁵³ The bottom margin of both documents is indeed quite narrow.

⁵⁴ General problems of authenticity of documents issued emperor Uroš have been treated by Ђ. Бубало, *Фалсификована повеља цара Стефана Уроша о Стонском дохотку*, *ССА* 2 (2003) 113–138 [Ѓ. Bubalo, *Falsifikovana povelja cara Stefana Uroša o Stonskom dohotku*, *SSA* 2 (2003) 99–142]; Ž. Vujošević, *Über den Status einiger Urkunden des serbischen Kaisers Stefan Uroš (1355–1371): Ein Beitrag zur Kanzleiforschung*, *Иницијал* 4 (2016) 109–124 [Inicijal 4 (2016) 109–124].

Internal and external features of Serbian imperial documents belonging to the Dubrovnik corpus clearly demonstrate that the demand for changes in document production presented by Dušan's rise to empire was met in an organized manner. Adoptions of various Byzantine models, including all of the defining features of imperial documents – the *logos*-formula, the menologem, and the new gilded seal – appear very early, mostly on the first occasion when they can be expected.⁵⁵ At the same time, their introduction is visibly marked by efforts to reconcile them with Serbian pre-imperial traditions, resulting in accommodation between the two practices that did not always favor Byzantine solutions. Such a response could come only from a regular, organized, and competent native staff, familiar with the production of documents at the Nemanjić court before 1346. This second form of regularity necessary for the existence of a chancery service can also be studied from Dubrovnik corpus documents, which provide both direct information and possibilities for indirect inferences.

The main source of direct information about Serbian imperial chancery staff and organization are mentions of persons and actions associated with the document-making process in the texts of the documents themselves. Throughout the royal period, the eschatocols of Nemanjić documents occasionally ascribed actions such as writing, signing, and sealing to the ruler himself.⁵⁶ However, it can be safely supposed that such statements primarily served to reaffirm royal authorship of the document and rarely – if ever – reflected the actual circumstances of its production. More reliable information appears only with the earliest preserved mentions of document-makers other than the ruler, which date from the beginning of the 14th century.⁵⁷ At first closely resembling notes that referred to rulers and production-level activities, already from the 1320s these mentions assume the shape of distinct formulas placed either at the end of the main text or below the signature and using verbs that indicate management-level activities, such as *reče* (=said/spoke), *povele* (=ordered) and *preruči* (=commended/entrusted).⁵⁸ Perhaps under the

⁵⁵ Dušan's five Dubrovnik originals, issued between September 1348 and September 1349, already contain examples of every change associated with the assumption of the imperial title except for the *logos*-formula, but the use of this feature in Dušan's time is confirmed by Athonite documents, probably as early as January 1347 – cf. Д. ЖИВОЛИНОВИЋ, *ССА* 5 (2006) 100, 107–108, with references to older works.

⁵⁶ For example, in *Зборник* I, nr. 21: *therefore, I wrote and signed*.

⁵⁷ *Зборник* I, ns. 106, 123.

⁵⁸ Although clearly denoting a managerial role in document production, the term *preruči* is difficult to define precisely. Ђ. ДАНИЧИЋ, *Рјечник из књижевних*

influence of Byzantine practice, which employed similarly placed notes containing information about the document production process,⁵⁹ in Serbian imperial documents these formulas became more frequent, appearing in almost a third of the Dubrovnik units and about half of those preserved in Mount Athos.

Despite their brevity and somewhat vague wording, these first-hand testimonies shed precious light on the management of the Serbian imperial document production process. One characteristic that immediately comes to attention is its evident polycentrism. This is well reflected in the Dubrovnik corpus, where the first two preserved notes give the role of document production manager to the emperor's *protovestijar* or treasurer (#71: *recomandando*; #73: *reče*) and the next two to the emperor himself (#77, #78; both with *reče*). The Athonite corpus confirms this diversity with two more instances of direct management by the emperors (Hil. 44: *povele*; Hil 52: *preruči*), one by the empress-mother, (Hil. 50: *povele*) and another two in which the managers are high-ranking noblemen without specific administrative functions (Hil. 35: *reče*; Lavra 1: *preruči*). However, in all of the remaining 14 notes – four from Dubrovnik and ten from Athos – management is associated with individuals bearing the title of *logotet*, usually through a composite formula reflecting a two-level procedure that also involves the emperor (*by the emperor's order, the logotet L commended*),⁶⁰ or, in two examples from Uroš's time, by a characteristic addition to the

старина српских II, Београд 1863, 500 [Đ. Daničić, *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih* II, Београд 1863], interprets it as *efficere mandatum*, while contemporary Dubrovnik translators use *commete* and *comise* – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 198 (#41), 227 (#60). For a brief discussion of these terms see С. ЋИРКОВИЋ, *Хиландарски игуман Јован*, 68.

⁵⁹ Byzantine notes were usually placed under the signature or on the back. Some of them recorded the registration of the document in the various departments of the imperial administration, while others mentioned individual high-ranking dignitaries who were involved in a given document's production – F. DÖLGER – Y. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Byzantinische Urkundenlehre*, 36–40. The nature of this involvement has been a subject of some debate – N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *La chancellerie*, 177–179, claims that these dignitaries performed the final inspection (recognition) of the document, while J. KARAYANNOPULOS, *Zu den "διά-Vermerken" der byzantinischen Kaiserurkunden*, *Documenti medievali greci e latini* (eds. G. DE GREGORIO – O. KRESTEN), Spoleto 1998, 203–232, supports Dölger's view that they were influential personalities whose intervention prompted the emperor to issue the documents in question.

⁶⁰ These include Dubrovnik #85 and #90, Athonite Hil. 36, 38, 40, 42, 45, 46, 53, and Pant. 3, as well as a more loosely worded version in Hil. 37. Dubrovnik #79 is the only example where mention of the emperor is omitted.

customary corroboration and date formula (*this chrysobull was written and confirmed by the imperial seal in the year Y, the logotet being L*).⁶¹

The presence of the *protovestijar* can be readily attributed to the fact that documents in which he appears deal with financial matters – they are quittances confirming that certain Dubrovnik businessmen had paid their dues to the Serbian emperor.⁶² Reasons for management by emperors and members of the nobility are generally more difficult to identify, but these instances also give the impression of being sporadic and specifically motivated. On the other hand, the frequency and wording of formulas mentioning management by the *logotet* clearly indicate a constant role within the document production process, placing him between the ruler and the immediate producers – in the position of the head of chancery. Relatively numerous occasions when the *logotet* is bypassed by the ruler, the head of another administrative department or miscellaneous prominent individuals indicate that his role in this process was far from exclusive, and the impression of structural openness and fluidity is confirmed by the *logotet*'s own association with other duties.⁶³ Nevertheless, the very existence of a permanent chancery manager implies a level of organization that leaves no doubt regarding the regular nature of the Serbian imperial document-making service.

In addition to supporting these conclusions, frequent mentions of *logotets* in the Athonite corpus also serve to confirm the identities and establish the terms of office of individual *logotets* known from Dubrovnik charters – Dušan's *logotet* Đurađ from #79 is encountered on seven more occasions, the earliest probably being May 1349,⁶⁴ Uroš's Dragoslav from

⁶¹ Dubrovnik #88, and Hil. 48. This authentic phrase made its way into an Athonite forgery allegedly issued by Uroš (Hil. 47), but its place in that text is quite awkward.

⁶² Quittances “managed” by treasurers are found already in the royal period – Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 193 (#37), 221 (#55), 227 (#60). On Serbian quittances in general see Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Дипломатички обрасци српских средњовековних разрешних докумената*, *Споменица академика Симе Ђурковића*, Београд 2011, 269–288 [N. Porčić, *Diplomatički obrasci srpskih srednjovekovnih razrešnih dokumenata*, *Spomenica akademika Sime Ćirkovića*, Beograd 2011, 269–288].

⁶³ The title of *logotet*, like that of the *protovestijar*, was borrowed from Byzantium, where it was associated with numerous administrative roles, including a degree of authority over the chancery (cf. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *La chancellerie*, 168–172). For extensive treatment of Serbian *logotets* and the scope of their functions see М. БЛАГОЈЕВИЋ, *Државна управа у средњовековним српским земљама*, Београд 2001², 167–185 [M. Blagojević, *Državna uprava u srednjovekovnim srpskim zemljama*, Beograd 2001², 167–185].

⁶⁴ Hil. 37–40, 42, 46, and Pant. 3.

#85 and #88 is present in another two documents,⁶⁵ the latter issued in October 1360, while Uroš's Dejan from #90, also mentioned in the text of #89, appears again in a charter from 1365.⁶⁶ In contrast, none of these documents speak about any lower-level chancery staff. In fact, some production notes in Athonite documents mentioning Dušan's *logotet* Đurađ describe his role in the production process with the verb *zapisa* (=wrote). It is, of course, entirely possible that Đurađ and other *logotets* actually wrote some of the documents they were tasked with issuing,⁶⁷ but predominant use of other verbs indicates that the writing was regularly done by someone else. This is evident in Article 134 of Dušan's Code, which prescribes that for every document confirming land possessions there shall be a payment of 30 perpers to the *logotet* and six perpers to the scribe (*dijak*), the second one explicitly described as a fee for writing.⁶⁸

Remaining unknown by name,⁶⁹ the *dijaks* of the imperial chancery have nevertheless left personalized traces of their activity in the form of handwriting. An analysis of this external feature of Serbian imperial documents could yield very valuable results for chancery studies, especially in view of the high degree of scriptural uniformity achieved by the adoption of the business hand for all types of documents. However, identification of individual scribes in a group of contemporaries who doubtlessly in many instances not only knew each other, but also worked and perhaps even studied together, would in itself present a formidable effort requiring a high level of philological and grapho-forensic expertise, so the most that can be attempted here is a brief overview of the evidence provided by the Dubrovnik corpus.

⁶⁵ Hil. 45, 48. Dragoslav and Đurađ are also mentioned in forgeries – Hil. 47; ЋИРКОВИЋ, *ССА* 10 (2011) 42.

⁶⁶ Hil. 53. For more on the *logotets* of this period, especially Đurađ, see С. ЋИРКОВИЋ, Хиландарски игуман Јован, 68–70, who also discusses Đurađ's relationship to the grand *logotet* Gojko mentioned in Hil. 36 and 39.

⁶⁷ This was apparently the case in Hil. 39, where Đurađ's role is described in a somewhat old-fashioned way – *written and corroborated by the hand of the logotet Đurađ*.

⁶⁸ Н. РАДОЈЧИЋ, *Законик цара Стефана Душана*, Београд 1960, 68, 125 [N. Radojčić, *Zakonik cara Stefana Dušana*, Beograd 1960]. The term *dijak* originally meant the ecclesiastic office of deacon, but it gradually also came to denote scribes, who appear to have mostly been laymen – cf. *Лексикон српског средњег века* (eds. С. ЋИРКОВИЋ – Р. МИХАЉЧИЋ), Београд 1999, 152 (Т. СУБОТИН-ГО-ЛУБОВИЋ) [*Leksikon srpskog srednjeg veka* (eds. S. Ćirković – R. Mihajčić), Beograd 1999].

⁶⁹ The only imperial document which seems to have named a *dijak* is #62, but in the preserved copy-translation the name is omitted.

Bearing in mind the abovementioned reservations, handwriting comparison seems to show that four of five Dušan's documents preserved in the original (#70, #72, #75, #76) – the last two both written on September 20, 1349 – come from the same scribe, but the third, much longer and more important document written on that occasion (#74) is the work of another. In the more numerous group of Uroš's documents the diversity is greater. Among the five documents issued on April 24–25, 1357, only the two issued on the second day (#86, #87) seem to come from the same hand, but they cannot be connected to any other units. In contrast, #83 displays significant similarity with two earlier documents (#80, #81), as well as the group of three later units (#88–#90) whose common origin is almost beyond doubt. Finally, #84 and #85 each appear to be completely unique. No parallel can be found for the handwriting of #82, issued just two weeks earlier, but in that case such a conclusion only corroborates other evidence indicating that the preserved specimen is a copy.⁷⁰

Thus, even without taking the Athonite corpus into account,⁷¹ handwriting analysis demonstrates that the chancery often employed two or more scribes at a time and that some of them remained in service for several years. But in addition to scribal hands imperial documents contain another set of handwritten clues that deserve to be examined – the *logos*-formulas and the signatures. Ideally, these were supposed to be added by the ruler himself as the ultimate confirmation of authorship. Yet, it has been shown that in Byzantium the ruler only wrote the signature, whereas the spaces for the *logos* formula were usually filled in by chancery officials and occasionally even left blank.⁷² Conversely, in pre-imperial Serbian documents, especially those of the solemn type, the signatures themselves are often very complex and calligraphic, indicating that they were not of the ruler's hand,⁷³ while in Dušan's 1334 charter to Dubrovnik even a short, not particularly calligraphic signature is explicitly said to be the work of the current chancery chief, who *commended and signed and sealed* the document.⁷⁴

Against this backdrop, an analysis of the *logos*-formulas and signatures offered by the Dubrovnik corpus of Serbian imperial documents

⁷⁰ On the other hand, positive identification of the handwriting of #80 and #89 with other originals speaks in favor of their own originality – see above, p.88.

⁷¹ To illustrate the possibilities offered by that avenue of research, it is sufficient to note the match between Uroš's #88–#90 and his Hil. 48.

⁷² N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΕΣ, *La chancellerie*, 180–183.

⁷³ Cf. images of supposedly original documents in *CCA* 1 (2002) 14; 2 (2003) 32; 3 (2004) 6; 5 (2006) 44; 6 (2007) 12; 8 (2009) 17; 9 (2010) 18; 12 (2013) 24.

⁷⁴ Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*, 220 (#54).

again produces some indicative results. Among the four available *logos*-formulas, the handwriting in #82 – a probable copy – seems unique, while that in #83 and #86 is clearly identical, as is the last *slovo* in #87. However, the previous three elements of that document's formula were obviously inserted by another hand using very dark (black?) ink, suggesting subsequent filling in of spaces that originally remained blank. Available signatures are far more numerous, but the sample is split up between onomastic signatures and two types of menologems. The small menologems on Dušan's letters (#70, #72) are quite similar to each other and visibly dissimilar to Uroš's only example (#81).⁷⁵ Dušan's large menologems (#75, #76) are definitely twins, and again differ from those on Uroš's documents (#80, #84, #85), which in turn share a characteristic abbreviation for the word *indiction* but the lettering of #80 seems to stand apart from the other two. Finally, Dušan's only onomastic signature in the Dubrovnik corpus (#74) can only be compared with Athonite specimens,⁷⁶ while Uroš's seven signatures of that type appear to follow the breakdown seen in the analysis of the main text – #82 is unique, #86 and #87 are certain twins, #88–#90 are certain triplets, and #83 seems like a cross between these two groups.⁷⁷ These results can be interpreted as linking the signature more with the *dijaks* than with the *logotets*, but they must be taken very cautiously, because signatures might have also involved the ruler, and the incentive for imitation of some ideal model was naturally stronger than in the writing of the main text.

Even more elusive than the participants of the document production process is the process itself. As shown by the survey of internal and external features presented above, document typology was well developed in the sense that the general appearance and textual patterns of documents belonging to a certain type were quite clearly established. Yet, at the level of closer textual comparison variations are so abundant that use of formularies seems highly improbable.⁷⁸ Documents that display a

⁷⁵ Dušan's Athonite small menologem (Hil. 46) also displays similarities with his Dubrovnik specimens.

⁷⁶ There it stands closest to Hil. 35.

⁷⁷ Document #83 has a sure match in Lavra 1, while #88–#90 can be linked quite convincingly to Hil. 48 and 52.

⁷⁸ For example, all nine Dubrovnik corpus letters begin with an address to the Dubrovnik authorities, but among these there is only one identical couple. Likewise, eight plain charters that begin with the traditional notification (see note 12) include two identical pairs, two variations on one of these pairs, and two formulations that can be considered unique. The diversity is just as great even in onomastic signatures

higher degree of similarity are almost always those composed on the same occasion.⁷⁹ The most notable exception are Dušan's and Uroš's great charters of privileges (#74 and #87), with the latter almost literally copying the former's lengthy disposition. Since the eschatocol of Dušan's charter mentions that it was produced in triplicate, with one original apiece for the Dubrovnik authorities, the doge of Venice and the Serbian emperor, it would be reasonable to expect that when eight years later Uroš decided to confirm it, his chancery staff pulled out their original of Dušan's document to use as a model.⁸⁰ However, a copy of #74 written by Dubrovnik's mid-14th century official Cyrillic scribe Giv'e de Parmigano bears on its reverse a pen trial consisting of the first three words of #87 in the same hand that wrote document #87 itself, suggesting that it was in fact this copy, supplied by the Dubrovnik envoys, that was used as the model by Uroš's document makers.⁸¹

The 29-item Dubrovnik corpus of Serbian imperial documents manages to provide an informative overview of the environment in which it was produced. That environment clearly possessed the defining characteristics of a regular document-making service – regularized products and a regular staff. A two-level organization consisting of a manager (*logotet*) and direct producers (*dijaci*) whose presence can sometimes be established over several years, this chancery produced various types of documents clearly defined by sets of external and internal features. Its considerable level of sophistication and expertise is best demonstrated by its well-orchestrated response to the demand for changes brought about by the Serbian

– eight available specimens (seven of them belonging to Uroš) are broken up into one set of triplets, two sets of twins and one unique solution.

⁷⁹ Thus, the two letters that share the same address formula are #70 and #72, one of the couples of plain charters with common beginnings are #75 and #76, and the only two documents that share entire sets of formulas are Uroš's two chrysobulls of April 25, 1357 (#86, #87). Still, this was not a rule – Uroš's two plain charters issued the day before (#84, #85) differ significantly even in the most formal sections of the protocol and eschatocol.

⁸⁰ Although the act of producing an extra original intended for keeping by the issuer might have been motivated by the extraordinary importance of the document, it could also indicate that there were no chancery registers of issued documents. The "issuer's" original is not mentioned in any other imperial documents, including Uroš's #87, but it is encountered in the confirmation of privileges granted to Dubrovnik by Uroš's co-ruler and ultimate rival, king Vukašin, in 1370 – С. ТИРКОВИЋ, *ССА* 4 (2005) 162–163.

⁸¹ That is confirmed by textual analysis in Н. ПОРЧИЋ, *Старији препис*, 174–182, which also discusses the implications of this find with regard to the (apparent lack of) archiving of outgoing documents at the Nemanjić court.

state's transition from kingdom to empire. Yet, in some respects, this service remained somewhat surprisingly underdeveloped. It apparently lacked proper formularies and there does not seem to have been much of a system for preserving copies of issued documents, opening the production process to various degrees of improvisation and occasionally considerable involvement of addressees, who supplied ready models for the documents they needed. Based on these findings, a cumulative analysis of the entire corpus of late royal and imperial period documents, especially those of the Athonite corpus, could finally arrive at a comprehensive presentation of documentary production on the highest level of the Nemanjić state at the time when it reached the peak of power and institutional development.

Table 1:
Documents of the Dubrovnik Corpus

Tag	Author	Date ⁸²	Type	Status	Edition ⁸³
#62	Dušan	1346-10-26 taq	letter	copy-translation	229
#63	Dušan	1347-06-14	plain charter	copy-translation	230–231
#64	Dušan	1347-06-28 taq	letter	copy-translation	230–231
#65	Dušan	1347-08-01	plain charter	copy-translation	232–233
#66	Dušan	1347-08-28 taq	letter	copy	232–233
#67	Dušan	1347-08-06	plain charter	copy-translation	234–235
#68	Dušan	1347-08-28 taq	letter	copy	234–235
#69	Dušan	1348-04-29	chrysobull	copy (dubious)	237–241
#70	Dušan	1348-09-xx	letter	original	244–245
#71	Dušan	1348-12-08	plain charter	copy-translation	244–245
#72	Dušan	1348-09-xx	letter	original	246–248
#73	Dušan	1348-10-12	plain charter	copy	246–248
#74	Dušan	1349-09-20	chrysobull	original	250–252
#75	Dušan	1349-09-20	plain charter	original	253–254
#76	Dušan	1349-09-20	plain charter	original	255

⁸² Also serves as the document tag in the online collection of images of Serbian documents preserved at the State Archives in Dubrovnik ([www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/Serbianroyal DocumentsDubrovnik/collection](http://www.mom-ca.uni-koeln.de/mom/SerbianroyalDocumentsDubrovnik/collection)).

⁸³ Numbers denote pages in ПОРЧИЋ, *Документи*.

#77	Dušan	1352-03-30 taq	letter	copy	256
#78	Dušan	1355-02-01 cca	letter	copy	257
#79	Dušan	1355-12-05	plain charter	copy	258–259
#80	Uroš	1356-01-xx	plain charter	original	259
#81	Uroš	1357-01-xx	letter	original	261
#82	Uroš	1357-04-10	chrysobull	copy?	263–266
#83	Uroš	1357-04-24	chrysobull	original	267–268
#84	Uroš	1357-04-24	plain charter	original	269
#85	Uroš	1357-04-24	plain charter	original	270–271
#86	Uroš	1357-04-25	chrysobull	original	272–273
#87	Uroš	1357-04-25	chrysobull	original	274–277
#88	Uroš	1360-09-29	chrysobull	original	278
#89	Uroš	1362-07-14 cca	chrysobull	original	279–280
#90	Uroš	1362-08-22	chrysobull	original	281–282

Table 2:
Selected Imperial Documents of the Athonite Corpus

Tag ⁸⁴	Author	Date	Edition (published image) ⁸⁵
Hil. 32	Dušan	1348	Ж. ВУЈОШЕВИЋ, ССА 5, 117–120 (ibidem).
Hil. 35	Dušan	1350-05-28	В. АЛЕКСИЋ, ССА 8, 73–74 (ibidem).
Hil. 36	Dušan	1354-08-10	Вујошевић, 244–247 (ibidem).
Hil. 37	Dušan	1354-08-10	С. БОЈАНИН, ССА 4, 121–123 (ibidem).

⁸⁴ Tags are taken from existing published catalogues: Hil – Д. СИНДИК, Српска средњовековна акта; Lavra – *Archives de l’Athos XI, Actes de Lavra IV: Actes serbes* (par S. ĆIRKOVIĆ), Paris 1982; Pant – *Archives de l’Athos XII, Actes de Saint-Pantélémon: Actes serbes* (par S. ĆIRKOVIĆ), Paris 1982.

⁸⁵ ACH – *Actes de Chilandar. Deuxième partie, actes slaves* (ed. В. KORA-VLEV), Византийский временник, приложение къ XIX тому, Петроградъ 1915 [*Vizantiiskii vremennik, priloženie k’ XIX tomu, Petrograd’ 1915*]; Анастасијевић – Д. АНАСТАСИЈЕВИЋ, Српски архив Лавре Атонске, *Споменик Српске краљевске академије* 56 (1922) 6–21 [D. Anastasijević, Srpski arhiv Lavre Atonske, *Spomениk Srpske kraljevske akademije* 56 (1922) 6–21]; Мошин – В. МОШИН, Повеља цара Душана о селу Лушцу, 104–119; ССА – *Стари српски архив*; Убипарип – М. УБИПАРИП, Две повеље цара Уроша у архиву манастира Хилан-дара, *Прилози КЛИФ* 67 (2001) 99–111 [M. Ubiparip, Dve povelje cara Uroša u arhivu manastira Hilandara, *Prilozi KLIF* 67 (2001) 99–111]; Вујошевић – Ж. ВУЈОШЕВИЋ, Архилевичка хрисовуља цара Стефана Душана, *Иницијал* 1 (2013) 241–254 [Ž. Vujošević, Arhiljevička hrisovulja cara Stefana Dušana, *Inicijal* 1 (2013) 241–254].

Hil. 38	Dušan	1355-06	ACh 519–520 (none known). ⁸⁶
Hil. 39	Dušan	1358 ! -03-25	С. МИШИЋ, ССА 4, 136–139 (ibidem).
Hil. 40	Dušan	1355-05-02	М. КОПРИВИЦА, ССА 15, 111–114 (ibidem).
Hil. 42	Dušan	1355-05-17	ССА 11, 60–61 (ibidem).
Hil. 44	Dušan	1347?-01-17	Д. ЖИВОЛИНОВИЋ, ССА 5, 101–103 (Мошин).
Hil. 45	Uroš	1356-05	Р. МИХАЉЧИЋ, ССА 2, 86–89 (ibidem).
Hil. 46	Dušan	1349-1353	И. КОМАТИНА, ССА 13, 209–210 (ibidem).
Hil. 47	Uroš	1358-06-20	Ђ. БУБАЛО, ССА 2, 108–111 (ibidem).
Hil. 48	Uroš	1360-10-15	Р. МИХАЉЧИЋ, ССА 4, 152–154 (ibidem).
Hil. 50	Uroš	1360-1361	Убипарип, 103–104 (ibidem)
Hil. 52	Uroš	1363-07-15	М. ШУИЦА, ССА 2, 144–145 (ibidem).
Hil. 53	Uroš	1365-03-11	Р. МИХАЉЧИЋ, ССА 5, 140–142 (ibidem).
Hil. 54	Uroš	1366-05-09	С. БОЈАНИН, ССА 1, 105–107 (ibidem).
Lavra 1	Uroš	1357-04-10	Анастасијевић, 6–7 (Lavra, planche I).
Lavra 2	Uroš	1361-11	Анастасијевић, 6–7 (Lavra, planche II).
Pant. 1	Dušan	1349-06-12	В. БОЖАНИЋ, ССА 15, 57–60 (ibidem).
Pant. 3	Dušan	1349-05-21	В. ПЕТРОВИЋ, ССА 15, 46–48 (ibidem).

Небојша Порчић

ДУБРОВАЧКИ КОРПУС СРПСКИХ ЦАРСКИХ ДОКУМЕНАТА КАО ИЗВОР ЗА ИСТРАЖИВАЊЕ ПИТАЊА КАНЦЕЛАРИЈЕ

Резиме

Корпус од 29 докумената српских царева Стефана Душана (1346–1355) и Стефана Уроша (1355–1371) који се према околностима настанка и/или месту чувања могу назвати дубровачким нуди најбоље могућности за приступање обради недовољно проученог питања српске царске канцеларије. Поред тога што чини готово половину укупног броја истраживачки употребљивих царских докумената на српском језику, овај корпус одликује се типолошком разноврсношћу и погодностима дипломатичког статуса, са високом заступљеношћу оригинала (15 комада) и аутентичних преписа (13 комада). По питању присуства два основна предуслова који једну средњовековну документарну продукцију одређују као институционализовану службу, „канцеларију“ – устаљеност производа и устаљеност особља – дубровачки документи

⁸⁶ Better text edition: А. СОЛОВЈЕВ, Б'ци у Душановој повељи г. 1355, *Прилози КЛИФ* 6–2 (1926) 184–190 [А. Solovjev, В'ci u Dušanovoj povelji g. 1355, *Prilozi KJIF* 6–2 (1926) 184–190].

српских царева дају потврдан одговор. Њихова унутрашња и спољна дипломатичка обележја јасно указују на постојање три основна типа докумената – свечаних повеља, обичних повеља и писама. Наслеђени из краљевског раздобља, ови типови су се после Душановог узимања царске титуле суочили са захтевом за усвајањем низа обележја византијских царских докумената, пре свега логос-формуле, менологема и новог типа печата. Очигледно организовано увођење ових новина, које су вешто уклопљене у традиционалне обрасце, сведочи већ само по себи о присуству сталног особља вичног канцеларијским пословима. То присуство налази и непосредну потврду у бројним поименичним поменима логотета (Ђурађ код Душана, Драгослав и Дејан код Уроша), достојанственика који се често јављају у улози руководилаца документарне продукције, али и у траговима које су у виду рукописа за собом оставили данас анонимни писари – дијаци. И за једне и за друге има примера вишегодишњег присуства и учешћа у састављању већег броја докумената. Ипак, у неколико наврата руководећу улогу преузимају сами владари или чак други високи достојанственици (протовестијар), што упућује на институционалну флуидност канцеларијске службе. Поред тога, упркос јасној типологији, чини се да нису постојали прави формулари, као ни ваљани регистри или архива издатих докумената – у састављању Урошеве потврде повластица Дубровчанима из 1357. године као предложак је коришћен препис Душанове повеље из 1349. који су донели Дубровчани, иако је Душан својевремено начинио један примерак за себе. Ови организациони недостаци могли су и у другим случајевима подстаћи веће учешће самих дестинатора у издавању докумената, што се мора имати на уму у даљим настојањима да се пружи целовита слика феномена канцеларије у држави Немањића и српском средњем веку у целини.

Кључне речи: Србија, средњи век, дипломатика, документи, канцеларија, цар Душан, цар Урош.

Чланак примљен: 25. септембра 2017.

Чланак прихваћен: 20. маја 2018.