



Supported by a grant from Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway through the EEA Financial Mechanism and Polish science resources 2008-2011

#### LUS. FOL. 3

## Foral de Alfândega de Lisboa de 1587 reimpresso em 1674

# Binding:

The manuscript was probably bound in the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was made of soft, blue-coloured cardboard. This type of binding recurs in other manuscripts from the collection.

## History:

The dating, location and history of the manuscript prior to its reaching the Berlin collection is uncertain due to a lack of traces allowing its investigation. The manuscript is an anonymous copy of fragments from *Foral de Alfandega da Cidade de Lisboa de 1587*, a code of customs regulations established during the Portuguese reign of Philip II of Spain. It was based on a printed version of the work from 1674 or one of its later reprints. The manuscript was marked with a probably erroneous accession number of the Berlin collection, as evidenced by the fact that in the German library register it corresponds to a Latin manuscript, not a Portuguese one. Nevertheless, the marking of the manuscript with an accession number indicates that it was incorporated into the collection of the Berlin Library after 1828, when the institution introduced the accession register. The copy probably had a practical, referential character, and was created in Portugal or Spain. The dating of the manuscript assumed by Lemm (19<sup>th</sup> century) is confirmed by traits of the handwriting. A lack of markings of owners of the manuscript other than the Berlin Library might mean that it reached the collection of this institution directly from the hands of the first owner.

### Content:

The copy contains selected chapters of the 1674 edition of the text, devoted to rules applying to goods during a customs control. The copyist reproduces the contents of the chapters faithfully, with only slight orthographic, morphological and syntactic changes. In the case of two chapters, the copyist made an error in the numbering, probably caused by a misreading of Roman numerals used in the printed edition of the text. With reference to the Krakow p. 112.