

Nada Zečević

THE GENOESE CITIZENSHIP OF CARLO I TOCCO
OF DECEMBER 2, 1389
(II)

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

On December 2, 1389 Carlo I Tocco and his regent mother Magdalena were granted the citizenship of the Republic of Genoa. This act was, as pointed out in the first part of this paper, most probably a consequence of the Tocco need for protection from the Ottoman, Venetian, Navarese, and Albanian expansions in western Greece as well as of the Genoese aspirations towards the Ionian islands governed by this family.¹ However, although at first sight this document seems an important demonstration of a pragmatic political alliance, it never left the domain of protocol. Its implementation was never recorded by any of the parties; in fact, short time upon its ratification, the Tocco ruler was recorded as making alliances with the Genoa's rival, the Venetian Republic.²

¹ For the text of the document and historical analysis of its contents see *N. Zečević*, The Genoese Citizenship of Carlo I Tocco of December 2, 1389 (I), *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta* 41 (2004) 361–375.

² *Zečević*, The Genoese Citizenship I, 370. *F. Thiriet*, *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1959), 358, considers that the reason for the Tocco turn towards the Genoese was their fear from the Venetians. For *Ch. Gasparis*, *Il patto di Carlo I Tocco con il Comune di Genova (1389–1390): una conseguenza delle incursioni albanesi*, in *Οι Άλβανοί στο Μεσαίωνα: The Medieval Albanians* (Athens, 1998) 255, this alliance was designed to protect the Tocco from the Albanians. Although my inquiry of the source evidence about the relationships between Genoa and Venice 1388–1391 suggests a conclusion

How did such a situation occur? Was the enactment of this document delayed by some significant political event or had both parties signed it with just a *pro forma* alliance in mind?³ Aiming at answering this question, in this part of the paper I shall turn to documentary elements of the Genoese citizenship grant of 1389. By observing its paleographic, diplomatic, sigillographic, and prosopographic characteristics, and by comparing these elements with other examples of the Genoese and Tocco documentary practice, I shall survey the official perception of this alliance. In addition, in order to fully understand the circumstances under which the grant was concluded, I shall also comment on the people, institutions and topography mentioned in the act.

Paleographic features

The grant was written in Latin. The language is, however, influenced by vulgar dialect, as can be seen from expressions such as “greraio” (ln. 29), “guerra” (lns. 51–55), “mondi” (lns. 37; 44), “instromento” (ln. 57 and *subscriptio*, ln. 3), “illessus” (ln. 47), “Jerusalemij” (ln. 56), “octuagessimo” (ln. 65).

The handwriting of the document is humanistic. It is legible, although certain words are not fully comprehensible due to minor damages of the parchment. This is especially significant in the *subscriptio* of the act where several groups of words cannot be read due to the fading of the ink.⁴ The most notable features of the script are the following: regular *ductus*; elaborated capitals (with “J”, “A”, and “E” from the *subscriptio* as the most highlighted) denoting personal and topographic names, as well as the beginning of a new sentence; uncial small “a”; small “d” with vertical axle inclined to the left; reduplicated “ii” in which the second character is lengthened (thus forming “ij”), “-ti” replaced with “ci”, small “s” resembling to “f”.

The abbreviations used by the notary follow the general medieval practice. Among the most used ones are: “gra” (“gratia”), “dni” (“dnomini”), “nri” (“nrostri”), “pntem” (“pnraesentem”), “noie” (“nomine”), “pte” (“pte”), “cois” (“communis”), “oia” (“omnia”), “pGa” (“propria”). Endings with “-um”, “-am”, and “-rum”, as well as “cum” prefixes and passive verb endings “-(n)tur” are denoted by the use of

closer to Thiriet’s opinion (*N. Zečević*, *The Tocco of the Greek Realm*, PhD dissertation defended at the Central European University, Budapest, 2004, pp. 97–98), I am more inclined to see the grant as the result of a general instability in western Greece (*Zečević*, *The Genoese Citizenship I*, 362–363), while at the same time not disclosing Albanian attacks from a list of its potential causes (*Zečević*, *The Genoese Citizenship I*, 363–365; 366, n. 25).

³ Between November 1387 and July 1390, the Genoese carefully followed the situation in the Levant. As the documentary evidence from July 1390 testifies to their first estimations about the improvement of the situation (more on this, *G. G. Musso*, *Navigazione e commercio Genovese con il Levante nei documenti dell’ Archivio di Stato di Genova* (Roma, 1975), 30, it is quite possible that after this period they ceased to consider the alliance with the Tocco important for their position in the Levant, which further resulted in the perception of the grant as no more than a formal document.

⁴ My suggestions for interpretations of illegible words were made upon the comparison with the *subscriptio* formulae of the notary acts of Genoa and its colonies in Caffa and Pera. For detailed references on literature dealing with the diplomatic practices of Genoa and its colonies, see below, nn. 5, 8, 14, 16, 19, 37, 70.

traditional signs. Some abbreviations are created by the use of common relative signs, such as “G” (per), “A” (prae), “GG” (perpetuo) “I” (quod), “H” (quorum). In several instances, the notary used *superscriptiones* to abbreviate some words: “Bcumq” (“quocumque”), “suC” (“supra”), “MagD” (“Magnifice”), “Bciens” (“quociens”), “JaF” (“Janue”), “procuE” (“procuratore”).

The initial “I” and “E” (of the *subscriptio*) are elaborated and as such can be understood as an indication of the grant’s importance. At the same time, however, they might reflect a custom of the Genoese notaries to focus on elaboration of initials in wintertime, when they were less occupied with other tasks of the chancellery.⁵

Just as in other paleographic practices of the medieval West, the quotation of the name of the doge and the Genoan institution of the **Consilium Quindecim Sapientum Ancianorum** is marked by “..”.⁶ Similarly following general paleographic practices of the medieval West, the quotation of the *addressantes* and *addressati* is followed by the reduplication of titles “dominus” and “domina” respectively, in all cases.⁷ The notary used full stop marks to close the sentences. A new sentence is followed by a capital letter.

Word reduplication occurs once in the case of the term “defensione” (ln. 44). The first of the repeated words was underlined by the notary, most probably in order to mark his own scribal error. As the main text does not contain traces of other corrections, it seems that the notary’s *subscriptio* remark about himself having corrected the text (subscr. ln. 3) refers to this intervention with “defensione”.

Two baguettes appear on the document’s margins. The first one, located on the left vertical margin (ln. 26), is linked to the end of the quotation of the Tocco letter sent to Genoa in 1385, which suggests that this baguette should be understood as a closing quotation mark. Unlike this one, the meaning of the baguette, located on the right vertical margin (ln. 53), is not entirely clear, since the aligned text contains no quotation. A potential function of this baguette as the mark of a new passage is also excluded by the text.

Diplomatic features

The *protocole* of the Tocco Genoese grant consists of verbal *invocatio*⁸ and *intitulatio*. The text of the document does not contain any *arrega*. The *expositio* is long and contains a *petitio* in the form of a letter sent on behalf of Carlo I Tocco to

⁵ M. Balard, *Gênes et l’Outre-Mer*, vol. 1: Les actes de Caffa du notaire Lamberto di Sambuceto 1289–1290 (Paris — The Hague, 1973) (=Balard, Gênes). A similar method of initials’ writing was applied in Caffa: see Balard, Gênes, 1, 28. Apart from this similarity between the practices of Genoa and its colonies, it is important to note many differences between their chancelleries. On this issue, G. Lastig, *Entwickelungswege und Quellen des Handelsrechts* (Stuttgart, 1877), 178.

⁶ A. Giry, *Manuel de diplomatique* (Paris, 1894), 535.

⁷ Giry, *Manuel*, 690–691.

⁸ A similar invocation formula can be found in Genoese documents of the thirteenth century. On this see G. I. Bratianu, *Actes des notaires Génois de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle* (1281–1290) (Bucarest, 1927), 24.

the Genoan Republic on October 1385.⁹ The chronology of this “inserted” letter shows the use of a different style than the one used in Genoa. It consisted of: *datatio* according to the *stylus nativitatis* (ln. 6: year expressed in Latin characters/ day/ month/ indiction), repeated in an abbreviated form at the end of the letter (ln. 26), and *data topica* quoted in the end of the letter (ln. 26: “castro nostro Sancti Georgij de Cephalonia”).¹⁰ As the same features can be found in several other letters and instruments remaining from the Tocco Latin chancellery, there is no doubt that the letter of petition was quoted from an authentic Tocco letter.¹¹

Just like the *expositio*, the *dispositio* of the grant is long.¹² It contains the praeceptive and obligative final clauses, as well as the *sanctio temporalis*.

Differently from the usage of the Tocco chancellery, the *eschatocole* of the Genoese grant consists of *data topica* and *data chronologica*. Its beginning contains the characteristic expression “actum” which shows that the document was recorded simultaneously with the legal act of granting. According to the chancellery practice observed both in Genoa and its prominent colonies in the East (Caffa and Pera), the *data topica* of the Tocco grant specified not only the place, but also the exact location in which the grant was made (ln. 64: “Actum Janue in sala parua Cancellarie veteris palacij ducalis in qua discumbit fanulus praefati Magnifici domini”),¹³ while the *data chronologica* contain the following elements: year written in Roman letters according to the *stylus nativitatis*, the indiction calculated “secundum cursum Janue”, month, day and the fully specified hour.¹⁴ The *eschatocole* further contains the enumeration of the witnesses. As there is no reference to their signatures, it is ob-

⁹ A similar insertion of an *adresati* letter functioning as a *petito* can be seen in the Genoese pact with the Bulgarian ruler Ivanko, see I. Dujčev, Договоръ на добружанския княз Иванко съ Генуесцитъ отъ 1387 г., in *id.*, Стара Българска книжнина (Sofia, 1944), 185–186 (=Dujčev, Ivanko).

¹⁰ A Tocco instrument from the Archivio di Stato di Napoli, Archivio di Tocco di Montemiletto (=ASN, ATM), Atti notarili, busta 5, perg. No. 177, dated to November 30, 1421, in Naples, records a “Cephalonian” style of chronology, which seems to have followed the practice similar to that of Genoa: that is, it was one year later than the style of Constantinople.

¹¹ Tocco letters where these elements can be compared can be found in ASN, ATM, Atti notarili, busta 4, perg. nos. 175 and 177; J. Valentini (ed.), Acta Albaniae Veneta (=AAV) vol. 2, tome 7, no. 722ter (December 7, 1398), 3–4; *ibid.*, 747q (c. May 23, 1399), 5; *ibid.*, no. 761bis (August 16, 1399), 6–7. Cf. K. D. Mertzios, Μία ανέκδοτος ἐπιστολή τοῦ Καρόλου Α' τοῦ Τόκκου πρὸς τὸν Δόγην Βενετίας γραφεῖσα ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων τὸ 1425, in Akten d. IX Byzantinischen Kongress/Thessaloniki 1953 (Athens, 1956), vol. 2, 556–559; *id.*, Trois lettres inédits de Charles Tocco en 1427, 1428, et 1432, in Akten des XI Internationalen Byzantinischen Kongress 1958 (München, 1960), 352–354.

¹² The significance of the length of Genoese disposition *formulae* was noted by Balard, Gênes, 1, 32.

¹³ Although the precise designation of the place where the grant was made (doge’s palace) is a *se ipso* reference to the center of Genoese political power (a thirteenth-century example of the significance attributed to the political status of a place where an instrument originated can be found in M. Balard, Les Génois en Roumanie entre 1204 et 1261, Mélanges d’École française de Rome 78/2 [1966] 500: “in palacio Fornariorum quo potestas dicta habitat.”), it should be noted that the act took place in the small hall where the chancellery was located and not in the City Cathedral (as would be usual), which seems to indicate a minor importance of the event.

¹⁴ G. Pistarino, Le fonti Genovesi per la storia del Mar Nero, Byzantinobulgarica 7 (1981) 68–72. Cf. Dujčev, Ivanko, 185 and 196–197. A more detailed analysis of this practice can be found in G. Costamagna, La data cronica dei piu antichi documenti privati genovesi, Archivio storico per le province Ligure 72/2 (1950) 6–18.

vious that the practice of personal authentication of a testimony was not observed in Genoa in this period.¹⁵ The number of witnesses (four) does not surpass the maximum of witnesses convoked for granting an ordinary public instrument,¹⁶ which seems to suggest that the Genoese did not perceive this document as highly important.¹⁷ The quotation of the witnesses' names is preceded by a formula "praesentibus testibus ad hec vocatis specialiter et rogatis", that can be found in some earlier notary acts issued by the Genoese for common cases,¹⁸ which can be another sign of the document's ordinary status.

The *subscriptio* contains several elements of authentication typical for the Genoese public instruments issued in the second half of the fourteenth century: notary's name, the name of his father, place of birth, place/rank of service, appeal to a special authorization issued by the Holy Roman Emperor ("imperiali auctoritate"), as well as the notary's statement that he had been asked ("rogatus") by the contracting parties to write the act.¹⁹

Sigillographic notes

The notary's statement recorded in the *subscriptio* of the pact from December 2, 1389, stipulates that the grant was authenticated by a pending seal (subscr. ln. 4: "pendenti sigillo ducalis communis Janue ypensione muniui"). This sealing style is also confirmed by the existence of a *plica* (3,8 cm wide)²⁰ at the bottom of the parchment, bent in a common manner (once), as well as by the existence of the seal's ribbon, made of green silk.²¹ According to the known cases of the Genoese sigillographic practice, which during the second half of the fourteenth century did not apply metal seals, it can be concluded that the grant's authentication was done by means of a seal made of wax. Since the Genoese more or less consistently followed

¹⁵ Contrary to this, the chancellery of Carlo Tocco respected the signatures of witnesses as the most important method of the legal enactment of an instrument.

¹⁶ Useful notes on the role of witnesses can be found in *Giry*, Manuel, 608 and *A. Rovere*, I "publici testes" e la prassi documentale genovese (secc. XII–XIII), *Serta antiqua et medievale* 1 (1997) 291–332.

¹⁷ Cf. *Dujčev*, Ivanko, 186, where eight witnesses appeared.

¹⁸ *Balard*, Gênes, 1, 31, found these *formulae* applied as early as 1289–1290.

¹⁹ A similar — although less elaborated — *subscriptio formula* can be found in the Genoese pact with the Bulgarian ruler Ivanko, see *Dujčev*, Ivanko, 197. On the characteristics of *subscriptio* in Genoese documents, *G. Costamagna*, La triplice redazione dell' instrumentum Genovese (Genova, 1961); *id.*, Il notariato a Genova tra prestigio e potere (Roma, 1970) (reprint can be found in *Studi storici nel notariato italiano*, Milano, 1995), 143; *id.*, A proposito di aggiunte alla sottoscrizione notarile, *Bolletino storico della provincia di Novara* 71/2 (1980) 10–13; *L. Zagni*, Carta partita, sigillo, sottoscrizione nelle convenzioni della Repubblica di Genova nei secoli XII–XIII, *Studi di storia medievale e di diplomazia* 5 (1980) 5–14.

²⁰ *G. Čremošnik*, Studije za srednjevekovnu diplomatiku i sigilografiju Južnih Slovena (Studies in medieval diplomatics and sigillography of Southern Slavs) (Sarajevo, 1976), 92–93, noted that the usual dimensions of *plica* to have been 2–4 cm.

²¹ The sealing ribbon is inserted through two horizontally positioned holes, distant from each other 25 mm and tied below the *plica*.

general Western chancellery trends, it can also be concluded that the pending wax seal applied in the Tocco Genoese grant of 1389 must have been of red color.²²

The conclusion that the pending seal of the Tocco grant was made of red wax is further supported by a direct testimony which comes from the ratification of the Tocco citizenship grant (October 1390). The Genoese notary who wrote this document, “Raffaelus Boconus”,²³ stated that he had personally seen the original grant of December 2, 1389, with the pending red seal on it. In addition, Boconus described several other features of this seal in more detail. Thus we know that the seal contained the sculptural representation of a griffin and a motto-inscription common for the Genoese sigillographic usage of the time (GRIFFUS UT HAS ANGIT — SIC HOSTES JANUA FRANGIT).²⁴ All these characteristics show that the seal of the Tocco grant was the one most commonly used in Genoa during the fourteenth century.²⁵

From the sigillographic point of view, however, the Tocco grant seems not to have been understood as a common instrument since its authentication contained a seal that was not applied for ordinary occasions. The statement of Raffaelus Boconus in the ratification document from 1390 reveals that apart from the pending red wax seal, the Tocco grant of 1389 was authenticated by one other seal, also made of wax, but of different color (green). His quotation of the inscription of this seal shows that it was religious-symbolical (CUM IMPRESSIONE VERE + CRUCIS ET QUATTUOR EVANGELISTIS CIRCONSCULPTIS).²⁶ Sealing instruments with two seals was a practice recorded in some early Genoese citizenship grants (e.g. to San Remo in 1199).²⁷ The probability that the green seal belonged to the Tocco chancellery — a conclusion that might be drawn from the fact that several Genoese

²² G. C. *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia: il sigillo nella diplomatica, nell’ diritto, nella storia, nell’ arte* (Milano, 1969), vol. 1, 68. See also *ibid.*, 258, mentioning the fact that the metal seal (*bullā*) was in use in Genoa exclusively during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries.

²³ *Gasparis*, *Il patto*, 255.

²⁴ *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, 92, notes that the seal with a representation of lion — a figure typical for Ghibelline circles of northern Italy — was influenced by the models of the Holy Roman Empire which symbolized sovereignty and power. The griffin, however, was recorded also as a heraldic feature of some Guelph circles, cf. *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, tavola 5, no. 5, p. 133.

²⁵ For other examples of this Genoese motto-inscription, see *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, 260, n. 34.

²⁶ G. Stella, *Annales Genuenses (1298–1326)*, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, vol. XVII, ed. L. *Muratori* (Milano, 1730), liber 1, capitulum 9, colls. 1005–1007. *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, 68 I 191. For an example of a Genoese seal with a circular motto-inscription, see *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, tavola VIII, no. 89, p. 204. *Ibid.*, 259–260, on the development of seal representation of griffins and its connection with the struggle of Emperor Fridrich III with the Pisans during the mid-thirteenth century. Also, see G. C. *Bascapé*, *Sigilli medievali di Genova*, *Bolletino ligustico* 13 (1961) 17–20.

²⁷ *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, 260–261. On the practice of sealing of Genoese instruments, L. T. *Belgrano*, *I sigilli del Comune di Genova nel Medio evo*, *Rivista numismatica* I (1864) 238. Belgrano noticed an increase of the significance of religious seals with evangelical symbols during the fourteenth century, and its potential overuse in comparison with the griffin seal. Belgrano also here proposed the following motto-inscription for this seal: + s. EXCELSI COMUNIS IANUE ET MAGNIFICI CONSILII DOMINORUM ANTONIANORUM. The increasing significance of the representation of cross on seals in this epoch, as from *Bascapé*, *Sigillografia*, 231, can be understood as the result of the Crusaders’ return of the crusaders from Palestine.

citizenship grants contained seals of both contracting parties — in this case does not seem high in this case, for two reasons. First, the grant's green seal described in the ratification act of 1390 does not refer to any element of the Tocco identification.²⁸ Second, it does not seem probable that the Tocco, being secular lords, would use religious symbols to exclusively identify their lordship.²⁹

Thus, it seems most probable that the two seals of the Tocco citizenship grant originated from the Genoese chancellery. Although there is little possibility that the Tocco seals were put on this grant, the document's text still reveals important conclusions about the Tocco sigillographic practice, as the Tocco letter of 1385 quoted in the grant's *expositio* directly refers to the seal used by this family. The expressions used to denote it ("solito sigillo", "ymo sigillo") indicate that it was the "sigillum minus/sigillum parvum/sigillum mediocre", such as was usually used by medieval magnate chancelleries to authenticate their ordinary documentation.³⁰

Prosopographic notes

Antoniotto Adurnus (Ins. 1; 10) — the doge of Genoa (June 1384–1390; April 1391 — September 1394).³¹ His rule is a paradigm of a frequent change of the highest Genoese officials under constant internal political struggles.³² Between the 14th and the 16th centuries, Antoniotto's Ghibelline-oriented family Adurno (Adorno)³³ produced several doges: Gabrielle (1363), the above-mentioned Antoniotto, Rafaele (1443–1447), Prospero (1478), and a second Antoniotto (1522–1527), which indicates

²⁸ Regarding the religious symbolism of the green seal, it seems likely that it was used on the occasion of the Tocco citizenship grant in order to additionally affirm the act of granting. On the significance and role of ecclesiastical circles in such occasions, see *H. Drös — H. Jacobs, Die Zeichen einer neuen Klasse, in Zur typologie der frühen Stadtsiegel, in Bild und Geschichte: Studien zur politischen Ikonographie* (Sigmaringen, 1997), 129–131.

²⁹ A rare example of such a practice can be found in the case of the Roman family of Frangepan, who used seals with representations of heads of SS. Peter and Paul. *Bascapé, Sigillografia*, 382, explains this with the family's connections to pontifical circles.

³⁰ *Bascapé, Sigillografia*, 301; *Čremošnik, Studije*, 65–68. The term "solito sigillo" suggests that the Tocco chancellery applied also other forms of seals, most probably the "sigillum secretum". Other documents suggest that the Tocco used the medium size seal ("sigillo mezzano") as well, see *J. A. Buchon, Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la Principauté française de Morée et ses hautes Baronnie* (Paris, 1843), vol. 2, no. 52, p. 267 (November 1, 1394) and *ibid.*, pp. 262–263.

³¹ Some information about the public dissension that brought him to power was provided by Stella, *Annales*, colls. 1121–1124. More recently, the rule of this doge was analysed by *E. P. Wardi, La strategia dinastica di un doge di Genova: Antoniotto Adurno, 1378–1398* (MA thesis with no date, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem), the information as from *S. Epstein, Genoa and the Genoese 958–1528* (Chapel Hill, 1996), 382. According to *A. Cappellini, Dizionario biografico di Genovesi illustri e notabili* (Genova, 1936), 8, Antoniotto (b. 1340–1398), the son of Adornino was "ambitious, turbulent, and wicked" man, whose rule was to be remembered for the enlargement of the ducal palace, the reception of Pope Urban VI and selling of Genoa to the French king Charles VI.

³² Useful analyses of this period can be found in *A. Goria, Le lotte intestine in Genova tra il 1305 e il 1309, in Miscellanea di storia ligure in onore di Giorgio Falco* (Milano, 1962), 253–280; *E. Grandi, La repubblica aristocratica dei genovesi* (Bologna, 1987); *Epstein, Genoa*, 326.

³³ According to *Cappellini, Dizionario biografico di Genovesi*, 9, the family of Adurno significantly advanced in the political circles of Genoa after the popular revolt of 1339.

their strong familial ambition for political power.³⁴ The fourteenth-century rule of Antoniotto Adorno is especially renowned for his attempts at preserving the favorable position of the Genoese in the East.³⁵ This position, together with the maintenance of good relationships with the Spanish Aragons and the Milanese Visconti, further enabled the revival of Genoese aspirations in northern Africa. His mandate is also known for the propagation of Genoese power to the neighboring communes, as well as for the accumulation of Adorno wealth and the spreading of his family's possessions in the Ligurian region. This ensured the family's protection in cases of political turmoil, which, during the fourteenth century, was a common feature of life in Genoa.³⁶

Nicolaus Gatinanti (Ins. 2–3) — recorded by the Tocco grant as a “notarius procurator” and the member of the Council of Elders (see below under **Consilium Quindecim Sapientum Ancianorum**). In 1376 and 1377, he seems to have been one of 21 notaries (out of some 170 in total) who were engaged in Genoan export-import trade activities.³⁷

Jordanes Catanzarus (Ins. 4; 7; 11; 15; 17; 23; 26; 31; 34; 41; 50; 57; 59; 61; 63) — the Tocco envoy to Genoa authorized to conclude the pact that granted the Genoese citizenship to the family. The Tocco letter of 1385 quoted in the grant's *expositio* designated him as the “ligius” and “familiaris” of the Tocco. According to some earlier interpretations of these expressions, this would mean an implication of Jordanes' familial connection with the Tocco. The recent scholarly perceptions, however, view these terms more as designations of a vassalage relationship.³⁸ Direct evidence with regard to this issue can also be understood ambiguously — the documented familial indication of kinship between the Tocco and the Calabrian family of Catanzaro can be seen as the sign of both kinship and vassalage.³⁹

³⁴ *Epstein*, Genova, 233; 264; 313; 315. Genoese sources recorded some members of this family for their diplomatic activities (Giacomo, fifteenth century). Also, see *S. Bliznjuk*, *Genovesi a Constantinopoli ed Adrianopoli alla metà del XV secolo in base a documenti dell'Archivio di Stato di Genova*, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 90/1 (1997) 13–23.

³⁵ See above n. 3. A Genoese document of July 28, 1394, *Musso*, *Navigazine e commercio Genovese*, 246, recorded Antoniotto's brother Giorgio as actively involved in the affairs of the East. On Giorgio (1350–1430), see *Cappellini*, *Dizionario biografico di Genovesi*, 8–9.

³⁶ Interestingly enough, Antoniotto Adorno kept his treasure in the famous Florentine treasury of Monte, which was run by pro-Guelph circles.

³⁷ *B. Kedar*, *The Genoese Notaries of 1382: The Anatomy of an Urban Occupational Group, in The Medieval City*, eds. *D. Herlihy and A. L. Udovitch* (New Heaven–London, 1977) 87, n. 47 (“Nicolaus Fatinanti”).

³⁸ See below under **Ligius et familiaris**, and nn. 58–60.

³⁹ The ratification document in *Gasparis*, *Il patto*, 254, mentioning Jordanes as “Jordanum vocatum Cadenzanus”. An indication of a close relationship of the Tocco with the family of Cantanzano (“Catanzaro”) — one of Magdalene's sisters was married to “Antonello Ruffo”, the count of Cantanzano — can be found in a letter of Leonardo I to Lappa Acciaioli (May, 28, 1374), in *A. T. Luttrell*, *Aldobrando Baroncelli in Greece 1378–1383*, *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970), 277, and more recently (with specific information on the nature of the families' connection) *J. Chrysostomides*, *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca: Document for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th centuries* (Camberley, Surrey, 1995), no. 14, pp. 30–31, especially, n. 3.

Margarita dei gratia Regina (Ins. 55–56) — the daughter of Charles, the *Herzeg* (Duke) of Durazzo and Maria, the daughter of *Herzeg* (Duke) of Calabria. Around 1370, she was married to Charles, who later became King of Naples and Hungary. Following the death of her husband (February 1386), she was the regent of the throne in Naples on behalf of her son Ladislas until July 1393.⁴⁰

Vençeslaus (recte Ladislaus) (ln. 56) — Ladislas, King of Naples 1386–1414 and claimant to the Hungarian throne.⁴¹

Karolus Rex (ln. 56) — Charles III, King of Naples 1381–1386 and Hungary 1385–1386.⁴²

Antonius de Credentia (ln. 63; subscr. Ln. 1) — the official notary and chancery (see below, under **Notarius publicus ... et cancellarius**) of the Genoan Republic during the second half of the fourteenth century.⁴³ The fact that in 1374 he was recorded in Famagusta as writing the peace treaty with Cyprus, suggests his experience with the Eastern political affairs,⁴⁴ and consequently, his personal involvement in the Genoese connection with the Tocco. Antonius identified himself as the son of a late Conrad, originating from Credentia. Such an identification does not allow us to conclude whether he was one of those who owed their professional position to a status inherited from their fathers, but is certainly an argument for the conclusion that Antonio belonged to a large group of his colleagues who were of non-Genoese origin (in 1382, 94 out of 171 notaries were of non-Genoese origin).⁴⁵

Aldobrando de Conuersia, Conrado Mazurro, Petro de Burgilio, Masimo de Judicibus (Ins. 65–66) — notaries and chancelleries of the Genoan Commune.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ A. Valente, Margherita di Durazzo vicaria di Carlo III e tutrice di re Ladislao (Napoli, 1919). E. G. Léonard, *Les Angevins de Naples* (Paris, 1954), 459 and 504.

⁴¹ A. Cutolo, *Re Ladislao d'Angiò — Durazzo* (Napoli, 1969); Léonard, *Les Angevins*, 477–481.

⁴² A. Valente, op. cit. B. Hóman, *Gli Angioini di Napoli in Ungheria 1290–1403* (Roma, 1938), 432 sq. Léonard, *Les Angevins*, 443–444; 455–476.

⁴³ An earlier mention of him as notary comes from the mid-1360s (*Musso*, *Navigazione e commercio Genovese*, 230, and *ibid.*, n. 1). As seen in B. Kedar, *The Genoese Notaries*, 82, n. 31, *Antonius de Credencia* was among twelve notaries (out of the recorded 171) who in 1383 were entitled “notarius et cancellarius”. With the same titular qualities he was recorded as late as April 11, 1402, as seen in *Musso*, *Navigazione e commercio Genovese*, 254.

⁴⁴ *Liber Iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, vol. II, in *Monumenta Historiae Patriae* vol. IX (Torino, 1857), col. 814. My attention to this detail was drawn by the article of Kedar, *The Genoese Notaries*, 77, n. 12.

⁴⁵ Kedar, *The Genoese Notaries*, 79, and *ibid.*, n. 20.

⁴⁶ According to Kedar, *The Genoese Notaries*, 82, n. 31, as early as 1382, Conrado Mazurro, Petro de Burgilio (“Petrus de Bargalio”) and Masimo de Judicibus (in 1382 identified as “Maximus de Judicibus de Rapallo”) were identified in this manner. Some members of Mazurro’s family seem to have been engaged in the Levantine trade, as seen in *Musso*, *Navigazione e commercio Genovese*, 25, n. 2 (March 26, 1387) and pp. 48–49 (January 29, 1387), mentioning an armed galley of Antonio Mazurro prepared to leave for Caffa.

Notes on institutions

Januensium dux (et populi defensor) (Ins. 1; 10; 12; 19; 21; 24; 28; 30; 36; 42; 45; 50; 60; 63; 64; subscript. Lns. 1; 4) — the function of the doge as the supreme administrative officer in Genoa was recorded for the first time in Genoa after the Ghibelline revolt in 1339, when Simon Boccanegra was acclaimed doge by the crowd, thus replacing the existing administrative *collegium* of two captains.⁴⁷ Unlike in Venice, the Genoese doge originated from the *popolo* and was thus oriented against the “ancient” Guelph nobility.⁴⁸ Genoese doges were also entitled “defensores populi” after the popular rebellion of 1339.⁴⁹

Consilium Quindecim Sapientum Ancianorum (Ins. 1; 10) — commonly called “Anziani” (“Antiani”= the Elders), this body represents the Genoese senate, the most important political institution in Genova after the doge. According to the Genoese annalist Giorgio Stella, they were also called “Quindecim de Populo Consiliarii et Officiales”. Although their powers are well known (“qui potestatem habeant in providendo super agendas Ducis et dando quietem et bonum ordinem super omnibus spectantibus Januensium Reipublicae”)⁵⁰, the nature of their congregation and the criteria for the election of the senators are still not entirely clear.⁵¹

Magnificus et potens vir dominus (ln. 5) — titles of quality connected by the documents with the title of “comes palatini”,⁵² which at this time was the most important title of Carlo I Tocco.

Dux Leucate et comes Cefalonie (Ins. 5; 6; 28; 53) — originally (since the rule of the Orsini, end of the twelfth — mid-fourteenth century), the title of “comes palatinus” pertained to the islands of Cephallonia, Zakynthos and Ithaka. It was associated with the Tocco family during the life of Carlo’s father Leonardo I with the act of possession today generally assumed to have happened c. 1357. Leonardo’s entitlement as “dux” originates from the 1360s, when he occupied the island of Leukas, taking it over from the Venetians.⁵³ During his lifetime and after his death, both ti-

⁴⁷ Some information about the election of the first Genoese doge can be found in Stella, *Annales*, cap. 2, colls. 1072–1075. These events were known to Nikephoros Gregoras, *Historiae Byzantinae*, ed. B. G. Niebuhr, in CSHB, vol. 1 (Bonnae, 1829), XI, 7, 4, p. 548, as well as to John VI Kantakuzenos, *Historiarum libri IV*, ed. L. Schopen, in CSHB (Bonnae, 1832), IV, 26, p. 197. For useful inquiries into this event and institution, see G. Forcheri, *Doge, Governatori, Procuratori, Consigli, e Magistrati della Repubblica di Genova* (Genova, 1968); L. M. Levati, *Doghe perpetui di Genova 1339–1528* (Genova 1928); G. Petti Balbi, *Simon Boccanegra e la Genova del ‘300* (Genova, 1991).

⁴⁸ Epstein, Genova, 205.

⁴⁹ Forcheri, *Doge, Governatori*.

⁵⁰ Stella, *Annales*, cap. 2, coll. 1074. Lists of members of this Council in the period 1362–1402 can be found in *Liber Iurium Reipublicae*, vol. II.

⁵¹ On the development of this institution, see recently Epstein, Genova, 36; 68; 137; 225; 253. The documentary evidence shows that in many instances at least one seat was reserved for a notary; the Tocco citizenship grant seems to confirm this rule (Ins. 2–3 “notarius procurator Nicolaus Gatinanti”).

⁵² Giry, Manuel, 324.

⁵³ The year 1362 has been commonly assumed today as the date when Leonardo I established the Tocco power over Leukas. As pointed by A. T. Luttrell, *Vonitza in Epirus and its Lords*, *Rivista di*

titles also pertained to his wife, Magdalena Buondelmonte.⁵⁴ Their eldest son Carlo inherited the titles, transferring them also to his wife Francesca.⁵⁵ During the 1390s, Carlo I introduced an innovation in the use of these titles by granting his younger brother Leonardo II with the title of “comes” and by linking it with the possession of the island of Zakynthos. At the same time, he kept the same title for himself in order to designate his direct power over the island of Cephalonia.⁵⁶ Usually, Carlo’s titles of “comes” and “dux” were wrongly quoted by his neighbors (e.g. “Ducha Zefalonie”, “Duca et comes Zefalonie,” “Dux Luchate et Cefalonie”).⁵⁷ In some instances, this might have been a consequence of reporting from the perspective of the Other, but in the case of Carlo’s entitlement by his closest neighbors and rivals, the Venetians, it is quite clear that such “errors” were made deliberately, in order to cast doubt upon the legitimacy of the Tocco power over the region.

Ligijs et familiaris (ln. 7) — most generally, the term “ligijs” denotes a free-man subjected to a feudal lord. The term “familiaris” pertains to a manorial man, of both free and dependant status.⁵⁸ The Tocco correspondence indicates an interconnection of these terms. According to this evidence, the two terms reflect a model of “familiaritas” employed by the Neapolitan Angevins of the time (“familiaris regalis”).⁵⁹ Moreover, the Tocco correspondence shows that both terms referred to the persons of noble status.⁶⁰

studi bizantini e neoelenici 11 (n.s. 1) (1964) 139 and *ibid.*, n. 1, this date should be reconsidered. The duchy of Leukas originates from the earlier times of Byzantine rule over the island.

⁵⁴ E.g. *F. Thiriet*, (ed.), *Régestes des deliberations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie* (Paris, 1958), vol. 1, no. 645 (May 15, 1383), p. 157 and *AAV* 1: 2, p. 280, where Magdalena was entitled “comitissa”; *R. J. Loenertz*, *Hospitaliers et Navarrais en Grèce: 1376–1383*, in *id.*, *Byzantina et Franco-Greca* (Roma, 1970), no. 28 (April 30, 1381), 346.

⁵⁵ Dubrovački arhiv (The Archives of Dubrovnik), *Diversa Notariae* 12, fol. 243r (July 11, 1418) as from the microfiche VIII/2 of the Arhiv Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti u Beogradu (The Archives of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Belgrade), Građa Državnog arhiva u Dubrovniku (Materials of the State archives of Dubrovnik) (the content of the document was briefly quoted in *N. Jorga*, *Notes et extraits pour servir à l’histoire des croisades au XV siècle*, series 2 [Paris–Bucarest, 1899], 169, n. 1, and as a regestum in *B. Krekić*, *Régestes des archives de Raguse pour le Levant*, in *id.*, *Dubrovnik et le Levant au Moyen Âge* [Paris, 1961], no. 647, p. 269), refers to Francesca Tocco as “dignissima ducissa dela Luchata, comitissa Cephalonie palatina”.

⁵⁶ *N. Zečević*, *Brotherly Love and Brotherly service: on the relation between Carlo and Leonardo Tocco*, In *Love, Marriage and Family Ties in the Middle Ages: Selected Papers presented at the International Medieval Congress, Leeds 2001*, eds. *M. Müller and I. Davis* (Turnhout, 2003), 149–151. Cf. *G. Schirò*, *Prolegomeni* 1, in *id.*, (ed) *Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia di Anonimo* (Rome, 1975), 30–31.

⁵⁷ *Thiriet*, *Régestes*, vol. 2, no. 1660 (July 9, 1417), p. 156, “Dux Cephaloniae”. *AAV* 1: 3, no. 886 (July 7, 1401), p. 242, Carlo was entitled at the same time “dux” and “comes”. Examples of reference to Carlo as duke of Cephalonia can be found in *AAV* 2: 6, no. 1530 (March 15, 1410): “Dux Luchate et Cefalonie”; correctly as “ducis luchate” in *AAV* 2: 6, no. 1718 (March 17, 1412), p. 199.

⁵⁸ *M. Bloch*, *Feudal Society*, vol. 1, Engl. Translation LA Manyon (London–New York, 1989repr), 211–218. Cf. *H. Pirenne*, *Qu’est-ce qu’un homme ligé?*, *Bulletin de l’Academie Royale de Belgique: classe des letters* (1919), pp. 46–60. On the development and understanding of this term in Byzantium, see *J. Ferluga*, *La ligésse dans l’Empire Byzantin: contribution a l’étude de la féodalité a Byzance*, *ZRVI* 7 (1964) 95–123. For recent definitions of familiaris, see *J. F. Niermeyer*, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon minus*, revised by *J. W. J. Burgers* (Leiden–Boston, 2002), vol. 1, p. 536.

⁵⁹ In the context of the Angevin Naples, the term “familiaris regalis” denoted a person from the closest circle of royal companions (“milites”) and vassals; the hierarchy of the first half of the fourteenth

Noster procurator (ln. 8) — the Tocco correspondence with the Venetians reveals some of *procuratores* as representing the family's interests in cases of litigation with the citizens of Venice. Some of these men were clearly designated as being of noble status.⁶¹

Nuncius specialis (ln. 9) — according to the Genoese view expressed in the grant (ln. 26), this person could have been both an ordinary envoy (“nuncius”) or a diplomatic legate (“ambasciator”). The Tocco letter quoted in the exposition of the grant informs us that this person was assigned by his masters to conduct the talks with the Genoese authorities, as well as to finalize the act (lns. 15–17). This letter, at the same time, clearly shows that he was also assigned the task of a diplomatic envoy. As suggested by Michael Balard after the examples of Genoese documents from Caffa, the term of “nuncius specialis” should be understood as an “intermediary”.⁶² The Tocco correspondence with Venice dated 1415 records one such person as acting on the occasion of a litigation in Venice on behalf of the Tocco.⁶³

Officium octo prouisionis parcium Ciuitatis (lns. 33–34) — seems to have been a reference to the Genoese executive body, mentioned in the Annals of Giorgio Stella as “Octo qui nomen Officii Provisionis habebant” or “Officium Octo super Urbis”.⁶⁴ A document of April 1377 indicates that this body also had some competence with regard to certain matters related with maritime communication.⁶⁵ Stella mentioned its members as armed during the popular revolt that brought Antoniotto Adurno to power.⁶⁶ From the grant, it is not clear whether this could have been a reference to another Genoese body that directly conducted the Commune's affairs in the East (“Officium octo provisionis Romaniae”).⁶⁷

century shows that they were ranked high, just after the princes of Taranto. On this, see *J. F. Niermeyer, Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*, vol. 1, 536.

⁶⁰ A letter written by Francesca Tocco to the Venetian authorities, *AAV*, 2: 7, no. 761bis (August 16, 1399), pp. 6–7, recorded her envoy on this occasion as a “ligium et familiarem meum carissimum”, and denoted with the terms of noble status. On the issues of modern definition of the concept of vassalage, see *Bloch, Feudal Society*, vol. 1, 231–236; *S. Reynolds, Fiefs and Vassals: Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (Oxford, 1994), 22–34.

⁶¹ Some of these individuals were mentioned in several Venetian documents both as *procuratores* and *ligii* of Carlo Tocco, *I libri commemoriali della Republica di Venezia: regesti*, ed. *R. Predelli* (Venezia, 1883), vol. 3, series 1, book 9, 16 (January 2, 1396), p. 236; *E. A. Tsitsiles, Κεφαλληνιακά σύμμεικτα: συμβολαί εις την ιστορίαν και λαογραφίαν της νησοῦ Κεφαλληνίας*, vol. 1 (Athens, 1904), 94 (April 19, 1396). Most of the Tocco correspondence shows that these procurators were in charge of settling Tocco litigation cases in Venice, *AAV* 2: 7, no. 1395 (February 6, 1415), pp. 175–176. Francesca's letter to the Venetian authorities from August 16, 1399, *AAV* 2: 7, no. 761bis, pp. 6–7, mentioned a Tocco procurator charged with Francesca's apology to the Venetian officials.

⁶² *Balard, Gênes*, 1, 59.

⁶³ This function was recorded in the Tocco domain by *AAV* 2: 7, no. 1935 (February 6, 1415), pp. 175–176.

⁶⁴ Stella, *Annales*, liber 2, coll. 1122 (ad ann. 1383).

⁶⁵ *Musso, Navigazione e commercio Genovese*, 23.

⁶⁶ Stella, loc.cit.

⁶⁷ Cf. the document from April 11, 1402, in *Musso, Navigazione e commercio Genovese*, 254.

Oath-making by touching the St. Evangelium (ln. 59) — In the Greek East, this kind of oath was usually seen as “Latin”.⁶⁸ In the cases of granting Genoese citizenship, this oath was recorded frequently during the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries. In more significant cases, it took place in the Cathedral of St. Lorenzo in Genoa, in the presence of all members of the parliament. Only in one earlier case was the act of submission recorded as being simultaneous with the oath.⁶⁹

Ducissa Cephalonie (lns. 27; 53) — see **Dux Leucate et Comes Cefalonie**.

Notarius publicus ... et cancellarius (lns. 63; 64; 66; subscr. ln. 1) — in the context of the Genoese institutions, notaries held a prominent status, which was usually (but not necessarily) inheritable. This status brought them important positions of power: they were elected into the Council of Elders and other bodies of the Comune’s administration (e.g. General Council, Office of Maritime War, etc.), while some held important posts in the Genoese colonies in the East (among them even of consuls). From 1363, the majority of chancellors (three out of four) — officials elected by the Genoese doge and the Consilium Quindecim Sapientum — were notaries. The mention of four notaries entitled as chancelleries in the Tocco grant (ln. 66) seems to be in accordance with this tendency, which had become the rule by 1413. A significant number of the fourteenth-century Genoese notaries were also notably engaged in trading activities.⁷⁰

Topographical details

Bulzaneto (ln. 3) — a settlement in Liguria. During the rule of Antoniotto Adurno, it became directly subjected to Genoa.

Castrum nostrum Sancti Georgij de Cefalonie (ln. 26) — fortified residence (“kastron”) of the counts of Cephalonia and the political capital of the Tocco domain. It was located near the modern village of Perata on the island of Cephalonia. The polygonal shape of the castle recorded for the Tocco period probably dates back from the period when the island was subjected to the Orsini family.⁷¹ Since the Tocco conquest of the island of Leukas (1360s), and definitely after the bestowal of Carlo Tocco of the position of despot of Epiros (1415), the town lost its political significance.⁷² Although the establishment of the Venetian power over the island at the

⁶⁸ *Dujčev*, Ivanko, 185.

⁶⁹ *Day*, Genoa’s Response, 50.

⁷⁰ Among the detailed modern works on Genoese notaries and documentary practices, especially helpful are those by *G. Costamagna*, *Il notariato a Genova tra prestigio e potere* (Roma, 1970) (reprint in *Studi storici nel notariato italiano*, Milano, 1995); *G. Airdi*, *Studi e documenti su Genova e l’Oltremare* (Bordighera, 1974); *Kedar*, *The Genoese Notaries*, 73–94.

⁷¹ St. George was mentioned as a fortification as early as the times of the Norman invasion of the island (1085).

⁷² Visiting this region after the Battle of Nicopolis (1396), Jean Froissart described the town of St. George as the center of the Tocco court, as well as an agreeable and mythological place, Jean Froissart, *Chroniques*, in *Ouvres de Froissart*, vol. 16, ed. *K. de Lettenhove* (Bruxelles, 1875), 53–54.

end of the fifteenth century brought some political-administrative revival of the town, by the eighteenth century it was deserted. A census from the beginning of the Venetian rule (1504) recorded its typical Western division into “Borgo” (fortified *burgum*) and “Exo Borgo” (*suburbium*). As this census recorded the existing situation, it can be concluded that the town had already been organized according to this principle during the Tocco rule.

Palatium ducale (ln. 64) — a palace in Genova constructed between the 1270s and 1307, originally known as the “Palazzo publico” or “Palazzo commune”. Its designation as “Palazzo ducale” came into use after 1339. The palace’s location in the center of the city, that is, in the quarter influenced by the mighty family of the D’Oria, where the city’s Cathedral and the Dominican monastery were located, shows the political prominence of the object. The doge’s palace lost its importance in the sixteenth century to the new princely palace.⁷³

* * *

To sum up, the documentary analysis of the Tocco citizenship grant issued by the Genoese authorities on December 2, 1389, at first sight suggests that the act was perceived by its Genoese *addressantes* as an extraordinary political event: its paleographic features largely follow the Genoese practice of communication with high-ranking foreign individuals, the document was authenticated by two seals (one of them containing an ecclesiastical confirmation), the seals were pending, the act was simultaneously written and granted, and the document was written and authenticated by a competent public notary. Underneath this, however, lay hints which imply that the Genoese did not consider the utmost importance of the occasion: the language of the grant is corrupted by vulgar expressions, the witnesses seem to have been of a more common background, their number indicates a more mundane approach to the situation, the granting was performed in an informal part of the palace (smaller hall where the chancellery was located), instead in the most important ecclesiastical location of Genoa (the Cathedral of St. Lorenzo), the oath of the Tocco envoy was taken at the place where the grant was made.

Thus, the evidence of the documentary analysis seems to indicate that the Genoese citizenship grant issued to the Tocco on December 2, 1389, was perceived indeed as an instrument of a more formal rather than factual alliance. Yet there is no doubt that even such a ceremonial document should be used important historical evidence. In fact, its paleographic and diplomatic features, as well as hints of its

Among the recent titles on this location, *G. Fokas Kosmetatos*, Το κάστρο Αγ. Γεωργίου Κεφαλληνίας: η παλαιά πρωτεύουσα της νησού (Athens, 1966); *P. Soustal* (ed.), *Tabula imperii Byzantini*, vol. 3 (Wien, 1981), 46; 154–155. The absence of the material remains that would suggest constructional interventions during the Tocco period were explained as a consequence of frequent earthquakes in the region (*Foka-Kosmetatos*, Το κάστρο, 15 and *ibid.*, 32–45).

⁷³ On the spatial representation of power in this city see *L. Grossi Biandi — E. Poleggi*, *Una città portuale nel medioevo: Genova nei secoli X–XVI* (Genova, 1980).

sigillographic authentication (all comparable to similar cases of Genoese practice) and the information it yields on the relevant prosopography, topography and institutions, make this Genoese document a valuable source for our knowledge of the fourteenth century Genoese notary practice and citizenship policy, as well as of the organization of the Tocco notariate and power organization.

Нада Зечевих

ЂЕНОВСКО ГРАЂАНСТВО КАРЛА I ТОКО (2. XII 1389)

(II)

Други део рада о грађанству Карла I Токо и његове мајке регенткиње Магдалене Буонделмонти у Ђенови 2. XII 1389. доноси документарну анализу инструмента. Палеографске, дипломатичке, хронолошке и сигилографске одлике документа, у поређењу са карактеристикама других јавних исправа које је ђеновска канцеларија издавала током друге половине XIV века, недвосмислено указују на аутентичност исправе. Са друге стране, међутим, исте одлике указују и на могућност да је инструмент о Токо грађанству од самог почетка био виђен међу представницима ђеновске власти као протоколарни документ. Овакав закључак даље доприноси одговору на питање зашто документ никада није био примењен у стварности.

Поред поменутих анализираних одлика документа, просопографска и топографска анализа, као и осврт на важније институције поменуте у инструменту о ђеновском грађанству Токо породице, откривају детаље који овај документ чине сведочанством од прворазредног значаја, како за ђеновску, тако и за Токо политику и нотарску праксу.