

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

**SERBIA IN THE REGISTERS
OF THE ANGEVIN CHANCERY (1265–1295).
AN ATTEMPT AT RECONSTRUCTION**

Abstract: The article presents the history of the registers of the Angevin royal chancery in Naples until their total destruction in World War II and the subsequent effort to reconstruct them, as well as the history of research and publication of documents from those registers pertaining to Serbia and the Southern Slavs in general. It is concluded that the project of reconstruction, which has so far covered the period from 1265 to 1295, made only indirect and consequently insufficient use of publications in which 19th century researchers who examined the registers in search for information about the Southern Slavs (Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski, Franjo Rački, Vikentij Makušev) presented their findings. On the other hand, the reconstruction project has revealed some information that was missed or misinterpreted by those earlier researchers. The article brings these two sources together to produce an optimized reconstruction of 27 documents from the registers containing references to Serbia, with the dual intent of providing an updated edition of this corpus of source material for Serbian medieval history and drawing attention to the usefulness of these 19th century publications in the ongoing reconstruction of the Angevin registers.

Keywords: South Italian Angevins, Serbia, Middle Ages, chancery, registers, Neapolitan archives, reconstruction, documents, Franjo Rački, Vikentij Makušev.

**The Angevin registers as chancery products,
archival materials and victims of violence and war**

On June 28, 1265, in the city of Rome, cardinals appointed by Pope Clement IV invested Charles, Count of Anjou and Provence, younger

brother of King Louis IX of France, with the Kingdom of Sicily.¹ This act marked the beginning of the final phase of the century-long conflict between the papacy and the German imperial dynasty of Hohenstaufen. Comprising the island itself and the southern part of the Italian peninsula, the Kingdom of Sicily was historically a papal fief, but ever since the end of the 12th century it was ruled by Emperor Frederick II, who turned it into the mainstay of Hohenstaufen power in Italy. After Frederick's death in 1250, the kingdom came into the hands of his illegitimate son Manfred, prompting the papacy to call for the new ruler to be deposed and replaced by a more suitable one. This suitable candidate was found in Charles of Anjou. In February 1266, at the head of an army composed of his French followers and Italian supporters of the papacy, he defeated and killed Manfred in the battle of Benevento and proceeded to take over the southern kingdom. He had hardly done so when his rule was challenged by young Conradin, grandson of Emperor Frederick by his legitimate son Conrad. However, by autumn 1268 Conradin had been defeated, captured and executed, leaving Charles to eliminate remaining pockets of opposition and devote himself to his other far-ranging ambitions for which his new kingdom – relatively large, wealthy, and strategically placed in the center of the Mediterranean – seemed to offer an ideal starting point.²

¹ S. RUNCIMAN, *The Sicilian Vespers: A History of the Mediterranean World in the Later Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge 1958, 85.

² The body of scholarly literature on Charles of Anjou and the early period of Angevin rule in Southern Italy is vast. Runciman's classic work, which sets Charles's activity in the wider international context of the Mediterranean basin in the last decades of the 13th century, has in the meantime been supplemented by such publications as the collective volume *L'État angevin. Pouvoir, culture et société entre XIII^e et XIV^e siècle*, Actes du colloque international de Rome et Naples (7–11 novembre 1995), Rome 1998, and the biography by J. DUNBABIN, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship, and State Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe*, London 1998. Rich surveys of available primary and secondary sources issued until the mid-1970s accompany the entries on Charles I and his son and successor Charles II in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (DBI) – P. HERDE, *Carlo I d'Angio*, DBI 20 (1977); A. NITSCHKE, *Carlo II d'Angio*, ibidem (available online at: [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-i-d-angio-re-di-sicilia_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-i-d-angio-re-di-sicilia_(Dizionario-Biografico)) and [https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-ii-d-angio-re-di-sicilia_\(Dizionario-Biografico\)](https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/carlo-ii-d-angio-re-di-sicilia_(Dizionario-Biografico)) – cons. August 26, 2020). More recent bibliographic references can be found in *The Italian Angevins: Naples and Beyond 1266–1343* (eds. J. GILBERT – C. KEEN – E. WILLIAMS), *Italian Studies* 72/2 (2017) 121–217, and especially on the Angevin Europe portal (<https://angevine-europe.huma-num.fr/ea/en/angevin-europe>, under “Kingdom of Sicily, Bibliography” – cons. August 26, 2020).

By marking the formal beginning of Charles's rise to the Sicilian royal throne, his investiture in Rome also marked the beginning of the activity of his royal chancery.³ Already in July 1265 he was issuing documents under the title of King of Sicily with the date "regni nostri anno primo", but once he actually took over the kingdom, the chancery's volume of work increased dramatically, as it produced and expedited the king's documents and recorded their copies in registers. Already during Charles's reign, these registers were organized into several series – the registers of the chancery (*registri cancellariae*) were supposed to contain all issued documents except the ruler's personal correspondence, which was recorded in the separate *registri secreti*, but documents of financial and fiscal nature were also recorded in the registers of the royal chamber (*camera*) and of the masters of accounts (*magistri rationales*), that is, the treasury.⁴ For easier reference, documents were not simply entered chronologically but also grouped according to addressees or to types of royal actions they conveyed. The addressees were royal officials performing various administrative duties in each of the kingdom's provinces – provincial governors (*iusticiarii*), financial officials who collected taxes and revenues (*secreti*), and authorities charged with controlling maritime traffic and trade (*magistri procuratores et portulani*)⁵ – as well as the miscellaneous others (*extravagantes*), who were further broken down into *extravagantes infra* and *extra regnum*, depending on whether the official in question served within the Kingdom of Sicily or in other Angevin possessions. Documents not addressed to officials were grouped according to types of actions, such as privileges and concessions, various authorizations, appointments, licenses, etc. Typically, each register included documents falling under one or more of these headings that were issued during

³ The chancery of the South Italian Angevins is treated by A. KIESEWETTER, *La cancelleria angioina, L'État angevin*, 361–415 (focusing primarily on the time of Charles I and Charles II), and S. PALMIERI, *La cancelleria di Sicilia in età angioina*, Napoli 2006.

⁴ On the introduction of various series of registers see A. KIESEWETTER, *La cancelleria angioina*, 364–369.

⁵ Angevin provincial administration and the duties of the officials mentioned are discussed in L. CADIER, *Essai sur l'administration du royaume de Sicile sous Charles I et Charles II d'Anjou*, Paris 1891, 20–25, and R. TRIFONE, *Gli organi dell'amministrazione angioina*, *Archivio storico pugliese* 15 (1962), 83–100, pp. 91–92. For more recent views see S. MORELLI, *I giustizieri nel regno di Napoli al tempo di Carlo I d'Angiò: primi risultati di un'indagine prosopografica*, *L'État angevin*, 419–517, and IDEM, *Per conservare la pace. I Giustizieri del regno di Sicilia da Carlo I a Carlo II d'Angiò*, Napoli 2012.

the course of one year, reckoned within the fifteen year indiction cycle in which a year began on September 1 and ended on August 31.⁶

By medieval standards, the output of this chancery was enormous – it is estimated that only during the reign of Charles I (1265–1285) around 100,000 royal documents were entered into the chancery registers, with at least 250,000 more being added during the reigns of his son Charles II (1285–1309) and grandson Robert (1309–1343).⁷ In addition, the chancery also kept a large quantity of incoming material, especially reports and original documents submitted by royal officials as proof of their activities, which would eventually constitute two other important archival entities known respectively as the *fascicoli* and the *arche*. Practically from the outset, the preservation of these opulent records was confronted with serious challenges. For example, the individual registers often consisted of a number of separate quires only provisionally bound together, which could easily be separated, misplaced or damaged as the chancery or its parts accompanied the ruler's court on its frequent travels.⁸ To prevent this, under Charles II and Robert the royal archive was permanently deposited in Naples, since 1333 in the same building that housed the royal mint.⁹ The archive still suffered losses – to flooding in 1336 or to conquering Aragonese troops in the early 15th century – but these were quite moderate compared to the total loss of the *registri secreti*, which disappeared without trace, or the separately housed archive of the treasury, devastated during the inter-Angevin power struggles of 1346–1348.

In the early modern period, the archive of the Angevin chancery was subjected to another two major waves of destruction – during the plague of 1526–1527 and the revolt of 1701. On the other hand, this period was also marked by events which contributed to its better preservation. In the mid-16th century, the majority of surviving chancery registers, whose quires had been further disordered, scattered and even separated

⁶ The various headings under which registry entries were recorded are listed and explained by P. DURRIEU, *Les archives angevines de Naples. Étude sur les registres du roi Charles I^{er} (1265–1285)* I, Paris 1886, 46–78, and B. CAPAZZO, *Inventario cronologico-sistematico dei registri Angioini conservati nell'Archivio di Stato in Napoli*, Napoli 1894, XIX–XLIX. See also A. KIESEWETTER, *La cancelleria angioina*, 369–370.

⁷ A. KIESEWETTER, *La cancelleria angioina*, 363.

⁸ B. CAPAZZO, *Inventario cronologico-sistematico*, IX, L–LIII.

⁹ As a result, the archive is sometimes known as the Archivio della Regia Zecca – for example, in the concise, yet highly informative survey of its history by S. PALMIERI, *L'archivio della Regia Zecca. Formazione, perdite documentarie e ricostruzione, L'État angevin*, 417–445, pp. 418–429.

into individual leaves, were rebound into 436 volumes with a new pagination in Arabic numerals. During the next two centuries, this enabled a series of Neapolitan archivists, such as Pietro Vincenti, Carlo De Lellis, Sigismondo Sicola and Michelangelo Chiarito, to create extensive repertoires, summaries and indices (usually called *notamenta*) of the registers' contents.¹⁰ Then, towards the end of the 18th century, the registers which remained after the events of 1701 were recollected and firmly rebound once again, now producing a total of 378 volumes. This happened just in time for the great surge of wider interest in archival materials that accompanied the advent of modern academic historical studies in the first decades of the 19th century. The Angevin registers, as well as other parts of the old Angevin archives, such as the *fascicoli* and the *arche*,¹¹ attracted much curiosity, and in 1845 they were officially opened to researchers as what was then called the Grande Archivio of Naples.

While the opening confirmed to the academic public the immense wealth of information contained in these archives, it also drew attention to a great flaw which seriously impeded the use of its most valuable segment – the Angevin registers. The mid-16th and late-18th century rebinding projects, although beneficial to the physical preservation of the registers, were carried out with an appalling measure of ignorance or disregard of their contents – dealing with thousands of documents recorded on individual leaves, fragments and quires, which were frequently issued by different rulers who bore the same names and generally had dates expressed only in indiction years, the rebindings produced a chaotic mix up in which parts of different original registers were bound together, frequently under completely unrelated register titles.¹² Through great efforts of researchers, such as Paul Durrieu, and archivists, such as Bartolommeo Capasso,¹³ by the end of the 19th century the mix ups were identified and described, laying the blueprint for an ideal reconstruction of the original registers. At the same time, work on *notamenta* compiled by early modern archivists, some of which were newly discovered, also opened the possibility of a partial reconstruction of some registers that had been lost in the meantime.

¹⁰ Works of this type that were known in the late 19th century are listed in B. CAPAZZO, *Inventario cronologico-sistematico*, 461–475.

¹¹ On these two series see P. DURRIEU, *Les archives angevines*, 239–245, and the more recent works referenced in S. PALMIERI, *L'archivio della Regia Zecca*, 419, note 7.

¹² For a more detailed description with examples see B. CAPAZZO, *Inventario cronologico-sistematico*, LIX–LXIII, LXIX–LXXI.

¹³ See above, note 6.

As a result of these activities, during the first decades of the 20th century the word “reconstruction” was already associated with the Angevin archives. However, the events of World War II were to give it a completely new meaning. On September 30, 1943, the collection of the most valuable holdings of the Neapolitan archives, which had been evacuated to a villa outside the city for fear of air raids, was set on fire by retreating German troops acting on orders from their superiors.¹⁴ For the volume series of the Angevin royal archive the destruction was total: 378 volumes of “old” registers, four volumes of new registers compiled by the archivists from loose fragments, 42 volumes and 12 folders of *fascicoli*, as well as thousands of documents from the *arche* bound together into 69 volumes, were all reduced to ashes.¹⁵

It was at this point of despair that the superintendent of the Neapolitan archives, Count Riccardo Filangieri, devised an unprecedented project of reconstruction of archival material. The idea was to use all available sources of information – originals and copies preserved in other archives, the *notamenta* of the early modern Neapolitan archivists, published and unpublished transcriptions or excerpts of document texts, references in scholarly works, researchers’ notes, photographs, microfilms – to reconstruct as much as possible of the contents of the lost archives of the Angevin chancery, beginning with the registers. In fact, as far as registers are concerned, this was supposed to be a double reconstruction, the aim not being to reconstruct the hopelessly mixed up pre-1943 volumes inherited from the mid-16th and late 18th century rebindings, but to rely on earlier reconstruction efforts in order to restore their original medieval organization. Drawing on the expertise and enthusiasm of the Neapolitan archivists and on widespread support from researchers around the world, the project was taken under the auspices of the Neapolitan learned society, the Accademia Pontaniana, and already in 1950 the first volume of the reconstructed *Registri della cancelleria angioina* (=RCA) appeared in print.¹⁶ During the next sixty years, successive generations of Neapolitan

¹⁴ The events are described in the report by the then-current superintendent of the archives, Riccardo Filangieri, published in English translation in *The American Archivist* 7/4 (1944) 252–255.

¹⁵ Numbers are given according to S. PALMIERI, *L’archivio della regia zecca*, 439. Other sources give somewhat different numbers for the *fascicoli* and the *arche*.

¹⁶ *I registri della cancelleria angioina ricostruiti da Riccardo Filangieri con la collaborazione degli archivisti napoletani* I, Napoli 1950. The plan of the project and the sources it counted on are laid out in the Preface to this volume (pp. IX–XIV). See also a subsequent account of the reconstruction experience in RCA XXXVII (ed. J. Mazzoleni), Napoli 1987, 12–30.

archivists published a total of 50 volumes, covering registers of the period from 1265 to 1295, as well as three volumes of the *fascicoli*. After 2010, publication of paper volumes was discontinued, but the restoration work is envisaged to continue in the form of a digital database.¹⁷

Information on South Slavic lands in the Angevin registers: A history of research

The opening of the Neapolitan archives for research in 1845 did not go unnoticed among researchers interested in the medieval history of the South Slavic lands which lay just across the Adriatic from the former Angevin kingdom. As a result, already in the first quarter-century since its opening, the Grande Archivio was visited by three such researchers who almost immediately made their findings known to the academic public.

The first of them was Croatian historian, politician, writer, and diligent collector of historical sources and antiquities about the history of the Southern Slavs, Ivan Kukuljević Sakcinski (1818–1889). In 1856/57, Kukuljević undertook a five-month research expedition southward along the eastern Adriatic coast all the way to Corfu, then crossed to Bari, visited Naples and Rome, and returned through northern Italy.¹⁸ During his three week stay in Naples, he visited libraries, galleries, museums and private collections, but devoted special attention to the “grand archives”. In his report, he noted the presence of sources about several topics of potential interest to students of South Slavic history and published a small sample of excerpts from 21 documents, 19 of which were recorded in the Angevin chancery registers – eight from the time of the first three Angevin kings and eleven from the time of King Ladislav (1386–1414).¹⁹

Probably encouraged by Kukuljević’s findings, his younger associate who would go on to become the foremost Croatian historian of the 19th century, Franjo Rački (1828–1894), came to Naples in September 1859 and stayed there for four weeks with the primary goal of examining

¹⁷ All printed volumes of the reconstructed registers are accessible online at the Accademia Pontaniana website: <https://www.accademiapontaniana.it/publicazioni/> (cons. August 26, 2020). For the digital database see <http://patrimonio.archivio.distanapoli.it/asna-web/vedi-tutti-i-documenti/ricostruzione-archivio-della-cancelleria-angioina.html> (cons. August 26, 2020).

¹⁸ His report on the journey was published soon after his return in I. KUKULJEVIĆ SAKCINSKI, *Izvjestje o putovanju kroz Dalmaciju u Napulj i Rim s osobitim obzirom na slavensku književnost, umjetnost i starine*, *Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku* IV (1857) 305–392.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, 354–357.

the “Angevin registers”. The report he published about his sojourn²⁰ offers a description of the registers, noting their mixed up contents and the lack of reliable archival aids which forced him to conduct his research page by page. As a result, in the time at his disposal, Rački managed to examine “over thirty volumes” as well as some loose parchments (evidently from the *arche*). From his findings, he published 64 documents related to the history of the Southern Slavs (31 issued by Charles I and Charles II, and the rest issued by King Ladislav), some in full-text and others in “exact excerpts, in which I usually used the same words found in the document itself”.²¹ Also, unlike Kukuljević, Rački published the archival locations of his finds, using both the medieval designations of the register volumes and their Arabic numeration, introduced only several years earlier.

The third and most productive researcher of Neapolitan sources about the medieval history of the Southern Slavs was the Russian historian and philologist Vikentij Makušev (1837–1883). With the support of the Russian government, he spent three years (1868–1871) looking for information about Slavic and Albanian history in all major Italian archives, libraries, and other institutions and collections. Six months of this expedition (the winter and spring of 1869/70) Makušev dedicated to Naples, primarily to the Grande Archivio, publishing his findings in a lengthy report which was printed in 1871.²² The introductory part of this report is a curious piece of scholarly writing. In presenting the history and the holdings of the archives, in which he duly notes the chaotic grouping of the registers into volumes, Makušev uses the opportunity to malign its staff as lazy (“dolce far niente”), uneducated, negligent in their duties, and even prone to selling the materials they were employed to preserve, sometimes with the approval of the director, whom he characterizes as a man of dubious honesty and limited knowledge. The Russian researcher also remained unimpressed with the results of the then active Neapolitan commission for the edition of archival material, accusing it of being “sluggish”, “incompetent” and unable to render proper service to

²⁰ F. RAČKI, Izvadci iz kralj. osrednjega arkiva u Napulju za jugoslovjensku poviest, *Arkiv za povjestnicu jugoslavensku* VII (1863) 5–71.

²¹ *Ibidem*, 8.

²² В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы и хранящиеся въ нихъ материалы для славянской истории II. Неаполь и Палермо*, Приложение къ XIX^{му} тому Записокъ Императорской академии наукъ 3, Санктпетербургъ 1871 [V. MAKUŠEV, *Ital'janskije archivy i hranjaščiesja v nich materialy dlja slavjanskoj istorii II. Neapol i Palermo*, Priloženie k XIX^{mu} tomu Zapisok Imperatorskoj akademii nauk 3, Sanktpeterburg 1871].

science, although he did devote significant space to presenting information he collected from its publications.²³

Makušev was more pleased with the work of some Neapolitan researchers, especially Camillo Minieri-Riccio and Giuseppe Del Giudice. However, when he turned to present the work of previous researchers of Slavic history, the full brunt of his wrath bore down on Franjo Rački, whom he accused of providing faulty information about the archive, not noticing important documents and not living up to his claim of using in his excerpts “the same words found in the document itself”. In fact, he announced that Rački had not transcribed the documents himself, but hired a (not particularly skilled) local priest to do that, and that one document Rački published from the *arche* was actually copied from a printed edition. Finally, he proceeded to list numerous mistakes he had noted in Rački’s edition, accompanied by a sardonic “Risum teneatis, amici!”²⁴

Only after this, the Russian scholar finally went on to present his own findings.²⁵ Declaring that he had examined all 378 volumes of Angevin registers, he reported to have found 800 documents pertaining to Slavic and Albanian history, 520 of which he transcribed in full. However, with all his criticism of the work of others, his own presentation of the material gathered left much to be desired. The vast majority of the documents are presented as short excerpts, with snippets of original Latin text woven into a narration in Russian, and without mention of their archival locations. In addition, the documents were neither numbered nor presented in a general chronological order, but instead arranged under a series of separate headings dedicated to individual Slavic peoples and lands (Russians, Czechs, Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Dalmatia, individual Dalmatian communes), Slavic history in general (especially traces of Slavic settlement in Southern Italy), Hungary, and Albanians.

These obvious shortcomings were quickly pointed out by Rački, who in 1872 published another work which dealt with materials from the Neapolitan registers.²⁶ Although prompted by Makušev’s report, this was not a polemical reply, but in fact an effort to reproduce the results of Makušev’s researches in Italian institutions in a form more accessible and suitable to the South Slavic academic community – as far as Neapolitan

²³ Mostly from the *Codice Aragonese I–II* (ed. F. TRINCHERA), Napoli 1866, 1868 (B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы*, 7–16).

²⁴ B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы*, 19–23.

²⁵ *Ibidem*, 25–80.

²⁶ F. RAČKI, Rukopisi tičući se južno-slovenske povjesti u arhivih srednje i dolnje Italije, *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 18 (1872) 205–258.

material is concerned, Rački selected from Makušev's report excerpts of those documents he considered most relevant to the history of the Southern Slavs, replaced the sections in Russian with text in Croatian, and published them together with documents from other cities as one series arranged in chronological order. Nevertheless, the Croatian historian did not miss out on the opportunity to address Makušev's criticism of his own work. Although he actually admitted to most of the faults Makušev accused him of, Rački emphasized that he – unlike his Russian counterpart who enjoyed state sponsorship – was forced to work much more hurriedly, and then proceeded to indicate apparent misreadings and other mistakes in Makušev's own work.²⁷ Finally, for good measure, he cautioned his younger colleague that public maligning of archive directors and personnel can have very negative consequences for future research.

As it turned out, Rački's criticism of Makušev's ecdotic approach was premature, because Makušev's report was just a preliminary presentation of his results. The Russian scholar's ultimate intention was to publish a proper collection of source material consisting of the full-text transcripts he had made at the archives, accompanied by appropriate references to archival locations. In 1874 he published one such collection containing material from Ancona, Bologna and Florence, and in 1882 another one with material from Genoa, Mantua, Milan, Palermo and Turin.²⁸ However, before he could publish the volume with material from Naples, he died,

²⁷ Without the opportunity of checking in the registers themselves, most of Rački's "corrections" were simply common-sense observations. For example, Makušev's conclusion that a "Johannes, comes de Russia" who is mentioned departing from the presence of Charles I with "59 horses" in early 1271 was a visitor from Russia (B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы*, 26), was met with Rački's comment that he could just as easily have been from "Rassia", an alternative name for medieval Serbia. In fact, another record about the same individual published in the reconstructed registers (RCA VI, 169, 171–172) places him among a group of French lords headed by Count Guy of Flanders returning from the crusade in Tunis, thus identifying him as Count Jean III de Roucy, a feudatory from northern France.

²⁸ B. МАКУШЕВ, *Исторические памятники Южных Славянъ и сосѣднихъ имъ народовъ извлеченные изъ итальянскихъ архивовъ и библиотекъ I. Анкона – Болонья – Флоренція*, Варшава 1874 [V. Makušev, *Istoričeskie pamjatniki Južnyh Slavjan i sosėdnich im narodov, izvlečennye iz ital'janskich archivov i bibliotek I. Ankona – Bolon'ja - Florencija*, Varšava 1874]; B. МАКУШЕВ, *Историјски споменици Јужних Словена и околних народа из италијанских архива и библиотека II. Ђенова, Мантова, Милано, Палермо, Турин, Београд* 1882 [V. MAKUŠEV, *Istorijski spomenici Južnih Slovena i okolnih naroda iz italijanskih arhiva i biblioteka II. Đenova, Mantova, Milano, Palermo, Turin*, Beograd 1882].

leaving the academic community without access to the information he had collected.²⁹

Somewhat unexpectedly, after Makušev the initially promising stream of researchers of South Slavic history coming to study the holdings of the Neapolitan archives completely dried up. Some researchers with other primary interests made some contributions, such as the Hungarian Leopoldo (Lipót) Óváry,³⁰ but for the most part it seemed that Makušev's systematic approach (and perhaps also the extreme confidence with which he presented its results) had convinced everybody that there was not much else to be found in Naples. As a result, in subsequent collections of sources for the history of South Slavic peoples, editions of documents from the Neapolitan archives were in some way drawn, or simply reproduced, from previous editions, primarily those of the three direct researchers named above. A partial exception was the 1913 edition of documents about the history of Albania (known in abbreviated form as the *Acta Albaniae*),³¹ which made some effort at direct research, but it too predominantly relied on earlier publications, especially Makušev,³² and its primary focus was not South Slavic.

Information on Serbia from the Angevin registers: An exercise in reconstruction

It follows from the previous section that, as far as South Slavic (and therefore also Serbian) history is concerned, research in the registers of the Angevin chancery ended decades before the their volumes were destroyed in 1943, staying limited to practically just two pioneering works – Rački's and Makušev's – both with significant shortcomings. Perhaps as a result of that, but maybe also due to the language barrier and

²⁹ Archival references for some documents from the Angevin registers found by Makušev, predominantly those concerning Albania, can be recovered from footnotes in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Историческія разысканія о Славянахъ въ Албаниі въ средніе вѣка*, Варшава 1871 [V. MAKUŠEV, *Istoričeskie razyskanija o Slavjanah v Albanii v srednie věka*, Varšava 1871].

³⁰ It was he who contributed to G. WENZEL, *Magyar Diplomacziái Emlékek az Anjou-korból* I, Budaest 1874, several full-text editions of documents excerpted by Rački and Makušev. His notes preserved in Budapest are also recorded among the sources for the reconstruction of the Angevin registers in RCA I, XI,

³¹ *Acta et diplomata res Albaniae mediae aetatis illustrantia* I–II (ed. L. de Thallóczy – C. Jireček – E. de Sufflay), Vindobonae 1913, 1918 (= *Acta Albaniae*).

³² In fact, the editors of this publication made an effort to recover Makušev's Neapolitan notes among his papers which were preserved in Warsaw, but they were not found there – *Acta Albaniae* I, x.

the feeling that everything the South Slavic branch of research had to offer was included in Hungarian editions, the *Acta Albaniae*, and collections such as the Croatian *Codex diplomaticus*,³³ when Neapolitan archivists embarked upon their project of reconstruction, these works remained outside of their scope. Similarly, the Neapolitan project of reconstruction did not produce much impact in Serbian and generally South Slavic historiography, probably due to the already established perception that everything worth knowing was already published by Rački and Makušev.³⁴ However, even from a purely methodological standpoint, both of these approaches have to be challenged. On the one hand, the works of Rački and Makušev (and, to a lesser degree, Kukuljević), whatever shortcomings they may possess, represent first hand testimonies about the lost originals of the Angevin registers and have to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, precisely because of their evident shortcomings, these works need to be compared with the results of the Neapolitan reconstruction project, because there is a realistic possibility (in fact, high probability) that the wide pool of sources used in the RCA reconstruction has yielded additional information that was missed by Rački and Makušev.

On this occasion, the testing ground chosen for the above challenge is the information contained in the Angevin registers from the period for which they have been reconstructed (1265–1295) that pertains to the Angevins' neighbor from across the Adriatic – Kingdom of Serbia. This choice was determined by three factors. First, selection of a clearly defined political entity should in principle make the task of recognizing relevant information easier. Second, information on Serbia was expected to constitute a sample whose size would be manageable within the scope of one paper, yet sufficient for drawing conclusions. Lastly, there was the desire to provide Serbian medieval studies with an updated edition – or rather an optimized reconstruction – of the “Neapolitan corpus” of sources for Serbian history of this period.

³³ *Diplomatički zbornik Kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije (Codex diplomaticus Regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae) I–XVIII* (ed. T. SMIČIKLAS et al.), Zagreb 1904–1967. The relevant volumes of this edition (VI and VII), whose sources for Neapolitan material, in addition to Rački and Makušev, included G. WENZEL, *Magyar Diplomacziak Emlékek*, as well as copies of outgoing Neapolitan documents preserved in Dalmatian archives, also seem to have been somewhat underused in the RCA.

³⁴ There is, for example, no trace of its use in the relatively recently published volumes of additions to the *Codex diplomaticus (Supplementa I–II)* (ed. H. SIROTKOVIĆ – J. KOLANOVIĆ), Zagreb 1998, 2002), although examples such as notes 44 and 46 below indicate that it could offer significant information.

In the final tally, the proposed merging of information from the volumes of the reconstructed RCA and the works of Makušev, Rački and Kukuljević, has identified 27 documents in the registers that refer to Serbia. They are presented below under numbers assigned according to chronological order. Two additions have also been attached to that corpus. The first (A1) is the only document encountered during this research that fits the established criteria of subject and timeframe, but does not come from the registers, its origin being the *arche*. It is included in order to achieve comprehensiveness of the corpus of Neapolitan archival information about Serbia for the given period. The second addition is a cluster of three documents from 1293 and 1294 (A2–4), known only from Makušev's work, which deal with the aftermath of a piratical attack by a Neapolitan ship-owner against a vessel carrying merchandize belonging to two citizens of the Dalmatian commune of Dubrovnik (Ragusa), an immediate neighbor of the Serbian kingdom but recognizing Venetian rule. Although there is only a slight possibility that one of the merchants was also a Serbian subject from the town of Kotor (Cattaro),³⁵ the documents were nevertheless included in this edition as a particularly good example of entries that were certainly present in registers which have been reconstructed so far, but have gone completely undetected by the reconstruction project because they were apparently noted only by Makušev.

The subject matter of the 27 documents that comprise the central part of the collection is not particularly diverse. As many as 13 of them can be said to reflect political relations. Even before he had secured his new kingdom from the Hohenstaufens, Charles I was laying down ambitious plans of expansion in the Balkans, where he sought to establish himself as the champion of Latin Christendom in the effort to restore the

³⁵ Document A2 names one of the Dubrovnik merchants as Petrus de Cervia, while A4 calls the same individual Petrus Tome. Cervia could be a corrupted version of two Dubrovnik noble surnames – Ceria and Cereva/Zrieva – and Dubrovnik sources in fact note the activity of a Petrus de Ceria in the period 1301–1332, but his father's name was Nicola, not Toma. On the other hand, "Tome" could be interpreted as the patronymic used at the time by the sons of the prominent Kotor nobleman Toma/Thoma Dragonis, in which case "de Cervia" from A2 might be explained by the (admittedly quite improbable) choice of the individual in question to identify himself as "de Servia". However, none of the three known sons of Thoma Dragonis was named Petrus – they were Drago, Medos(sius) and Paulus. Also, although the Toma family had strong links with Dubrovnik, there is no information about them being granted citizenship there until 1301. Cf. И. МАНКЕН, *Дубровачки патрицијат у XIV веку*, Београд 1960, 176, 428–430, and tables XX, LXX, LXXVIII [I. MANKEN, *Dubrovački patricijat u XIV veku*, Beograd 1960].

Latin Empire in Constantinople that had been toppled by the Byzantines in 1261.³⁶ As confirmed by the excerpt from the Treaty of Viterbo (no. 1), the document which effectively installed Charles in his desired role, these plans at first considered Serbia and other Eastern Christian Balkan lands as potential prey.³⁷ Soon, however, it became clear that the rulers of these lands, and Serbia in particular, might be inclined to cooperate with the mighty Western ruler against Byzantium. As a result, Angevin registers provide us with a series of documents spanning the period 1271–1281, which record traces of these apparently quite intensive contacts conducted through exchanges of embassies (nos. 2, 3, 5, 9–11, 13, 16, 17). The document recording a grant of privileges to an Albanian lord (no. 4) can also be seen as a reflection of this spirit of understanding, since it views the lands belonging to the Serbian kingdom not as prey, but as possessions that are to be safeguarded like territories under the Angevins' own rule.

It is not by accident that this series discontinues after 1281. In 1282 the island of Sicily revolted against Charles's rule and switched its allegiance to the rulers of Aragon, inaugurating a deep crisis of Angevin power that prevented any serious attempts at realization of their Balkan ambitions. In fact, the two remaining reflections of political relations in the present corpus of documents (nos. 21 and 22) belong to a different field of Charles's international activity – the one he opened with the marriage of his son and successor Charles to Mary, daughter of the King of Hungary. A dynastic crisis which broke out in Hungary in 1290 enabled Mary, now queen-consort of King Charles II, to claim the throne of that realm for their son Charles Martel.³⁸ In the power struggles that ensued, the Angevins attempted to enlist the support of former Serbian king Stefan Dragutin, a relative of the Hungarian royal house who at the time ruled a large appanage in northern Serbia and southern Hungary, by granting to Dragutin's son Vladislav the privileges published here. However, the pri-

³⁶ On Charles's Balkan policy and Byzantine countermeasures see S. RUNCIMAN, *The Sicilian Vespers*; D. J. GEANAKOPLOS, *Emperor Michael Paleologus and the West, 1258–1282: A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*, Cambridge, Mass., 1959; K. SETTON, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571): Vol. I: The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, Philadelphia 1976, 85–146.

³⁷ For an overview of the treaty's provisions see D. J. GEANAKOPLOS, *Emperor Michael Paleologus*, 197–199.

³⁸ On the situation in Hungary and the eventual Angevin ascension there see J. V. A. FINE, *The Late Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*, Ann Arbor 1994, 204–209; P. ENGEL, *The Realm of Saint Stephen. A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*, London – New York 2001, 107–111, 128–130.

vileges' insistence on preserving the rights of other Hungarian lords in the area might have reduced the attractiveness of this alliance in the eyes of Dragutin and his son, because one year later Vladislav was apparently married to a princess from the anti-Angevin camp.³⁹

Four documents which refer to Serbia concern the noble family of Chau. Three of them, dating from 1280–1281 (nos. 15–17), mention Mary, wife of Charles's captain and vicar general in Albania Anselm de Chau, who died there in the winter of 1274,⁴⁰ and her departures for Serbia, where she was visiting her sister, the Serbian queen-mother Helen.⁴¹ Later information suggests that Mary eventually moved to Serbia permanently, with one tradition claiming that she was buried there along with her son, also named Anselm.⁴² Document no. 19, which has come up in the RCA reconstruction without being previously noted by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev, now seems to lend additional credibility to this tradition by mentioning in the year 1289 that an Anselm "de Cahors" has lost the rights to a source of income in the Angevin kingdom due to his failure to return from a prolonged stay in Serbia.⁴³

Almost all of the remaining documents refer to another frequent form of contacts between the Angevin and Serbian shore of the Adriatic – export of grain and other victuals from the South Italian kingdom. Most of the recorded cases concern special export permits granted upon requests from the Serbian rulers (nos. 18, 23–27). However, there is also the case of an Angevin state-sponsored business venture in which a ship-owner from Puglia was instructed to sell royal grain in Dubrovnik or Kotor and then immediately proceed to "Simia", where the profit was to be

³⁹ A. KRSTIĆ, The Rival and the Vassal of Charles Robert of Anjou: King Vladislav II Nemanjić, *Banatica* 26/2 (2016) 33–51, pp. 33–40.

⁴⁰ The timeframe of his death is clearly defined by documents from the reconstructed registers – RCA XI, 162–163, 191, 207–208.

⁴¹ Discussions on the precise origins of Queen Helen (and her sister) were finally been put to rest by G. MCDANIEL, On Hungarian-Serbian Relations in the 13th Century: John Angelos and Queen Jelena, *Ungarn-Jahrbuch* 12 (1982/ 1983) 43–50.

⁴² С. JIREČEK, *Geschichte der Serben* I, Gotha 1913, 319; Г. СУВОТИЋ, Краљица Јелена Анжујска – ктитор црквених споменика у Приморју, *Историјски гласник* 1–2 (1958) 131–147 [G. SUBOTIĆ, Kraljica Jelena Anžujaska – ktitor crkvenih spomenika u Primorju, *Istorijski glasnik* 1–2 (1958) 131–147], pp. 139–140.

⁴³ This younger Anselm de Chau reappears in the pages of the reconstructed registers from the following years (1292–1293) in Angevin southern Italy and on a trip to France (RCA XXXVI, 63, 72; XLIII, 49, 56; XLIV/2, 494, 502; XLV, 110; XLVI, 128, etc.). Of course, his presence in the West at this time does not mean that he did not eventually return to Serbia and find his final resting place there.

used to purchase timber and equipment for the Angevin navy (nos. 6–8).⁴⁴ The remaining two documents are also associated with seafaring. No. 20 uses the Bay of Kotor, then located in the Serbian kingdom, as a point of nautical reference (“*citra cultum Catare*”) on the eastern Adriatic shore. On the other hand, no. 12 speaks of the activity of Slavic pirates along the coast of Angevin Albania in the spring 1276, noting that their attacks have encouraged local anti-Angevin forces to be more aggressive.⁴⁵ At that time, the main “Slavic” pirate lair on the Adriatic was the Dalmatian town of Omiš (Almissa), then recognizing the overlordship of the Kingdom of Hungary,⁴⁶ but since these raids took place so far south it seems that these Slavic pirates could also have come from the much closer maritime regions of Serbia, especially since Serbia was at that time destabilized by the struggle for the throne between King Uroš I and his son Dragutin. In fact, even though it recognized Hungarian rule, Omiš also had links with the kings of Serbia.⁴⁷

As an attempt at reconstruction by bringing together the editions published by the RCA project and the three 19th century researchers of South Slavic history, this 27-document corpus yields some interesting results. First, the RCA project demonstrated a high degree of reliability as a document finder – among the 27 documents there is only one (no. 17)

⁴⁴ Although the index of the respective RCA volume fails to identify this location, rendering it as “Simia (?)” (RCA XI, 413), another mention of it in RCA X, 279, 321, is interpreted as referring to the island of Symi off the southwestern coast of Asia Minor. However, the context of these mentions – as well as a mention in RCA XIII, 45, which places “Symia” on the way to Hungary – obviously point to a location on the eastern Adriatic coast. As a result, it is easy to conclude that this Simia/Symia is in fact Senj (Segna), at the time an important port and well-known shipbuilding center – cf. B. KRMPOTIĆ, *Trgovački ugovor Dubrovnika sa Senjom godine 1248*, *Senjski zbornik* 8 (1980) 309–317.

⁴⁵ Makušev interpreted this as prearranged assistance by the pirates to the Byzantines – B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 46, and ИДЕМ, *Историческая разыскания*, 30.

⁴⁶ For basic remarks on Omiš piracy see M. ANČIĆ, *Srednjovjekovni Omiš, Omiš i Poljica* (ed. Ž. Domljan), Zagreb 2006, 47–66, esp. pp. 47–48, 50–54, 60–61. It should be pointed out that RCA volumes covering the 1270s contain a significant number of records about attacks perpetrated by Omiš pirates and about Angevin measures to counter them.

⁴⁷ Count George, a prominent Omiš leader from the mid-13th century, was married to a daughter of the former Serbian king Vladislav – Н. Порчић, *Документи српских средњовековних владара у дубровачким збиркама. Доба Немањића*, Београд 2017, 37, 289–290 [N. PORČIĆ, *Dokumenti srpskih srednjovekovnih vladara u dubrovačkim zbirkama. Doba Nemanjića*, Beograd 2017].

that appears in the editions of the three researchers, but was not found by the RCA. Conversely, the RCA includes as many as nine documents that were not reported by the three researchers (nos. 1, 6–9, 13, 19, 20, 24). However, when considering the quantity of available information about individual documents, the role of the three 19th century editions greatly increases. For 10 of the 17 documents which are present in both the RCA and the three old editions information provided by the old editions significantly supplements or corrects the information contained in the RCA. In five of these (no. 5, 23, 25–27) it appeared justified to completely substitute the document editions provided in the RCA with those published by the 19th century researchers, in another four (nos. 16, 18, 21, 22) the old editions were used to supplement those in the RCA, while in no. 11 information provided by the 19th century researchers led to a correction of the date of issue – and consequently other information – given in the RCA.⁴⁸ When one adds to this the abovementioned example of three documents from the old editions that have been completely missed by the RCA (nos. A2–4), it becomes safe to conclude that the RCA project, while in itself a carefully and diligently prepared publication of sources of considerable value for Serbian and South Slavic history, can still be significantly enhanced by the results of the three researchers in that field who had the opportunity to work directly on the registers of the Angevin chancery before their tragic loss.

⁴⁸ Also, information from Rački and Makušev has led to the conclusion that nos. 25 and 26, which the RCA treated as one document, are two separate items.

The Documents

1.

Mention of Serbia in the Treaty of Viterbo

1267, May 27 (Viterbo)

The text of the treaty is believed to have been recorded in an original register (Register III in the RCA reconstruction), which was lost before the first inventories were made (see RCA I, 90). Existing editions are based on authentic copies of the treaty preserved in the National Archives in Paris (Trésor des chartes, Layettes, J. 509, no. 7).

The edition in RCA I, 92, offers an abridged text based on the edition in J. A. BUCHON, *Histoire de l'Empire de Constantinople sous les empereurs français*, Paris 1824, 455–463. The edition below presents the full text of the relevant article of the treaty based on Buchon, as well as the editions in G. DEL GIUDICE, *Codice diplomatico* II, 30–44, and *Layettes du Trésor des chartes* IV (ed. E. BERGER), Paris 1902, 220–224.

... Conceditis etiam nobis et nostris in predicto regno heredibus ut nos et ipsi heredes, preter feudum, principatum, terras et insulas et alia dicta superius, habeamus plene et integre tertiam partem omnium illorum que de predicto imperio infra annum quo dicti nostri equites in ipso imperio pro recuperatione et acquisitione morabuntur eiusdem, vel etiam post ipsum annum, quandocumque a nostris nostrorumve in dicto regno Sicilie heredum equitibus et gente vestra simul vel separatim ab alterutris recuperari poterunt, vel in ipso acquiri, sive in demaniis, sive feudis vel aliis rebus aut iuribus quibuscumque consistant, reliquis duabus partibus, et preter illas urbe Constantinopolitana ac predictis quatuor insulis, vobis vestrisque successoribus reservatis. In quibus utique duabus partibus includentur et computabuntur si qua promisistis vel iam concessistis vel promittetis seu concedetis deinceps quibuscumque personis, communitatibus sive locis, ratione subsidii vel auxilii impendendi vobis ad recuperationem seu acquisitionem imperii supradicti, seu quacumque alia ratione, occasione vel causa, tertia parte nostra per ea in nullo penitus diminuta, sed remanente ab illis omnibus libera penitus et immuni. Huiusmodi autem tertiam partem quandocumque et ubicumque in ipso imperio eiusque pertinentiis acquirendorum seu recuperandorum habebimus in ea ipsius imperii parte, in qua nos vel nostri in predicto regno heredes estimabimus seu reputabimus nos eandem tertiam partem cum ipso regno, feudo principatus Achaye ac Moree aliisque premissis terris posse tenere commodius et habere, ita quod

etiam in terra memorati despoti ac in regnis Albanie et Servie liceat nobis nostrisque in regno Sicilie heredibus, si voluerimus, huiusmodi tertiam partem eligere ac etiam obtinere. ...

2.

Expected arrival of envoys from
Balkan lands, including Serbia

1271, September 12 (Melfi)

Originally part of the *Registrum secretorum de curia* which contained records for the period from August 1271 to January 1272 (Register XXIX in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 13, f. 1'.

The document was published as an excerpt in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 29 (= F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 217; *Acta Albaniae* I, 75–76). The edition below is based on the somewhat abridged text in RCA VII, 173–174, supplemented by the sources listed therein.

De exhibendis expensis nunciis certorum magnatum ad regnum accedentium. Item scriptum est eidem (secreto Apulie). Fidelitati tue [mandamus] quatenus, si processu temporis aliquos ambassatores seu nuncios de partibus Achaye, Servie, Bulgarie, Albanie aut de imperio vel de regno de Sagarach, deferentes aliquas licteras seu ambassarias a dominis ipsarum partium vel regnorum ad portus vel maritimam iurisdictionis tue destinare contingat, eis, nullum aliud super hoc mandatum nostrum expectans, expensas equitaturas et securum conductum pro ipsis et eorum familiis usque ad nostram presentiam sine difficultate aliqua exhibere procures. Recepturus etc. Datum Melfie, XII septembris.

Item simile facte sunt secreto Principatus et Terre Beneventane.

Item similes facte sunt secreto Sicilie.

Item similes facte sunt secreto Calabrie.

3.

Departure of Angevin, Bulgarian and Serbian envoys

1273, May 12 (Foggia)

Originally part of the *Registrum secretorum* which contained records for October 1272 and March–May 1273 (Register XLVII in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 21, f. 39'.

The document was excerpted in I. KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, *Izvjestje*, 355 (under the year 1274), and В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 28 (= F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 217). A full-text edition in G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból* I, 416–417, bearing the wrong year (1272), is repeated in J. RADONIĆ, *Acta et diplomata ragusina* I, Beograd 1932, 58–59. The edition below is based on the somewhat abridged text in RCA IX, 216, supplemented by the sources listed therein, primarily Wenzel and G. DEL GIUDICE, *Codice diplomatico* I, 220.

Pro Nicolao de Sancto Omero milite.

Scriptum est magistro portulano Apulie etc. Volumus et tue fidelitati precipiendo mandamus quatenus Nicolaum de Sancto Omero militem, familiarem et fidelem nostrum, extrahere de quocunque portu Apulie voluerit pro se suaque familia et nunciis illustrium imperatoris Vulgarorum et regis Servie sexaginta equitaturas et triginta salmas ordeï absque iure exiture aliquo libere patiaris, proviso ne pretextu concessionis huiusmodi maior per eos equorum et ordeï quantitas extrahatur. Datum Fogie per eumdem Iohannem,⁴⁹ XII madii prime indictionis.

4.

Mention of Serbia in the charter of privileges
for *sevast* Paul Gropa

1273, May 18 (Pescara)

Originally part of the Registrum extravagantium which contained records from October 1272 and March–August 1273 (Register XLVIII in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 3, f. 4.

A full-text edition in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Genealogia di Carlo I. di Angiò. Prima generazione*, Napoli 1857, 139–140, drew the attention of Makušev, who proposed some different readings, especially of toponyms (В. МАКУШЕВ, *Исторические разыскания*, 24). An excerpt with commentary was published in *Acta Albaniae* I, 86–87. The edition below is based on the somewhat abridged text in RCA X, 176, supplemented from the sources listed therein, primarily C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Genealogia*, 139–140, and IDEM, *Saggio di codice diplomatico formato sulle antiche scritture dell'archivio di stato di Napoli* I, Napoli 1878, 106.

⁴⁹ Refers to Iohannes de Masnelio, archdeacon of Palermo, who was temporarily replacing the royal chancellor, Symon of Paris.

Pro Sevasto Paulo Gropa.

Karolus etc. Per presens privilegium notum facimus universis tam presentibus quam futuris, quod nos, attendentes grata et accepta servitia que nobilis vir sevasto Paulus Gropa, fidelis noster, serenitati nostre devotius exhibuit et exhibiturum in postremo speramus, eundem casalia Radicis maioris et Radicis minoris, nec non Coboche, Zuadigorize, Sirclani et Craye Zessizarie, sita in valle de Ebu,⁵⁰ dummodo non sint de pertinentiis regni nostri Albanie, neque regni Servie, nec terrarum datarum in dotem per quondam Michaellem despotum quondam Helene filie sue, uxori quondam Manfredi olim principis Tarentini, nec excedant valorem annum CCCC yperperorum, damus concedimus et donamus in perpetuum de liberalitate mera et gratia speciali eidem sevasto Paulo et eius heredibus de ipsius corpore legitime descendentibus natis iam et nascituris, sub servitiis usibus et consuetudinibus imperii Romanie. Ut autem huius nostre donatione et concessione plenum robur obtineat firmiter, presens privilegium fieri et aurea bulla typario maiestatis nostre impressa iussimus communiri. Datum Piscarie, per Iohannem de Mesnelio etc, XVIII madii I indictionis.

5.

Departure of Angevin envoys for Serbia

1274, February 8 (Brindisi)

Originally part of a register containing documents addressed to *procuratores* and *portulani*, which contained records from November 1273 to August 1274 (Register LVI in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 18, f. 150'.

The document was excerpted in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 30 (abridged in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 217). RCA XI, 94–95, offers only a Latin translation of an Italian excerpt from C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno di Carlo I. d'Angiò dal 2 Gennaio 1273 al 31 dicembre 1283 (= Il regno)*, *Archivio storico italiano* 91 (1876) 41.⁵¹ Therefore, the edition below reproduces Makušev's excerpt, which quotes fragments of the original Latin text.

⁵⁰ В. МАКУШЕВ, *Исторические разыскания*, 24: "Cobecheste, Zvadigoriza, Sirclane (или Suclane) et Essizan, sita in vale de Ebu". He identifies de Ebu with the river Devol.

⁵¹ The reference in RCA XI, 95, to *Acta Albaniae* I, 113, as one of the sources for the reconstruction is wrong, because it refers to the *Acta Albaniae* edition of our no. 13. In fact, *Acta Albaniae* does not include any reference to no. 5.

8 февраля II инд. 1274 г. изъ Бриндизи король Карль I приказываль “universis portulanis Apulie”, чтобы они “de uno bono et competente vase omnibus necessariis ad navigandum munito provideant” – “sub pena gracie regis” – “cum Jacobum de Regio militem et Johannem de Gerardo clericum dilectum etc. ad illustrem regem Servie pro expressis nostris servitiis destinemus”.

6.

Sale of grain in Dubrovnik and Kotor

1274, March 29 (Brindisi)

Originally part of the *Registrum extravagantium infra et extra regnum*, which contained records from November 1273 to August 1274 (Register LIX in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 14, f. 249'. The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition below reproduces the Italian excerpt published by C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno*, *Archivio storico italiano* 91 (1876) 51. The same excerpt (only translated into Latin) is presented in RCA XI, 207.

Marzo 29 (1274), Brindisi. (Carlo I) ordina a Sergio Bovi di Ravello, dimorante in Bitonto, di mandare Angelo, suo figliuolo colla nave, all'uopo preparata nel porto di Brindisi, a Manfredonia per ricevere da Orso Rufo, maestro portolano e procuratore di Puglia, 15000 salme di grano a salme generali e portarle a vendere a Ragusa ed a Cattaro, dove potrà ricavarne miglior prezzo.

7.

Sale of grain in Dubrovnik and Kotor
and purchase of ship equipment in Senj

1274, April 12 (Monopoli)

Originally part of the *Registrum extravagantium infra et extra regnum*, which contained records from November 1273 to August 1274 (Register LIX in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 14, f. 249'. The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition below reproduces the Italian excerpt with quotes from original Latin published by C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno*, *Archivio storico italiano*

91 (1876) 53–54. The same source is reproduced (in modernized Italian) by the edition in RCA XI, 211–212.

Aprile 12 (1274), Monopoli. Scrive poi (Carlo I) a Sergio Bove di Ravello, dimorante a Bitonto, che secondo il contratto tra loro, esso Bove si è obbligato fare venire dalle parti di Simia il legname necessario alla copertura venti compresi nell'arsenale di Brindisi, alla ragione di 15 once di oro a peso generale per il sequente legname necessario alla copertura di ciascun compreso e per le rispettive porte, cioè: ...⁵² Quindi gli ordina che faccia tutto quel legname trasportare da Angelo Bove, suo figlio, con la stessa nave che col carico di grano va a vendere a Ragusa ed a Cattaro, dopo che avrà fatta quella vendita. E che il legname si faccia sbarcare nel porto di Brindisi e propriamente in quello arsenale. E nello stesso tempo gli commette di fare comprare dal medesimo Angelo, suo figlio, altro legname di simile quantità e misura al predetto, per altri 7 compresi degli arsenali di Trani e di Bari, che con la stessa nave trasporterà e sbarcherà a Trani, consegnandola al maestro portolano di Puglia.

8.

To the officials of Puglia about
the sale of grain in Dubrovnik and Kotor

1274, April 24 (Trani)

Originally part of the same register as no. 5 (Register LVI in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 18, f. 152.

The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition below reproduces the somewhat abridged text published in RCA XI, 95, based on sources listed therein.

Scriptum est Ursoni Rufolo, magistro portulano et procuratori Apulie.
Scire te volumus quod Sergio Bovi de Ravello habitatori Botonti ... scripsimus in hec verba: "Karolus etc. Sergio Bovi etc. Cum infrascriptam quantitatem lignaminum pro munitione galearum et teridarum nostrarum necessariam reputemus, fidelitati tue ... mandamus quatenus de pecunia percipienda de venditione frumenti curie nostre, quod cum navi tua apud Ragusiam vel Cataniam⁵³ deferri et vendi mandavimus per Angelum Bovem,

⁵² The detailed specification of material included in the excerpt of Minieri-Riccio is omitted here as irrelevant to medieval Serbia.

⁵³ It is clear from nos. 6 and 7, as well as from other mentioned locations (Dubrovnik and the Apulian ports) that this should be Cattaro (Kotor) on the eastern Adriatic coast, not Catania in Sicily.

prepositum oneri ipsius navis, sub periculo tuo lignamina ipsa emi facias ... pretio quo poteris meliori et deferrī ac exonerari in portu Brundusii, et magistro procuratori Curie ... Apulie assignare ... Lignamina vero predicta sunt hec, videlicet ..." Quare fidelitati tue precipimus quatenus omnia lignamina ipsa statim cum delata fuerint in predicto portu recipias et ea ... diligenter ibidem facias conservare ... Datum Trani ... mense aprilis, XXIV eiusdem, II indictionis.

9.

Safe conduct for the envoys of Empress Mary of Constantinople
and for the Serbian envoy count George

1274, September 2 (Lagopesole)

Originally part of the *Registrum extravagantium* which contained records from November 1273 to August 1274 (Register LXVI in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 19, f. 122'.

The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition in RCA XII, 157, reproduces the full-text edition of the safe conduct for the envoys of empress Mary published in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Saggio*, 113–114, and a Latin translation of the Italian excerpt of the note concerning count George published in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno, Archivio storico italiano* 93 (1876) 423. The edition below reproduces Minieri-Riccio's edition of the safe conduct for the envoys of Empress Mary and his Italian excerpt of the note concerning count George.

Scriptum est universis, tam amicis quam fidelibus presentis litteras inspecturis etc. Cum Theobaldus de Villanova clericus et Gualterius armiger, nuncii et familiares magnifice et egregie mulieris domine Marie, imperatricis Constantinopolitane, consanguinee nostre, in Franciam ad eandem dominam de nostra licentia revertantur, amicos attente requirimus et rogamus, fidelibus districtius iniungentes, quatenus predictos nuncios, nostri contemplatione nominis, cum omnibus bonis eorum, habentes favorabiliter commendatos, nullam eis in personis vel rebus molestiam inferatis vel ab aliis permictatis inferri, quinimmo de securo conductu ad requisitionem ipsorum, si necesse fuerit, liberaliter provideatis eisdem. Ita quod vobis amicis speciales propterea referre gratias teneamur, vosque fideles possitis exinde in conspectu nostro merito commendari. Presentibus post tres menses minime valituris. Datum apud Lacumpensulem, II septembris III indictionis.

Ed altre simili lettere fa pel conte Giorgio, ambasciadore del re di Servia, che, adempita la sua missione presso esso re Carlo, ritorna al suo sovrano.

10.

To the justiciar of Bari on the departure
of the Serbian envoy count George

1274, September 3 (Lagopesole)

Originally part of the *Registrum iustitiariorum* which contained records from September 1273 to August 1274 (Register LXIII in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 21, f. 313.

The document was excerpted in I. KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, *Izvjestje*, 355, and B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 30 (= RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 217). A full-text edition in G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból I*, 417, is repeated in J. RADONIĆ, *Acta et diplomata ragusina I*, 59. The edition below is based on the somewhat abridged text in RCA XII, 106, supplemented by the sources listed therein, namely G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból I*, 417, and C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Saggio*, 114.

Scriptum est eidem iustitiario (Terre Bari) etc. Cum comes Georgius, nuncius illustris regis Servie, dilecti amici nostri, ad eundem regem de nostra licentia revertatur, fidelitati tue precipiendo mandamus quatenus eundem comitem, cum personis decem et octo secum redeuntibus, roncinis tribus et duobus equis ad arma, quos secum ducit, de quibus extrahendis licentiam sibi duximus concedendam, si in portu Trani vel Baroli est aliquod vassellum paratum, quod ad partes illas debeat navigare, in quo decenter et comode ire possint, cum nauo per te pro parte curie nostre solvendo, vel in ipsius defectu in aliquo alio vassello ad hoc ydoneo, quod statim invenire et conducere studeas, de quacumque fiscali pecunia et etiam de pecunia presentis generalis subventionis que est vel erit per manus tuas, aliquot mandato non obstante, etc, usque Iadaram vel aliam terram illarum partium, quam ipse elegerit, celeriter per mare facias transfretare. Recepturus etc. Datum apud Lacumpensulem, per magistrum Guilielmum de Faronvilla, decanum Sancti Petri Virorum Aureliani, regni Sicilie vicecancellarium, III septembris III indictionis.

11.

To the officials of Trani and Barletta on the departure
of the Serbian envoy count George

1274, September 3 (Lagopesole)

The RCA reconstruction (RCA IX, 217) places this document in its Register XLVII, immediately after our no. 3, assigning it to the pre-1943 location of Reg. 21, f. 39. However, this is obviously an error which originated with the document's only full-text edition in G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból* I, 417 (repeated also in J. RADONIĆ, *Acta et diplomata ragusina* I, 58–59). In that edition, the document was mistakenly placed behind our no. 3 instead of being placed behind our no. 10, with which it is clearly connected by such details as the name of the envoy, the number of persons and horses travelling with him, the ports of departure, etc. The link between no. 10 and no. 11 is confirmed by I. KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI, *Izvjestje*, 355, who presents their brief excerpts one after the other. Therefore, document no. 11 (like no. 10) was originally part of the *Registrum iustitiariorum* which contained records from September 1273 to August 1274 (Register LXIII in the RCA reconstruction), and its pre-1943 location would have been Reg. 21, f. 313. Its edition below is based on G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból* I, 417, which is listed as its only source in RCA IX, 217.

Item scriptum est portulanis portuum Trani et Baroli quatenus eundem comitem Georgium cum decem et octo personis, tribus roncinis et equis duobus ad arma de portu Trani vel Baroli, de altero videlicet ipsorum portuum, in quo per eundem iustitiarium vassellum pro transito eorum inveniri contigerit, transire et abire sine molestia permittatis, actentius provisiuri quod plures equitaturas vel equos ad arma etc. Presentibus post mensem unum etc. Datum ut supra.

12.

Slavic pirates along the coast
of the Kingdom of Albania

1276, May 22 (Rome)

Originally part of the *Registrum extravagantium* which contained records from September 1275 to August 1276 (Register LXX in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943 located in Reg. 23, f. 104'.

The document was excerpted in B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 48 (= *Acta Albaniae I*, 104; omitted in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*). The edition below is based on the somewhat longer excerpt from F. CARABELLESE, *Carlo d'Angiò*, 75, which is also used for the edition in RCA XIII, 118.

Rogero de Samaro⁵⁴ ... Quia Guillelmus Bernardi miles, capitaneus in regno Albanie et Durachio, intimavit quod Sclavi pirate, cum galionis eorum bene armatis per loca maritime illarum partium discurrentes, fideles nostros navigantes per maritimam illius provincie impediunt et eis inferunt incomoda atque dampna, ac etiam hostes et inimici de gente Paliologi, ad eorum audaciam animati, nituntur gentem et fideles nostros dampnificare intendunt ... ad partes Durachii cum vassellis⁵⁵ quibus prees te conferens, maritimam illam continue discurrendo, sic ipsam studeas custodire ... Datum Rome, XXII maii IV indictionis.

13.

To Angevin envoys departing for Serbia
with their Serbian counterparts

1279, February 23

Originally part of the register known as 1278C, fol. 226, which was still in existence in the second half of the 17th century, but was subsequently lost. However, its contents has been preserved in the form of excerpts recorded by Carlo de Lellis in his manuscript *Notamenta ex registris Karoli primi*, vol. I, which were edited in RCA XXI as *Additiones* to the reconstructed register LXXXIX. The edition below thus reproduces the edition in RCA XXI, 325.

Magistro Guillelmo de Aurelianis clerico et Raymundo Blanco, nuncios "nostris" missis ad regem Servie illustrem una cum nunciis eiusdem regis redeuntibus ad ipsum regem, mandatum quod provideantur de animalibus a capitano Durachii pro itinere faciendo. Datum die XXIII februarii VII indictionis.

⁵⁴ Roger was the *protontinus* (naval commander) in Trani.

⁵⁵ Makušev specifically mentions "duabus galeis, uno galeone et una vaccetta", but it is unclear where that should fit in the excerpt provided by Carabellese.

14.

To the officials of Puglia about
Angevin and Serbian envoys departing for Serbia
1279, February 27 (Torre di Sant’Erasmus, Capua)

The document was apparently originally recorded in two registers, namely (1) the *Registrum secretorum et procuratorum* for the period from September 1278 to August 1279 (Register LXXXVII in the RCA reconstruction), where its pre-1943 location was Reg. 30, f. 71’, and (2) the *Registrum camere* for the same period (Register LXXXIX in the RCA reconstruction), where its pre-1943 location was Reg. 28, f. 208.

The first of these records has been published in RCA XXI, 38, as an excerpt in Italian from a manuscript volume of notes by Minieri-Riccio. The second was excerpted in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 30-31 (abridged in *Acta Albaniae* I, 113; omitted in RAČKI, *Rukopisi*), while a full-text edition was published in G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból* I, 418 (reproduced in J. RADONIĆ, *Acta et diplomata ragusina* I, 60–61). The edition below is based on the full-text edition of the second record published in RCA XXI, 131, and sources listed therein, which include Wenzel’s edition and a full-text edition in G. DEL GIUDICE, *Codice diplomatico* I, 220.

Pro nuntiis Servie et regis Karoli.

Scriptum est magistris portulanis Apulie etc. Cum nos magistrum de Aureliano⁵⁶ clericum et Raynaldum Blancroy, nostros dilectos, ad illustrem regem Servie, una cum ipsius regis nunciis de nostra curia redeuntibus, ad eundem specialiter destinemus, volumus et mandamus quatenus tam ipsius regis quam nostris nuntiis de aliquo securo et sufficienti vase pro ipsorum transitu usque Durachium, nec non aliis necessariis super mare,⁵⁷ ad ipsorum requisitionem providere curetis, nullam in hoc committentes negligentiam vel defectum, mandato aliquo huic contrario per quod presentis mandati executio impediri valeat vel differri aliquatenus non obstante. Datum apud Turrim (Sancti Herasmi prope Capuam), die penultimo februarii (VII indictionis).

⁵⁶ The full name is given in the first record (Guglielmo de Aurelianis). It is also attested in our no. 12.

⁵⁷ G. DEL GIUDICE, *Codice diplomatico* I, 220: “super nave”.

15.

Departure of Maria de Chau for Serbia

1280, June 7 (Naples)

The document was apparently originally recorded in both duplicates of the *Registrum secretorum et magistrorum portulanorum et procuratorum* for the period from September 1279 to August 1280 (Register LXXXXIV in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, the locations of these records were Reg. 8, f. 144', and Reg. 35, f. 24.

Probably because of the duplication, the edition in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 31 (= F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 218), mentions two documents, but presents just one excerpt. The edition in RCA XXIII, 51, offers an excerpt in Italian, although its list of sources includes a "partial transcription" (in a manuscript by C. Minieri-Riccio) kept at the archive. The edition below reproduces this Italian excerpt side by side with the most complete Latin excerpt available, which was published by F. CARABELLESE, *Carlo d'Angiò*, 39.

Re Carlo ordina a Mauro Pironti e a Nicola Castaldo di Ravello, maestri portolani di Puglia,⁵⁸ di fare uscire liberamente dai porti di Manfredonia, Barletta e Trani tre cavalli da guerra e 17 uomini⁵⁹ che Maria de Chaus porta seco in Serbia, dove va con il figliuolo a vedere la regina di Serbia, sua sorella. E le permette pure di portare le vettovaglie necessarie per gli otto giorni di viaggio da fare per mare come pure la biada necessaria per detti 20 cavalli alla ragione di una terza parte del tomolo per ogni cavallo in ciascuna notte. Datum Neapoli, VII iunii VIII indictionis.

Quia nobilis mulier domina Maria de Chaus cum filio suo et familia eiusdem domine intendit transfretare ad presens ad partes Servie visura dominam reginam Servie, sororem suam ... eandem dominam Mariam cum filio, familia et viginti equitaturis suis ... de altero portum Manfridonie, Baroli et Trani, quem ipsa elegerit, transfretare et exire libere ... permittatis ad predictas partes Servie accessuram.

⁵⁸ Makušev gives the address: "magistris portulanis et procuratoribus Apulie".

⁵⁹ The previous mention of three "cavalli da guerra" and the subsequent mention of "detti 20 cavalli" suggest that the word "uomini" may be a mistake and should be replaced by "roncini". Cf. above, no. 10.

16.

To the officials of Puglia on the departure of Maria de Chau
and the Serbian envoy George for Serbia (I)

1281, June 4 (Viterbo)

Records of a document on the above subject addressed to the *portulani* of Puglia on June 4, 1281, apparently originally existed in two different registers: (1) in the *Registrum secretorum et magistrorum portulanorum* for the period from September 1279 to August 1280 (Register CI in the RCA reconstruction), and (2) a register containing the *Extravagantes infra et extra regnum* for the same period (Register CIII in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, the locations of these records were (1) Reg. 8, f. 171', and (2) Reg. 41, f. 132'.

It is not entirely clear whether these records refer to one and the same core document or to two very similar but ultimately separate letters. In the RCA editions, the first record is presented in the form of an excerpt in Italian (RCA XXIV, 121), which is in fact an abridged and modernized version of the excerpt published in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno, Archivio storico italiano* 112 (1879) 10. The second record is presented in the form of an excerpt in Latin which includes segments apparently quoted from the original (RCA XXV, 50). This excerpt is in fact a literal reproduction of the Latin excerpt published in *Acta Albaniae* I, 140, which itself is an abridged reproduction of the Latin-and-Russian excerpt published in B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 31 (also almost literally reproduced in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 218–219). To add to the confusion, Makušev follows his excerpt with a note that the king also wrote on the same matter to “universis tam amicis, quam fidelibus”, suggesting that there might have been another (third?) letter issued on June 4 to different addressees.

In order to provide the fullest available information on the document(s) issued by king Charles I on June 4, 1281, to the portolans of Puglia concerning the departure of Maria de Chaus and the Serbian envoy George for Serbia, the edition below offers two reconstructions: (1) for the record which was located in Reg. 8, f. 171', a reproduction of the most informative Italian excerpt of the letter to the *portulani* of Puglia (that of Minieri-Riccio), and (2) for the record which was located in Reg. 41, f. 132', a reproduction of Makušev's excerpt.

- (1) Il conte Giorgio, nunzio del re di Servia, dopo essere giunto in Napoli ed avuto conferenza con re Carlo, si dispone a partire con Maria Chau, vedova di Anselmo de Curban(!), consanguinea di re Carlo e sorella della

regina di Servia, la quale si porta in Servia per vedere la sorella. E re Carlo spedisce perciò ordine a portolani di Puglia di permettere che liberamente il conte e la Chau menino seco loro 25 cavalli con 30 persone di loro seguito e le vettovaglie necessarie pel viaggio di otto giorni per mare. Datum apud Urbem Veterem, IV iunii IX ind.

(2) “Cum nobilis mulier Maria domina Chau, consanguinea nostra karissima, et comes Georgius, nuncius illustris regis Servie, ad nostram venientes presenciam, ad regem eundem ad presens de nostra licentia revertantur”,⁶⁰ пишетъ король “magistris portulanicis et procuratoribus Apulie” изъ Витербо отъ 4 юня IX инд., и приказываетъ по этому пропустить ихъ свободно “cum 25 equitaturis et 30 personis”.

17.

To the officials of Puglia on the departure of Maria de Chours
and the Serbian envoy George for Serbia

1281, June 5

The document was excerpted in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 31, and that excerpt was then reproduced in abridged form in *Acta Albaniae I*, 140–141 (F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, omits it). A somewhat longer excerpt composed of quotes from the original Latin text was published by F. CARABELLESE, *Carlo d’Angiò*, 40. However, in the RCA reconstruction this document has been omitted, probably because its only trace that was located by the RCA editors – the abridged form of Makušev’s excerpt that was published in *Acta Albaniae* – omits most of the document’s distinguishing features, leading the editors to interpret it as a misdated edition of the “first” registry record of our no. 15 which was located in Reg 8, f. 171’ (see above). Indeed, it is highly probable that the record of this document was in fact written on that same page (Reg 8, f. 171’),

⁶⁰ It is important to note that a shorter Latin excerpt in F. CARABELLESE, *Carlo d’Angiò*, 40, corroborates this part of Makušev’s excerpt word for word. However, Carabellese cites as his source Reg. 8, f. 171’, which would correspond to the record reconstructed under (1). This may well mean that the original Latin records on both original locations (Reg. 41, f. 132’, and Reg. 8, f. 171’) were in fact copies of one and the same document, and that the noticeable differences between (1) and (2) – such as mentions in (1) of Maria’s and George’s “conferenza” with king Charles, as well as Maria’s husband and sister – are simply the result of Minieri-Riccio’s desire to add more context to his excerpt. In fact, Minieri-Riccio cites both Reg. 41, f. 132’, and Reg. 8, f. 171’, as the sources for his excerpt.

maybe even immediately below the record of no. 15. Both Carabellese and the editors of *Acta Albaniae* assign it to that page, and it is possible that elements of its text actually influenced the composition of Minieri-Riccio's excerpt of no. 15. The edition below is a fusion of quotes from the original Latin texts from Makušev's and Carabellese's excerpts. Both researchers noted that the document was entered under the date June 5, 1281, and addressed to the "officials of Puglia" ("Апулійскимъ чиновникамъ", "ufficiali di Puglia").

"Dudum per alias litteras nostras vobis mandavimus, ut nobilem mulierem Mariam relictam quondam nobilis viri Anselmi de Chau, dilectam consanguineam nostram, et nuncios magnifici principis regis Servie karissimi amici nostri de portubus decrete vobis provincie vigintiquinque equitaturas, personas vigintinovem, ordeum pro eisdem equitaturis⁶¹ et alia necessaria supra mare extrahere permittere debetis.⁶² Tamen quia super providimus dictos mulierem et nuncios posse octo dierum spacio transmeare" conferma.

18.

Permission for the archbishop of Dubrovnik to export grain
upon demand by the queen of Serbia

1283, June 7 (Nicotera)

The RCA reconstruction found records of the document in two different registers: (1) the *Registrum extravagantium infra* for the period from September 1283 to August 1284 (Register CXVIII in the RCA reconstruction), with the pre-1943 location Reg. 45, f. 29, and (2) the *Registrum secretis* containing entries for the period from September 1283 to June 1, 1284 (Register CXVII in the RCA reconstruction), with the pre-1943 location Reg. 47, f. 64.

In the RCA editions, the first record is presented in RCA XXVII/1, 224, in the form of a reproduction of the Italian excerpt published in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Diario angioino dal 4 gennaio 1284 al 7 gennaio 1285 formato su' registri angioni del grande archivio di Napoli*, Napoli 1873, 15,⁶³ under the date March 15, indiction 12 (=1284). The same record was appar-

⁶¹ Carabellese omits this word.

⁶² Makušev's excerpt ends here.

⁶³ The same excerpt is reproduced in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno*, *Archivio storico italiano* 121 (1881) 3–24, p. 11.

ently excerpted in Russian with a quote from the Latin original in B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 64, but wrongly dated with the year 1300 (reproduced in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 223, under the same wrong year). The second record is presented in RCA XXVII/1, 174, in the form of an abridged and modernized version of the Italian excerpt published in C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Il regno*, *Archivio storico italiano* 116 (1880) 177–186, p. 185. However, Minieri-Riccio's edition of this second record bore the date June 7, 1283. The RCA editors found it hard to reconcile this date with the fact that the archival location provided by Minieri-Riccio (Reg. 47, f. 64) places that record in a register containing entries from the 12th indiction (September 1283 to August 1284) and changed the date to 1284, but they kept the month and day (June 7), although they previously concluded that the original register in question did not include entries later than June 1, 1284 (see RCA XXVII/1, 132). In fact, dated register entries closest to the page where Minieri-Riccio places this record bear dates which point to the middle of March (March 13 on f. 63', March 18 on f. 65' – RCA XXVII/1, 174–175), thus apparently again suggesting that the record should be dated March 15, 1284.

Nevertheless, there is proof that Minieri-Riccio's dating of the second record is correct and that the document discussed here was in fact issued on June 7, 1283. This proof comes in the form of a document issued on March 7, 1287, in Barletta in the name of the local royal judge upon request from Dubrovnik archbishop Bonaventura "for his security". Preserved as an original in the State Archives of Dubrovnik, it includes transcripts of several documents dealing with this instance of grain export, published separately in *Codex diplomaticus. Supplementa II*, 123, 124–125, 134–136, 156–157, nos. 57, 59, 70, 71, 89 (with references to earlier editions).⁶⁴ This document reveals that our document no. 18 is in fact the primary order to allow export, issued on June 7, 1283, by the future Charles II in his capacity as regent of the kingdom during his father's absence in France, and that this primary order was included as a transumpt in later documents, among which there is a subsequent order issued on March 15, 1284. Apparently both registry records presented above were actually records of this subsequent order, the difference being that in his edition of the second record Minieri-Riccio realized that the

⁶⁴ The document of June 7, 1283, was published already in 1908 without the rest of the document from March 7, 1287 (*Codex diplomaticus* VI, 433–434). The Dubrovnik archives apparently possess another slightly different copy of this document, as well as a very similar document issued by the same judge to an envoy of the archbishop on February 1, 1287.

core document of the affair was issued on June 7, 1283, and decided to use that date as the date of issue. The edition below is a reproduction of the full-text edition in *Codex diplomaticus. Supplementa II*, 123.

Karolus, illustris Ierusalem et Sicilie regni primogenitus, etc. Laurencio Rufulo de Ravello, secreto, etc. Cum venerabili patri archiepiscopo Ragusino, ad petitionem illustris regine Servie, karissime cognate nostre, extrahendi de portu Baroli frumenti salmas trecentas, ad salmam generalem ferendas, ad predictam terram Ragusie per mare, pro usu suo et familie eius, licenciam duxerimus concedendam, devocioni vestre precipimus, quatenus, recepto prius ab enuncio dicti archiepiscopi ydonea fideiussoria caucione, quod predicti frumenti quantitatem non alio quam ad predictam terram Ragusie deferat; quodque de ipsius exoneracione a potestate vel rectore seu consulibus eiusdem terre in competenti termino, sibi per te iuxta loci distanciam prefigendo, ydoneas sub sigillis eorum tibi deferat responsales. Deinde nuncium ipsum, predictas salmas frumenti trecentas de predicto portu Baroli cum aliquo vassello ydoneo et sufficientis capacitatis quantitatis eiusdem, libere et sine aliquo iure exituro extrahere permittatis, ferendas ad dictam terram Ragusie pro vita et substentacione ipsius archiepiscopi et eius familie, ut superius est expressum; forma tamen super huiusmodi victualium extraccionibus, tibi per regni curiam tradita, in omnibus et per omnia inviolabiliter observata; attentius provisurus, ne pretextu presencium, maior vel alia frumenti seu alia victualium vel leguminum quantitas de predicto portu Baroli in fraude curie aliquatenus extrahatur sicut personę tue periculum et rerum dispendium desideras evitare. Datum Nicotere, anno Domini millesimo ducesimo octuagesimo tercio, die septimo iunii, undecime indictionis.

19.

Mention of the absence of Anselm de Chau in Serbia

1289, June 8

Originally part of the *Registrum iustitiariorum* for the period from September 1288 to August 1289 (Register VI of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 18, f. 232–232'. The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition in RCA XXX, 5–6, presents an excerpt in Italian, based on several sources which were not available to us. Therefore, edition below is a simple reproduction of that excerpt.

Re Carlo II comunica al giustiziere di Principato Citra che, volendo rispettare la volontà del defunto re Carlo I, suo padre, che aveva dato molte ricompense ai suoi fedeli, aveva donato 80 once di rendita annue a Guglielmo della Marra. I tre quarti di tale somma gli erano stati assegnati sulla terra di Stigliano in Basilicata e le 20 once rimanenti sui due terzi del castello di Caposele, già posseduti da Anselmo de Cahors e poi ricaduti alla regia corte, perchè il titolare, partito per la Serbia, non era tornato nel tempo stabilito. Infatti gli era assegnato il termine della Pasqua, seguito da un differimento sino alla Pentecoste. Ordina di immettere ora il della Marra nel possesso di due terzi di Caposele. Sub dato VIII iunii (1289).

20.

Mention of the Gulf of Kotor
as a nautical reference point

1292, May 23 (Naples)

Originally recorded in duplicate in the *Registrum iustitiariorum* for the period from September 1291 to August 1292 (Register XXIX of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, these two locations were Reg. 12, ff. 187'–188, and Reg. 58, ff. 210'–211.

The document went unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev. The edition in RCA XXXVI, 63, appears to be a full transcription of the original record. The edition below is a reproduction of that edition, limited to the part of the text which is relevant for medieval Serbia.

Pro consule Venetorum in Apulia.

Scriptum est iusticiario Terre Bari etc. Clamat querimonia gravis Marci Contareni, consulis Venetorum in Apulia, apud nos nuper deposita, quod olim Vincencius Cornu de Trana, qui quodam vassellum armavit in terra ipsa, proponens [se] cum illo contra hostes discurrere, suum ab huiusmodi proposito animum perperam retrahens et ad nephanda convertens, committendo illicita sub spe liciti, in quosdam nobiles venetos et ragusinos, amicos reverendos et devotos, citra cultum Catare in fosse Spinarize, cum complicibus suis in vassello ipso navigantibus, irruens, et exercens piraticam in eosdem, ipsos bonis eorum, valoris, ut dicit, yperperorum CCCC LIII et crossorum VIII, preter ballam I pannorum subtilium cuiusdam Veneti, per eundem Vicencium occupatam, prout etiam directe nobis virorum nobilium comitis ragusinis et consulis Venetorum in Duracho exinde lictere continent, nequitur spoliavit ... Datum Neapoli, die XXIII maii, X⁶⁵ ind.

⁶⁵ The 10th indiction given in the edition is probably a misreading or misprint. An entry on a nearby page (Reg. 12, f. 191 – RCA XXXVI, 64) bears the 5th indiction, which matches the timeframe of the register (September 1291–August 1292).

21.

Charles Martel and his consort grant possessions to
Vladislav, son of king Stefan of Serbia

1292, August 19 (Brignoles)

Originally recorded in the register known as *Quaternus privilegiorum* for the period from September 1291 to August 1292 (Register XXXIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 59, ff. 39.

The document was published in F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, 20–21, where it was mistakenly attributed to Charles Martel's father, Charles II. As a result, what claims to be a new, corrected edition of this document in B. MAKUŠEV, *Итальянские архивы II*, 32–33, is in fact an edition of the actual document of Charles II (no. 22 below).⁶⁶ It was finally published with the right attribution in G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból I*, 95. The edition in RCA XXXIX, 101, lists Wenzel as the only full-text edition, but also mentions a microfilm of the original register. The edition below attempts an ideal reconstruction based on Rački, Wenzel and the RCA edition, with reference to more important variations.

Pro Ladislao filio regis Servie.

Karolus secundus etc. Ut supra usque exemplum.⁶⁷ Considerantes igitur devotionem sinceram, quam vir magnificus Ladislaus, filius primogenitus illustris principis Stephani regis Servie, erga nos gessit⁶⁸ ab olim et gerit continue, actendentes etiam grata eius obsequia nobis hactenus prestita et

⁶⁶ It is remarkable that neither Rački nor Makušev realized they were dealing with two similar, but nevertheless separate documents, issued by two different sovereigns named Charles and recorded immediately one after the other on the same register page. Makušev even went so far as to label Rački's edition as "barbaric", without realizing that Rački had in fact published a different document than the one he was looking at. As a result of their confusion, generations of South Slavic scholars were familiar only with the confirmation document of Charles II, not knowing that the original grant of Charles Martel was also preserved right next to it.

⁶⁷ Thus in Wenzel. Rački: "ut supra"; RCA: "ut supra usque verba considerantes igitur devotionem sinceram". The "ut supra" refers to the beginning of the previous entry, which is a similar grant to the Croatian magnate family of Šubić (RCA XXXIX, 100): Karolus secundus Dei gratia etc. universis presens privilegium inspecturis. Cum devotorum nostrorum merita benigne respicimus, illaque premiorum largitione munifica compensamus, eos in solidiori devotione firmamus, et ad id animamus alios per exemplum.

⁶⁸ Thus in Rački. Wenzel: "gerit". RCA: "gexit".

que⁶⁹ prestare poterit in futurum, de speciali gratia et certa scientia concedimus, damus et confirmamus eidem Ladislao et heredibus ac successoribus eius quibuscumque ex eo legitime⁷⁰ descendentibus in perpetuum ducatum Sclavonie, preter terras quas possidet Radislaus banus cum fratribus suis, preter etiam terras quas tenent et possident infra ducatum predictum⁷¹ comes Iohannes de Vegla, Modursa⁷² et Vinodolis⁷³ cum fratre suo, et comes Duymus consobrinus frater⁷⁴ eiusdem comitis Iohannis, comes eiusdem comitatus, dum tamen ipsi in nostra fidelitate consistent, tenendam, regendam, habendam et possidendam per ipsum et heredes suos libere ad eorum omnimodam⁷⁵ voluntatem. In cuius rei testimonium⁷⁶ etc. Datum ut supra.⁷⁷

Pro eodem.

Similes facte sunt pro eisdem sigillo domine regine, verbis competenter mutatas ut supra. Datum ut supra.

22.

Charles II and his consort confirm the grant of possessions
to Vladislav, son of king Stefan of Serbia

1292, August 19 (Brignoles)

Originally recorded in the register known as *Quaternus privilegiorum* for the period from September 1291 to August 1292 (Register XXXIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 59, ff. 39–39’.

The document was omitted in F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, where the grant issued on the same day by Charles Martel (no. 21 above) was misattributed and published under the name of Charles II. It was nevertheless soon published in the form of full-text editions in B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 32–33, G. WENZEL, *Anjou-korból I*, 94, and C. MINIERI-RICCIO, *Saggio di codice diplomatico formato sulle antiche scritture dell’archivio di stato di*

⁶⁹ Rački: “atque”.

⁷⁰ Wenzel omits “legitime”.

⁷¹ Rački: “dicionem predictam”.

⁷² Rački: “Modrussa”. Refers to Modruš in Croatia.

⁷³ RCA: “Vinadolis”. Refers to Vinodol in Croatia.

⁷⁴ Rački: “fratris”.

⁷⁵ Rački: “commodam”.

⁷⁶ Rački and RCA omit “testimonium”.

⁷⁷ Refers to the Šubić grant: “Datum Brinonie, anno Domini MCCXCII, die XIX augusti V indictionis, regnorum nostrorum octavo.”

Napoli. Supplemento I, Napoli 1882, 60–61. The edition in RCA XXXIX, 101–102, also mentions among its sources a microfilm of the original register. The edition below attempts an ideal reconstruction based on all these editions, with reference to more important variations.

Pro eodem.⁷⁸

Karolus Secundus etc. Universis presens privilegium inspecturis. Cum devotorum nostrorum merita benigne respicimus, eos in solidiori devotione firmamus et ad id animamus alios per exemplum,⁷⁹ considerantes igitur⁸⁰ devotionem sinceram quam vir nobilis⁸¹ Ladislaus, filius primogenitus illustris principis Stephani regis Servie, gessit ab hactenus erga nos et gerat ad presens, actendentes etiam, quod ipse circa servitia Karoli primogeniti nostri regis Ungarie, principis Salernitani, et Honoris Montis Sancti Angeli domini, in acquisitione⁸² dicti regni sui Ungarie efficacia opera⁸³ iam laudandis principiis prestitit et autore Domino⁸⁴ prestare poterit in futurum, de speciali gratia et certa scientia concessioni, donationi et confirmationi eidem Ladislao et heredibus ac successoribus eius quibuscumque ex eo legitime descendentibus facte per prefatum Karolum⁸⁵ primogenitum nostrum regem Ungarie de ducatu Sclavonie, preter terras quas possidet Radislaus banus con fratribus⁸⁶ suis, preter etiam terras quas tenent et possident⁸⁷ infra ducatum predictum comes⁸⁸ Iohannes de Vegla, Modursa et Vinodolis⁸⁹ con fratre suo, et comes Duymus, consobrinus frater eiusdem comitis Iohannis, comes eiusdem comitatus, tenendo, regendo, habendo et possidendo per ipsum Ladislaum et dictos heredes suos ad eorum omnimodam voluntatem, iuxta quod in privilegio prefati Karoli primogeniti nostri regis Ungarie sibi indulto⁹⁰ plenius⁹¹

⁷⁸ Refers to no. 21 above: “Pro Ladislao filio regis Servie.”

⁷⁹ Makušev omits: “Universis ... per exemplum.”

⁸⁰ Minieri-Riccio: “confidentes igitur”; RCA: “devotionem sinceram et ad id animamus alias per exemplum, confidentes igitur”.

⁸¹ Makušev: “magnificus”.

⁸² Makušev: “certa servitia Karolo primogenito nostro regi Ungarie, principi Salernitano, et honoris montis Sancti Angeli domino, inquisitione”.

⁸³ Minieri-Riccio: “aperta”.

⁸⁴ Wenzel omits: “autore Domino”.

⁸⁵ Makušev omits: “Karolum”.

⁸⁶ Makušev, Wenzel and Minieri-Riccio: “cum fratribus”.

⁸⁷ Minieri-Riccio: “tenet et possidet”.

⁸⁸ Wenzel: “comites”.

⁸⁹ Minieri-Riccio: “innodolys”.

⁹⁰ Wenzel omits: “regis Ungarie sibi indulto”.

⁹¹ Wenzel and RCA omit: “plenius”.

continetur, nostrum benigne prestamus assensum, dictasque concessionem, donationem et confirmationem rectificamus et accertamus⁹² ac presentis nostri privilegii robore communimus. In cuius rei testimonium etc. Datum Brinonie, die⁹³ XVIII⁹⁴ augusti V indictionis.⁹⁵

Pro eisdem.

Similes facte sunt sigillo domine regine pro eisdem⁹⁶ verbis competenter mutatis ut supra.⁹⁷ Datum ut supra.⁹⁷

23.

To the officials of Brindisi about the export of grain
by the archbishop of Bar (Antibari)

1293, May 9 (Naples)

Originally recorded in the *Registrum extravagantium* for the period from September 1292 to August 1293 (Register XLIII of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 60, f. 123.

The document was published as an excerpt in Latin with quotes from the original text in F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, 22. This excerpt was reproduced in *Acta Albaniae* I, 154, which is then listed as the only available source for the document's reconstruction in RCA XLIV/1, 33. The edition below reproduces Rački's excerpt.

Karolus, rex Ungarie,⁹⁸ portulanis Brundusinis mandat ut "archiepiscopum Antibarensem ad patriam redeuntem evehere de portu Brundusii tres mulos aut mulas, nec non ordeum pro annona ipsarum sinant". Anno 1293, 9 maii, Neapoli.

⁹² Wenzel and RCA: "acceptamus".

⁹³ Makušev: "Datum Brinonie, anno Domini 1292, die", etc.

⁹⁴ Wenzel: "XVIII".

⁹⁵ Minieri-Riccio omits everything after "accertamus".

⁹⁶ Wenzel omits: "pro eisdem".

⁹⁷ Makušev omits the note about the queen's copy altogether.

⁹⁸ Changed in *Acta Albaniae* into: "Carolus II, Siciliae rex".

24.

To the officials of Puglia about the export of grain
by the archbishop of Bar (Antibari)

1293, May 10 (Naples)

Originally recorded in the *Registrum secretorum* for the period from September 1292 to August 1293 (Register XLIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 56, f. 169. Unnoticed by Kukuljević, Rački or Makušev, the document was published as a full-text edition in *Acta Albaniae* I, 154. That edition was then used as the only available source for its reconstruction in RCA XLIV/2, 478–479, and it is also reproduced below.

Pro archiepiscopo Antibarensi.

Scriptum est Henrico de Orvilla et notario Nicolao de Sancto Iohanne Rotundo secretis (Apulie) etc. Venerabilis patris domini M(ichaelis) Antibarensis archiepiscopi, devoti nostri, petitionibus annuentes, quas utique exaudiri gracia specialis induxit, devocioni vestre precipimus et mandamus quatenus predictum archiepiscopum, vel suum nuncium pro eo presentes licteras deferentem, extrahere de quocumque portu Apulie voluerit licito et permissio et per mare deferre ad predictam Antibarim pro usu sui sueque familie frumenti salmas centum ad salmam generalem libere et sine contradicione aliqua permictatis, mandato aliquo huic contrario non obstante, iuratoria autem caucione recepta, quod frumentum ipsum non alio quam ad predictam terram Antibari referatur. Proviso quod pretestu presencium maior dicti frumenti aut alia victualium quantitas de portu ipso nullatenus extrahatur. Data Neapoli, die X madii VIe indictionis, regni nostri anno secundo.

25.

To the officials of Puglia about the export of grain
by the archbishop of Bar (Antibari) upon request
from the king and queen of Serbia

1293(?), June 15 (Naples?)

The document was published as an excerpt in Russian with quotes from the original Latin text in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 31–32. There the document was dated “15 June, indiction 6, year 1287”, which can not be altogether correct because the corresponding year for indiction

6 is 1293, while the corresponding indiction for year 1287 is 15. Makušev's excerpt was reproduced in Croatian and Latin in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 219, under the year 1287. However, the edition in *Acta Albaniae* I, 154, took the indiction to be correct and then fused Makušev's excerpt with another excerpt of a document issued in Naples on June 15, 1293, published in F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, 22–23, with reference to Reg. 56, f. 171, as its archival location, in the belief that the two excerpts refer to one and the same document. Using the excerpt from *Acta Albaniae* as the only source for the document's reconstruction, the edition in RCA XLIV/2, 478–479, literally reproduced its contents and also adopted as its pre-1943 location Reg. 56, f. 171, which would place the original record into the Registrum secretorum for the period from September 1292 to August 1293 (Register XLIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction).

Nevertheless, a closer analysis of the excerpts published in B. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 31–32, and F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, 22–23, reveals several significant differences, apparently indicating that they are in fact records of two separate documents (see no. 26 below).⁹⁹ Such a conclusion would reopen two fundamental questions about document no. 25 – its date (and place) of issue and its pre-1943 archival location – because both were previously answered on the assumption that Makušev's excerpt was based on the same document as Rački's. Regarding the date, a case could be made for accepting Makušev's year 1287, since other sources place Michael, archbishop of Antivari, in Rome on May 31 of that year.¹⁰⁰ Still, it seems that 1293 is more plausible – our nos. 23 and 24 confirm that Michael was in Italy in the spring of 1293 (no. 24 even mentions the same quantity of 100 *salmas* of grain), while the fact that scribes in Angevin registers recorded indiction years much more frequently than the *anno Domini* also makes it that much more probable that Makušev saw (and copied) the indiction and that his *anno Domini* year is a mistake/miscalculation. Regarding archival location, any answer would be speculative, but it may be accepted as less probable that no. 25 was located next to no. 26 in Reg. 56, f. 171, since in that case one would think that at least one of Rački and Makušev would have realized that they are dealing with two documents and treated them as such.

In accordance with the (tentative) conclusion that Makušev's and Rački's excerpts refer to two different documents, the edition below reproduces

⁹⁹ Rački himself obviously did not think (or recognize) that Makušev's excerpt was based on the document from June 15, 1293, which he had published earlier in *Izvadci*, 22–23, since in *Rukopisi*, 219, he published it under the year 1287.

¹⁰⁰ *Acta Albaniae* I, 151.

only Makušev's excerpt, whereas Rački's excerpt is treated as a record of document no. 26.

15 июня VI инд. 1287(!) г. Карль II по просьбѣ “inclitorum principum regis et regine Servie, karissimorum consanguineorum nostrorum, qui sua nobis precamina porresserint”, дозволилѣ Михаилу Барскому архіепископу (M. Antibarensem Archiepiscopum) “extrahere de aliquo portu Apulie licito et deferre per mare Antibarum centum salmas frumenti”.

26.

To the officials of Puglia about the export of salt
by the archbishop of Bar (Antibari) upon request
from the king and queen of Serbia

1293, June 15 (Naples)

Originally recorded in the Registrum secretorum for the period from September 1292 to August 1293 (Register XLIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 56, f. 171.

The only source suggesting the existence of this document is an excerpt with quotes from the original Latin text published in F. RAČKI, *Izvadci*, 22–23, referring to Reg. 56, f. 171. An excerpt of a document apparently issued on the same day was published in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 31–32. In *Acta Albaniae* I, 154, these two excerpts were interpreted as recording one and the same document, and were therefore fused together. This fused excerpt was then listed and used as the only available source for that document's reconstruction in RCA XLIV/2, 478–479.

However, between Rački's and Makušev's excerpts several significant discrepancies can be noted. Rački's excerpt calls Serbia “Rascia”, while in Makušev's it is “Servia”; in Rački's excerpt the commodity being exported is an unspecified quantity of salt (“sal”), while in Makušev's it is 100 *salmae* of grain (“frumentum”); finally, most of the text that the two excerpts claim to quote from the original text does not match. All this suggests that the two excerpts in fact likely refer to different documents which were apparently issued in favor of the same individual on the same day (see no. 25 above).

The edition below reproduces Rački's excerpt.

Idem Carolus secretis Apuliae mandat, ut “venerabili patri M(ichaeli), archiepiscopo Antibarensi sine ulla difficultate permittant evehere sal Antibarim, cui concessit iam indultus scripturam, et quidem inclitorum prin-

cipum regis et regine Rasciae, charissimorum consanguineorum nostrorum, dilectionis intuitu inductus.” Anno 1293, 15 iunii, Neapoli.

27.

Permission to the queen of Serbia
for export of grain

1293, November 3

Originally recorded in the register containing orders to various officials for the period from September 1293 to August 1294 (Register LXIV of King Charles II in the RCA reconstruction). Prior to 1943, its location was Reg. 70, f. 102.

The document was published as an excerpt in Russian with quotes from the original Latin text in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы II*, 32 (reproduced in abridged form in Croatian and Latin in F. RAČKI, *Rukopisi*, 221). However, since these publications remained outside of the scope of the RCA reconstruction project, its edition in RCA XLVIII, 111, is based solely on a brief note by Leopoldo Óváry.

The edition below offers a reproduction of Makušev’s excerpt.

3 ноября 7 инд. 1293 г. король писалъ “secretis, magistris portulanis et procuratoribus Apulie: Cum nos illustri regine Servie, affini nostre, licentiam extrahendi per nuncios suos de portibus decreta vobis provincie ab inde deferendas per mare ad partes regni sui pro munitione castrorum suorum eiusdem regni mille salmas frumenti libere a iure exiture graciose duxerimus concedendam” и т.д. (слѣдуетъ приказаніе объ исполненіи).

A1.

Permission for export of beans
to Dubrovnik or Kotor

1289, August 6 (Trani)

The document was kept in the Arche (Arca D. Fasciculus 69, N. 8). An excerpt in Latin published in A. DE APREA, *Syllabus membranarum ad Regiae Siclae Archivium pertinentium II*, 1832, 53, was abridged and partly translated into Russian in В. Макушев, *Ита-льянские архивы II*, 6. The edition below reproduces De Aprea’s excerpt in full.

Portulani Trani, ut exsequantur litteras Angeli de Pando et Iacobi Bovis secretorum, magistrorum portulanorum et procuratorum Apulie, ac magistrorum portulanorum Aprutii, quae exscribuntur sinunt Philippum de Churalexio extrahere de portu Bari fabarum salmas 50 vehendas Ragusium vel Cateram, solutis pro iure exiture unciis auri 5 pro singulis 100 salmis. Per Mangonum, notarium Trani.

A2–4.

Three documents about a piratical attack
against Dubrovnik citizens

(July 2, 1293)

(November 2, 1293)

(April 27, 1294)

The documents were noted and issued only in В. МАКУШЕВ, *Итальянские архивы* II, 32, in the form of excerpts in Russian with quotes from the original Latin text (reproduced in abridged form in Croatian and Latin in F. РАЌКИ, *Rukopisi*, 220, where the first two documents are fused together under July 2, 1293).

Въ 1293 г. “Leotarus ambassator comitis et comunis civitatis Ragusie” прибылъ къ королевскому намѣстнику, Карлу, сыну Карла II, и “pro parte comunis ejusdem graviter conquerendo monstravit, quod dum Matheas de Dersia et Petrus de Cervia mercatores Ragusani, cum quodam vassello, in quo habere dicebantur merces valoris unciarum auri septingentarum septuaginta septem, versus partes Dalmacie navigarent, Marinus Bulgarus de Yscla, habitator Neapolis, olim armator unius vasselli, in predictos mercatores Ragusanos more piratico irruit eosque disrobavit bonis et mercibus ipsorum omnibus, quas ferebant”. Имъ были возвращены только 40 унцій золота; Карлъ приказываетъ “Capitaneis civitatis Neapolis” и “ducatus Amalfie” удовлетворить ихъ вполнѣ (1293 г. 2 июля VI и 2 ноября VII Инд.); но дѣло тѣмъ не уладилось, и въ слѣдующемъ году Дубровничане обратились къ самому королю Карлу II: «Raynerius Michael, consul Venetorum in Apulia, et Lucas de Mucio, ambassator civitatis Ragusii, devote nostri”, пишетъ король “vicario, magistro, iusticiario et iudicibus magne curie” отъ 27 апрѣля VII Инд. 1294 г., “in nostra presencia constituti, graviter conquerendo monstrarunt, quod cum dudum Matheus Derehie et Petrus Tome, cives et mercatores Ragusii, onerassent et onerari fecissent in partibus Romanie quandam barcam magnam seta, cera, grano et aliis mercibus valentibus uncias auri 777 et ultra, et de eisdem partibus cum ipsis barca et mercibus navigarent secure, Marinus Bulgarus” etc.

Небојша Порчић

**СРБИЈА У РЕГИСТРИМА
АНЖУЈСКЕ КАНЦЕЛАРИЈЕ (1265–1295).
ПОКУШАЈ РЕКОНСТРУКЦИЈЕ**

Резиме

У раду је најпре изложен историјат регистара канцеларије јужноиталијанских Анжујаца од њиховог настанка као збирке преписа свих јавних докумената које су издавали владари из ове средњовековне династије, кроз векове несигурног чувања у склопу архива у Напуљу, до потпуног уништења за време Другог светског рата и пројекта реконструкције који је потом покренут. Потом је пажња посвећена тројници истраживача из XIX века – Ивану Кукуљевићу Сакцинском, Фрањи Рачком и Викентију Макушеву – који су у овим регистрима трагали за грађом о историји Србије и јужнословенских земаља уопште, те издањима у оквиру којих су они саопштили резултате својих истраживања. Детаљним увидом у досад реконструисане регистре, који обухватају раздобље од 1265. до 1295. године, показало се да су приликом њиховог састављања резултати поменутих истраживача коришћени само посредно и стога непотпуно. С друге стране, током пројекта реконструкције откривени су неки подаци које су стари истраживачи пропустили или погрешно протумачили. Стога, рад покушава да на основу података из оба извора изврши најпотпунију могућу реконструкцију оних докумената из анжујских регистара који доносе податке о Србији, са двоструким циљем обезбеђивања новог исправљеног, допуњеног и обједињеног издања овог корпуса грађе за историју средњовековне Србије и указивања на могућност примене поменутих издања из XIX века у даљем току пројекта реконструкције регистара анжујске канцеларије.

Кључне речи: јужноиталијански Анжујци, Србија, средњи век, канцеларија, регистри, Напуљски архив, реконструкција, документи, Фрањо Рачки, Викентиј Макушев.

Чланак примљен: 13. марта 2020.
Чланак прихваћен: 9. октобра 2020.