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This dissertation examines the socio-economic and socio-cultural dynamics of medieval Famagusta from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. Contrary to the traditional historiography suggesting that Famagusta enjoyed commercial privilege after the fall of Acre in 1291 and lost its importance with the Genoese occupation of the city in 1374, this work offers more detailed analysis of economic and social dynamics of the late medieval Famagusta by examining wide-range of archival evidence and argues that Famagusta maintained its commercial importance until the late fifteenth century. In late medieval ages, Famagusta enjoyed economic prosperity due to its crucial role in Levant trade as a supplier and distributor of agricultural and luxury merchandise. It hosted nearly all prominent Genoese, Venetian, and Tuscan merchant companies and become one of the most important part of the Levantine trade policy of Venice and Genoa. Moreover, beside the economic growth Famagusta also witnessed social and cultural prosperity which enabled it to bear the title ‘emporium’. People from almost every nation lived, visited, co-operated, and enjoyed the cultural wealth where the cultural differences were far from being social disintegration factor. By analysing notarial, fiscal, ecclesiastical and visual evidence from the period under examination, the main elements that are necessary to understand the evolution of medieval ‘emporium’, such as economic, social, cultural, administrative and urban dynamics, are scrutinized in order to draw more consistent conclusions. Regarding the lack of any monograph on this subject, this dissertation provides the first comprehensive analysis of economic and socio-cultural dynamics of late medieval Famagusta.
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CHAPTER 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION:

(i) Method, Data and Organization

This thesis examines the economic and socio-cultural dynamics of medieval Famagusta from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. The main aim is to investigate and comprehensively analyse the economic and commercial dynamics of medieval Famagusta. Therefore, the focus will be on three fundamental components: the role of the Famagusta in Levantine trade, the activities of the Latin merchant companies established in Famagusta and the agricultural potential of the hinterland of Famagusta. However, this study does not aim to discuss all the major economic dynamics of the Levant area. Nor does it aim to address all the political and religious dynamics of medieval Cyprus during the period under examination. The central question of this work is how important was Famagusta for the Levantine trade and what was the main role of the Famagusta port regarding the long-distance trade policy of the Italian maritime powers. Additionally, this study pays special attention to the organization and activities of the prominent Genoese and Venetian merchant companies established in Famagusta. By doing so, the aim is to portray the influential role undertaken by the prominent merchant companies in the Levantine long-distance trade whose existence and power allowed the Italian maritime republics to maintain commercial control over the Levantine trade. The secondary objective of this study is to provide a detailed analysis of the socio-cultural dynamics of medieval Famagusta. In examining the social and cultural aspects
of the city the co-existence of different religious and ethnic groups and cultural interaction between them will be analysed through the primary and visual evidence. The main purpose in analysing the socio-cultural and religious dynamics of medieval Famagusta is to seek explanations of social and cultural phenomena that existing historiography failed to answer.

Unfortunately, there is not any detailed monograph written on the economy of late medieval Famagusta at all. However, a considerable amount of work has been published examining political, religious, and economic aspects of late medieval Cyprus in general and the ‘so-called’ economic rise of Famagusta after the fall of Acre in 1291.¹ Existing literature on medieval Famagusta has largely neglected the commercial and agricultural potential of Famagusta from the early thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. The traditional historiography mainly focuses on the strategic importance of the port of Famagusta and economic prosperity enjoyed by the city during the early fourteenth century. The first serious discussions about the commercial importance of Famagusta in the late medieval period emerged during the 1980s.

It is primarily the conclusions drawn by Jacoby in his famous article ‘Rise of a New

Emporium’ which constitute the framework of the recent articles about medieval Famagusta.² As will be seen in the section devoted to the ‘literature review’, main-stream historians believe that there is a direct correlation between the fall of Acre and so-called ‘sudden rise’ of Famagusta. Also, there is a common tendency in the modern scholarship to describe the city as a ‘boom town’ and correlate its so-called ‘economic decline’ with the Genoese conquest of Famagusta in 1374. Such a tendency to explain Famagusta’s commercial fame with the fall of Crusader states among the modern scholarship was mainly due to the lack of archaeological and archival evidence which prevented scholars from providing a detailed analysis of the economic and social dynamics of medieval Famagusta.

However, the existing evidence along with recently published notarial and fiscal records suggest quite a different picture to the one that traditional historiography offers. This study consulted various types of primary and secondary sources and examined only the quantitative data since archaeological survey and/or excavation in Famagusta is illegal. Among the wide range of evidence, Genoese and Venetian notarial records, Genoese fiscal records and Rhodian archival records concerning Cyprus are examined closely in order to provide comparative statistical analysis. In addition, this thesis provides a comprehensive analysis of the economic mechanisms, their functioning, importance and limits established in Famagusta. The economic activities carried out by merchant companies and the local networks established by them enabled Venice and Genoa to have easy access to the Oriental markets which we can scrutinise. This enables the changing economic and social environments of the Levant to be revealed. Although different types of primary sources are used in supporting the main argument of the thesis, the most important one is the notarial records. However, notarial records drawn up in Famagusta by Venetian and Genoese notaries are problematic. The major problem that readers should be very careful of is the large time

² For the detailed discussion of existing literature on medieval Famagusta see Chapter 1, section 2.
gaps between the published notarial records. The lack of periodical classification of the notarial records often misleads scholars to draw false conclusions about medieval Famagusta. For example, the sudden increase of Greek slaves and relative decrease of Muslim slaves in the notarial transactions recorded by the Venetian Boateriis encouraged scholars to reach the conclusion that Muslim slaves were displaced by Greeks during the second half of the fourteenth century. However, the transactions drawn by another Venetian called Simeone in the same period suggest a totally different phenomenon. The acts drawn up by Simeone contain a considerable amount of transactions concerning the sale of Tatar slaves and barely refer to the Greek slaves.\footnote{For the detailed discussion of slave trade and notarial acts concerning slaves see Chapter 2, section 3.}

Therefore, I have chosen to group the transactions into four periods. The first period starts with the examination of the deeds of Lamberto Sambuceto (Genoese) which cover the period from 1296 to 1307. The second period consists of the acts drawn up by Giovanni de Rocha (Genoese) from 1308 to 1310. The third period includes two different Venetian notaries Nicola de Boateriis from 1360 to 1362 and Simeone who stayed in Famagusta from 1362 to 1364 and from 1368 to 1371. The last notarial evidence in question is the records of the Hospitaller Convent in Cyprus from Rhodian archives published recently covering the period from 1409 to 1459. In this sense, the organization and analyses of the acts are prioritised according to their dates. Furthermore, although notarial transactions are very important in describing the socio-economic dynamics and trade volumes of the period, there are also important aspects that they do not provide information on. For instance, in some cases the measurement of the specific good bought by one party is not mentioned. Or, more commonly, the seller only mentions how much money he received from the buyer and instead of specifying the exact amount of the good he says ‘‘x Armenian dirhems received for’’ a certain amount of grain, cotton or sugar. Sometimes the acts concern the lending of money or
the repayment of a sum borrowed by an individual before and the transactions yield no information about the reasons why money was borrowed, or whether the payment of a sum was in actual money or merchandise. Moreover, on some occasions prominent merchant companies lend money to their agents to invest it overseas. In that case the acts are again silent concerning from whom the agent will buy the said merchandise or if the supplier overseas was a compatriot. While mostly the currency or measurement is provided, the country of origin of the merchandise is generally missing. This is due to the papal restrictions where the exact journey plan of the agents is not mentioned to avoid any official restriction or penalty.

Beside the notarial evidence, recently published Venetian letters, official records, chronicles, and travellers’ notes, together with the analysis of secondary sources, are used in order to contextualise the entire subject within a broader perspective. Moreover, by using a comparative quantitative method in order to examine the type of bulk commodities, general supply and demand and the scale of the investments of Genoese, Venetian, Tuscan and Syrian companies in Famagusta, Cilician Armenia, Egypt and Syria, the following chapter highlights the economic dynamics of the wider Levantine trade and the sectoral dominance amongst several merchant companies. As mentioned at the beginning, the traditional approach to the economic and cultural prosperity enjoyed by Famagusta consists of two main parts. The first part suggests that the rise of Famagusta took its starting point after the fall of Acre and allegedly the Genoese occupation marked the end of Famagusta’s sudden rise. This thesis rejects such traditional approaches and therefore provides more detailed and evidence-based explanations.

For this reason, chapter 2 of this thesis that focuses on the economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta is divided into four sections. The first section examines the economic dynamics and functionality of medieval Famagusta before the fall of Acre in 1291. The
origins of the early stages of the economic development of medieval Famagusta have remained untouched in the recent scholarship. One of the main reasons for this is the lack of archaeological and archival evidence. The political restrictions on archaeological excavations stand as the main factor behind the scarcity of information concerning Famagusta’s economic history. On the other hand, the traditional approach and interpretations for analysing medieval Famagusta discourage scholars from dealing with the economic development of Famagusta during the early thirteenth century. This is mainly due to the tendency among scholars to attribute Famagusta’s commercial fame to the fall of Acre and consider Limassol as a main port of the island until 1291. Therefore, this section examines the economic dynamics, agricultural potential and functionality of the Famagusta port from the early to the late thirteenth century. In examining the pre-existing assumptions, this section provides a detailed analysis of the agricultural potential and capacity of Famagusta’s hinterland together with the early merchant activities and functionality of its port.

The second section deals with the organization and activities of Latin merchant companies in Famagusta which were transporting local and Oriental merchandise to the Muslim East and Western port cities. This section is divided into two sub-sections. The first sub-section examines the economic dynamics of Famagusta from the 1270s to 1350 and focuses on the commercial relations between Famagusta and the Muslim East. Also the main political dynamics of the Levant during the aforementioned period are scrutinized in order to draw more certain conclusions concerning the economic importance of Famagusta. The second sub-section focuses on the role of Famagusta in distributing the Oriental and local merchandise to the West during the early fourteenth century to mid-fourteenth century. The commercial activities carried out by prominent merchant companies in Famagusta and their importance for Genoa and Venice in controlling the Levant trade is revealed mainly by analysing the notarial evidence. Moreover, this section also provides an analysis of the bulk
commodities, such as grain, cotton and sugar that the Latin merchants transported to the West. The aim is to provide more insights into the volume of the Levantine trade in the late middle ages. Apart from the notarial acts, large amounts of archival sources are scrutinized in this section in order to reveal the crucial role of Famagusta in the Levant trade.

The third section focuses on the economic and commercial dynamics of Famagusta from the 1350s to 1400. In this section, large amounts of archival documents are investigated in order to reveal the economic continuity and importance of Famagusta from the mid-fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries. The political instability in the Levant region, the Black Death and Papal sanctions are investigated in the light of the archival documents in order to evaluate their possible economic effects in Cyprus. The pivotal role maintained by Famagusta between East and West and the local networks established by the Genoese and Venetian merchant companies based in Famagusta from the 1350s to 1400 are visualised in order to reveal the volume of trade between Europe and the Muslim East. In an attempt to highlight the important role of Famagusta in the Italian sea powers’ Levant trade policy, the evidence displayed in this section also sheds light on the activities of Latin merchants in the Muslim East and the Black Sea. As will be seen, Famagusta was an important component in the local merchant networks established by Latin companies in the Levant. Therefore, the co-operation among leading merchant companies is highlighted, both in this and the previous section, in order to offer a better understanding of their organization and function in the Levant.

The fourth and the last section of chapter two examine the agricultural potential and economic dynamics of Famagusta throughout the fifteenth century. This section aims to contribute to a better understanding and assessment of the role of Famagusta in the Levant trade during the late medieval period by scrutinizing recently published archival material. Also, in light of the documents from the Venetian and Rhodian archives the agricultural potential of the island and productivity of the hinterland of Famagusta is examined in order to
shed light on the distribution of local resources and the continuous role of Famagusta in the Levant trade. Due to the word limit, this section is mainly focussing on the sugar, cotton and grain exportation from/to the island and pays special attention to the intensified commercial relations between Famagusta and the Muslim East after the Mamluk invasion of Cyprus in 1426. Yet, by analysing a large amount of archival and secondary sources, the third and fourth sections of chapter 2 offer new insights to the economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta and its role in the Levantine trade from 1350 to 1500.

The third chapter of this thesis, however, examines the socio-cultural and religious dynamics of medieval Famagusta by analysing different types of archival and monumental evidence. It consists of two sections. The first focuses on socio-cultural, ethnic and daily-life aspects of the city. Although the social and cultural aspects of medieval Cyprus have been excellently studied by scholars, there are a very limited amount of studies focussed on the socio-cultural and daily life in medieval Famagusta. For this reason, this section explores the dynamics of social life in medieval Famagusta by examining the most neglected aspects such as the role of the women, co-existence and interaction between different ethnic and religious groups, and the slave population of Famagusta. To examine such aspects of social and cultural life in Famagusta, this section often consults the notarial records, chronicles and church registers. On the other hand, the second section aims to yield background information to the religious dynamics of Famagusta in order to portray the religious interaction between various ethnic groups existing in Famagusta. It is divided into five sub-sections observing the reliability of native chronicles that the traditional historiography relies on, the economic and political power of religious institutions, social interactions between religious groups, and architectural aspects of the city. The main purpose of this section is to examine whether native Greek Orthodox and other religious groups existing in Famagusta were oppressed by
the Latin Church, as is argued by the mainstream historians, or whether rather more friendly relations were maintained.

The fourth chapter observes the structure and formation of the Latin Administration established on the island during the Lusignan hegemony. Chapter four is divided into three sections. The first examines the hybrid features of the Lusignan administration by focussing on its unique institutional organization with aspects borrowed from Byzantium and Jerusalem. Moreover, the Greeks and Syrians employed by the Latins in the administrative institutions and the existence of native Greek elite families are analysed in order to understand the social position of non-Latins and the function of the new constitutional model introduced to the island. The following section investigates the commercial quarter of medieval Famagusta by examining the development of commercial buildings through the archival and secondary sources. As an important part of the urbanisation process of medieval Famagusta the understanding of commercial institutions and their functionality is vital. Likewise, the establishment of the commercial quarter in Famagusta is another indication of its importance for the Western trade nations. The last section examines only the Genoese officials operating in Famagusta through the Genoese notarial registers. The limitation to the Genoese officials is basically due to the silence of Venetian notarial documents concerning Venetian officials operating in Famagusta. However, the Venetian and Anconitan officials that are mentioned by the Genoese notaries are included in this section as well. Additionally, the involvement of high-ranking Genoese officials in commercial business is analysed in detail in order to provide the whole picture. In fact, this chapter generally provides a comprehensive analysis of the administration, its units and personnel, which is crucial for our understanding of the economic and socio-cultural dynamics of medieval Famagusta.
(ii) A critical assessment of the scholarship on the economic history of medieval Famagusta

Considering that there is no monograph written specifically on medieval Famagusta nor any comprehensive study focusing only on the economic and socio-cultural dynamics of the city from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, this is the first time the questions regarding the economic history of Famagusta have been put forward.\(^4\) Considering the political restrictions on the one hand and the scarcity of the sources on the other, a very limited amount of research has focused on the economic history of medieval Famagusta. Regarding the commercial and strategic role of Famagusta in the Levantine trade the works produced by the recent scholarship are inadequate to understand the vital role of Famagusta during the late medieval period. The works that examine the economic and cultural aspects of the city are mostly articles that examine the social and economic aspects of medieval Famagusta together with other cities of the island. It would not be an exaggeration to state that there is not any work specifically offering a broad coverage of the economic development of Famagusta.

The earliest attempts among scholarship to delineate the role of medieval Famagusta in the Eastern Mediterranean are undertaken by Jean Richard, David Jacoby and Michel Balard. Jean Richard in his seminal article, albeit short, "*La situation juridique de Famagouste dans le royaume des Lusignans*" published in 1972 suggests that the papal restrictions were the stimulating factor for the commercial rise of Famagusta. Richard claims that the proximity of Famagusta to Ayas and Cilician Armenia triggered Famagusta’s transformation into an

\(^4\) There is only one thesis, written by Robert J. Mackenzie in 1994, who mainly examined state control in Genoese Tunis during the late thirteenth century. Mackenzie devoted half of his thesis to examining the social organisation and administrative dynamics of Famagusta from late thirteenth to early fourteenth century in order to provide comparative research. However, his research includes only Genoese activities in Famagusta and does not provide comprehensive data concerning commercial dynamics and economic evolution of the city. Mackenzie describes Famagusta as a “boom town” which enjoyed sudden prosperity after 1291. However, for him it was not long lived. Mackenzie, James. *Consuls and Communities: Social organization and state control in two Genoese Merchant Colonies*, Unpublished PhD thesis, (Cambridge, 1994).
emporium. According to this theory, beside the aforementioned factors the efforts of the Lusignan king Henry II in granting franchises to the city played an important role in its development. However, the lack of evidence regarding the role of royal initiative in the early development of Famagusta suggested by Jean Richard is already mentioned by David Jacoby.

The contribution of David Jacoby to the economic history of medieval Famagusta is certainly undeniable. Against Jean Richard’s article Jacoby’s ‘The Rise of a New Emporium in the Eastern Mediterranean: Famagusta in the Late Thirteenth Century’ published in 1989 offers a more thematic and detailed analysis of medieval Famagusta during the late thirteenth century. Jacoby’s article ‘Rise of a New Emporium’ understandably served as a framework in the studies of modern scholarship. However, his work suffers from serious limitations and weaknesses in providing answers to the crucial questions that need to be answered. David Jacoby argues that the political situation of the Frankish states of the Levant has set a basis for the economic growth of Famagusta. According to this hypothesis; the main reason for the large influx of refugees to Famagusta from Acre in 1291 was directly related to commercial and geographical considerations. According to Jacoby, this is mostly due to the immigrants from the cities conquered by the Muslims such as Antioch (1268), Jaffa (1268) and Margat (1285) who somehow found their way to Famagusta before the fall of Acre in 1291. In explaining the arrival of refugees from such cities Jacoby alleges that the surnames (such as Antiochia, Margato, Lezia, Tripolis, Neffino) appearing in the Genoese notarial records drawn up in the early fourteenth century indicate that these immigrants had already established commercial networks between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia. However, at the beginning of his article Jacoby states that ‘[notarial] registers [concerning the early thirteenth

century Famagusta] do not provide an overall picture, nor a representative sample of the city’s population around 1300.’’\textsuperscript{8} One major drawback of this theory is that explaining such phenomena with thirteenth-century notarial records does not provide consistent answers. Simply the appearance of such surnames in the notarial records does not justify that such families settled in Famagusta and established commercial networks within the Levant before 1291. Also they might be the families or individuals who fled to Acre after the Muslim invasions and then immigrated to Famagusta after the fall of Acre in 1291. As will be presented in the second chapter, these individuals with such surnames are a very tiny minority compared to the Venetian, Genoese or even Syrian merchants already conducting trade in Famagusta during the thirteenth century.

As is well known, during the thirteenth century the Limassol port was frequented largely by Venetian and Pisan merchants. According to the \textit{limited} amount of evidence Limassol port was superior to Famagusta and scholars suggest that the fall of Acre \textit{somehow} brought an end to this superiority. However, the question of replacement of Limassol by Famagusta still waits to be answered. For example, there is no consistent hypothesis or theory on the way Famagusta was suddenly transformed into an emporium while Limassol hosted a considerable amount of the merchant community. In other words, why would all those merchant companies risk their commercial business and attempt to establish their trade networks again in Famagusta while they already had established business networks in Limassol? At this point, Jacoby suggests that immigrants from the cities of Antioch and Tripoli chose to be settled in Famagusta before 1291 and the main reason for this choice was the proximity of Famagusta to Lesser Armenia.\textsuperscript{9} Although he is not able to support this theory with any primary evidence, the main argument is that after the fall of Antioch and Tripoli the immigrants from such cities maintained close trade relations with the Kingdom of

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid, pp. 151 and 153 and fn. 43.
\textsuperscript{9} Ibid, pp. 153-4.
Lesser Armenia, one of the main commercial centres, and the immigrants from Antioch and Tripoli chose to settle in Famagusta because it was closer to Lesser Armenia than Limassol. Therefore, Jacoby assumes that it is possible to “ascribe initial phase in the growth of Famagusta in the late thirteenth century to the settlement and activity of the refugees who arrived in Cyprus before 1291.”10 According to the theory, this was indeed the main reason for the large influx of immigrants to Famagusta in 1291. However, as mentioned before there is not any available primary evidence supporting this theory.

At this point, another important question needs to be asked. How many of them can be identified in the notarial acts and did they all reside in Famagusta? David Jacoby in his recently published article stated that only about 100 individuals can be identified as inhabitants of Famagusta who were former residents of Acre. Also, a charter of 1294 drafted in Nicosia reveals that some of them resided in Nicosia and Limassol.11 It is also known that Cyprus hosted large amount of refugees from Jerusalem (in 1244) and Acre (in 1267) but there is no evidence to suggest that they settled in Famagusta.12 Of course, it is true that some of the refugees from Acre (1291) settled in Famagusta and they surely contributed to the demographic growth of the city. However, one needs to ask at what level they contributed to the economy of Famagusta and what their function in the Levant trade was. David Jacoby has managed to trace a limited amount of refugees who were involved in trade after they settled in Famagusta. Among them, some members of the prominent Venetian Brizi family, Viviano de Ginnembaldo, Albertino Place and Giovanni David are the traceable ones that were involved in business both in Acre and Famagusta after 1291.13 Nevertheless, as is examined in chapter 2, trade was controlled by the prominent merchant groups in Famagusta and the

10 Ibid, 154.
notarial evidence clearly shows that immigrants from Acre did not play a crucial role in establishing the commercial network between Famagusta and the East as is suggested by the scholars.

Similarly to Jacoby and Richard, Michel Balard argues that Famagusta maintained a leading role in international trade at the end of the thirteenth century due to its strategic position and political factors. In contrast to Jacoby, Balard states that the loss of Christian dominions in the Levant did not contribute much to the rise of Famagusta. To him, the immigrants from the Holy Land were not present in large numbers and were easily integrated into Famagustan society. Balard believes that it was the Westerner merchant population of Famagusta that transformed the city into an emporium. In fact, Balard agrees with Richard that in order to promote the development of Famagusta, the kings of Cyprus granted particular franchises to the city and customs and fiscal benefits to the different western nations. Regarding the commercial affairs Balard argues that the Western merchants operating in Cyprus [Famagusta] did not aim to maintain trade relations with Muslim dominions in the Levant and having access to the Oriental markets was not their main intention. Instead, their activities were focused more towards the major axis which includes Italy, Catalan and Provencal regions, Little Armenia and the caravan traffic to Persia. However, the idea that merchants were more focussed towards the Western ports finds no confirmation in the primary records. As will be seen in the next chapter, notarial and fiscal records suggest that Genoese and Venetian merchant companies often operated in Lesser Armenia, Syria and Egypt transporting large consignments of merchandise to Famagusta and from there to the West.

Catherine Otten-Froux is another scholar whose contributions have helped to shape the history of medieval Famagusta. An important article contributing to the economic history of medieval Famagusta ‘Les relations économiques entre Chypre et le royaume arménien de Cilicie d’après les actes notariés (1270-1320)’ by Otten-Froux yielded important insights into the economic relations between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.18 The article not only deals with economic relations between Cyprus and Cilician Armenia but specifically focuses on the volume of trade between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia by examining the Genoese notarial records. After analyzing the types of merchandise transported and the scale of the investments of Famagustan merchants involved in Cilician Armenia, Otten-Froux reaches the conclusion that Cyprus played an important role in the Levant trade serving as a commercial hub and redistribution centre for the merchandise transported from the Levant.19 Otten-Froux claims that the merchants of Famagusta were visiting Cilician Armenia mostly to buy cotton from Ayas and directly transport it to the West. In addition to cotton, wheat and barley were transported from Cilician Armenia to Famagusta by Genoese and Syrian merchants.20 In general, Otten-Froux hints that the geographical proximity of Cyprus and Cilician Armenia facilitated the trade between these territories. Moreover, Froux’s analysis of the scale of trade between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia, based on comparative analysis of merchants from other cities, points out that commercial traffic between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia was intense.21

Among the modern scholarship Nicholas Coureas is the one who has contributed to the subject by publishing an incredible amount of articles. Although most of his articles are not

20 Ibid, p. 171.
directly related to Famagusta almost all of them include examination of notarial acts related
to Famagusta in the fourteenth century. Coureas in his great contribution to the book
‘Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374’ argues that the economy of Lusignan Cyprus
represents continuity and commercial stability compared to the Roman and Byzantine
periods. The final loss of Latin strongholds in Syria and Palestine triggered the economic
development of the island in general and specifically Famagusta. Coureas in his
comprehensive and leading work examines the natural resources, the emergence of new
industries, merchant companies and the potential of the coastal plains of Cyprus in order to
describe the commercial importance of the island during the thirteenth century.22

According to Coureas, during the Byzantine period the island’s economy was dependent
on agricultural production. This, however, was soon to change after the Latin conquest where
the island witnessed intense mercantile activities, especially the port of Limassol. In addition
to this, commerce and agricultural production were encouraged by the Lusignan kings and the
Latin merchant community was granted several privileges during the thirteenth century.23
Regarding the economic development of Famagusta, Coureas follows the same path as
Richard and Jacoby stating that the large influx of immigrants from Acre in 1291 soon joined
their compatriots in Famagusta and their choice caused short-term economic dislocation. That
is to say, the port of Limassol lost its importance and was replaced by Famagusta due to the
large influx of refugees.24 By reaching such a conclusion Coureas relies on the theories of
Richard and Jacoby already mentioned before. Additionally, Coureas contributed to the field
by publishing several articles examining the economy of Cyprus and Famagusta in the
fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. His works mainly focus on commercial relations between

22 Coureas, N. ‘Economy’ in A. N. Konnari and C. Schabel (eds.), Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374
(Brill, 2005), pp. 103-156.
23 Ibid, pp. 115-128.
Chios, Crete, Euboea, Florence, Genoa, Venice, Cilician Armenia and Genoese colonies of Pera and Caffa.25

Unfortunately there is not much written on the economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta. However, if we happen to outline the general tendency of the scholarship, one can safely divide the existing approaches into two. The majority of scholars prefer to correlate Famagusta’s economic development with the fall of Acre and a large influx of immigrants originated from Antioch, Tripoli, and Acre during the second half of thirteenth century. On the other hand others, without disagreeing with the aforementioned theory, draw attention to the encouragement of the Lusignan kings granting privileges and the existence of Western mercantile groups in Famagusta. However, although all of the aforementioned works contributed invaluable insights to the subject, each approach suffers from not being able to provide certain answers to the economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta. In this regard, this thesis aims to provide a clearer picture and fill the gaps that have been long neglected by the current scholarship.

Moreover, scholars such as Cornelio Desimoni, Romeo Pavoni, Valeria Polonio, Antonino Lombardo, Michel Balard, C. Otten-Froux, Chris Schabel, Laura Balletto, Nicholas Coureas, William Duba and Anthony Luttrell must also be mentioned for their great contribution to the subject by editing and publishing the Venetian, Genoese and Rhodian notarial sources.26 In addition to them, there are many other scholars who have published


26 It is important to mention here that although a considerable amount of documents from the Rhodian archives are published, this thesis consults only the Hospitaller documents recently published by K. Borchardt, A.
invaluable works on the political, religious, artistic and architectural history of Famagusta. However, to discuss their works here far exceeds the purpose of this section and the thesis in general as well.  

Luttrell and E. Schoffler (Documents Concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives: 1409-1459) for comparative analysis. This recent publication of Hospitaller records consist of 346 documents all related to Cyprus.  

The works published on political, religious and architectural history of medieval Famagusta included in the footnotes of following chapters. See also bibliography.
(iii) **Political and Economic Context:**

Medieval Cyprus with its complex economic and social history provides valuable insights into our understanding of the socio-economic and socio-cultural dynamics of the Eastern Mediterranean during the medieval ages. Due to its strategic position, located along the trade routes leading to Levant, the island always witnessed the conflict of interests. Indeed, the outlines of early medieval Cyprus are relatively better known. During the early medieval period, the island was an important part of long-distance maritime trade and was used as a stepping-stone by merchants originating both from East and West. The recent scholarship reasonably divided Byzantine Cyprus into three periods in order to explain the economic fluctuations. According to the modern historiography, the period from Anastasius’s reign (491) until the Arab raids (649 and 653) represents a ‘high degree of prosperity’. However, for three hundred years from ‘662’ onwards the island witnessed a sharp economic decline which was reflected in many administrative changes. It was during the reign of Alexius I (1081-1118) that Cyprus maintained a long-term economic recovery. Apart from the economic significance, Cyprus also served as a military base both for Byzantines and Arabs and allegedly witnessed an economic ‘boom’ during the first half of the twelfth century due to the establishment of the Crusader states on the mainland. In fact, the new trade routes brought the island into a more important position which also allowed its merchant community to commercialize local manufacture in the Levantine markets. This, of course, not only


29 Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, pp. 31-3.

30 Hunt, D. *Footprints in Cyprus* (London, 1982), pp. 141-155. For the importance of Salamis/Constantia as a commercial hub see Chapter 2, Section1.
attracted Latin merchant groups to the island but also laid the foundations of an establishment of leading merchant companies on the island during the later periods. In the Byzantine period, the Latin merchants were given several commercial privileges by Byzantine Emperors and operated in the main ports of the island such as Limassol, Pafos, Kyrenia, Salamis and Famagusta.

However, the conquest of the island by Richard the Lionheart in May 1191 introduced a new era to the island. Shortly after the conquest, the Templars bought the island from Richard the Lionheart and then returned it after a short ownership due to the civil revolt. It was in 1192, when Guy de Lusignan and his brother Aimery arrived in Cyprus together with the knights and nobles who supported them during the siege of Acre and bought the island from Richard the Lionheart. The island was now controlled by the Frankish dynasty until 1473 and organized it as a province of the Latin Church. The new administrative system established during the early Lusignan period and the constitutional structures of the Lusignan government were comprised of the Assizes of Jerusalem and the Byzantine constitutional laws. The hybrid administration created by the Franks that contained both Eastern and Western traditional features itself obviously enabled Westerner rulers to maintain peaceful relations with indigenous Greek population and other ethnic groups existing on the island.

Generally, the Lusignan rule can be described as a period of ‘economic stability’ and ‘cultural wealth’. The commercial activities of Latin merchants were encouraged by Lusignan kings and at the same time agrarian producers who were cultivating profitable crops such as grain, sugar, and salt around the hinterlands of Famagusta, Limassol, Morphou (Omorfo) and Larnaca were supported by the Lusignan rulers. Additionally, this period represents

---

32 For more detailed information on administrative structure during the Latin hegemony see Chapter 4.
religion and interaction that survives until today in the ecclesiastical art and architecture.

However, after the coronation of King Peter II (1369–1382) as king of Jerusalem in October 1372 (in Famagusta) a fight broke out between the Venetians and Genoese. The Genoese inhabitants of Famagusta were wounded and their houses and shops were looted by the Venetian and indigenous inhabitants. After the incident, King Peter II blamed the Genoese and decided not to pay any compensation for their losses. In 1373, Genoese troops landed in Cyprus and invaded both Nicosia and Famagusta. The results of the Genoese takeover of these two important cities were disastrous for Lusignan government. In the year of 1374, the Lusignan government agreed to pay a considerable amount of tribute to Genoa in instalments over twelve years in return for returning Nicosia and the rest of island except Famagusta.34 The Genoese controlled Famagusta until 1464 and were expelled by King James II. The annexation of Famagusta, the most important commercial centre of Cyprus, by Genoa is regarded as an economic downfall in modern scholarship.35 The year of 1473, however, represents the end of the Lusignan hegemony and the beginning of the Venetian protectorate. In July 1473, when the last Lusignan monarch King James II died, his spouse Catherina Corner inherited the crown and in 1489 Cyprus became a Venetian colony until the Ottoman conquest of the island.36

In fact, understanding the commercial role maintained by Famagusta in the Levant trade is not only providing new insights into the history of medieval Cyprus but also into the commercial dynamics of Levantine trade as well. Moreover, it would be impossible to examine the trade policies of Venice and Genoa in the Levant during the late medieval period.

without understanding the crucial role of Famagusta as a centre for such merchant companies in the Eastern Mediterranean. In terms of the economic activities of the late medieval Mediterranean, the period from the late thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries represents the economic development of Venice and Genoa, and in terms of politics the radically transformed situation regarding the disputes between Muslims and Christians. The political and diplomatic context in general is well-known. After the fall of Acre, the occupation of the crusaders in Syria and Palestine came to an end. This was not merely a political defeat, but also brought about a dramatic fall in the production and distribution in the Mediterranean area. During the period preceding the fall of Acre, the port of Acre served as a main gate for southern European merchants and considering the Levantine trade it was the main distribution centre of Eastern and Western goods. As the main market networks in the Levant were destroyed after the conquest of Acre, the distribution of goods was interrupted and the migration of the Christian population out from the fallen cities changed the established trade links and necessarily the commercial dynamics.\(^37\) From an economical point of view, the changes were significant and destructive for the mercantile nations. All these changes had an impact on the way the Levantine commercial network was re-established and on the efforts of Venice and Genoa in an attempt to control the Levantine trade accompanied with the creation of powerful merchant companies in the Mediterranean.

From the late thirteenth and fourteenth century onwards, Eastern Mediterranean port cities became large-scale trading settlements and were used as main business centres by Western maritime nations. These ports, now called *emporia* by historians, were an important part of the economic expansion of Venice and Genoa. The markets that existed in these ports were a vital part of an external economic policy of the Western maritime nations where the produced, consumed, imported and exported articles were all gathered. The port of

Famagusta took its place among the three most important *emporia* (with Alexandria and Laiazzo) in the Eastern Mediterranean and its intermediary role within the East-West trade contributed to its continuous rise and prosperity, especially from the early-fourteenth century until fifteenth century.

Indeed, regarding the Mediterranean long-distance trade the mid-fourteenth century should be regarded as a turning-point. In general, one can safely conclude that trade in the mid-fourteenth century peaked and then declined. The continuous expansion of the Mongols along the Silk Road and their siege of Caffa in 1345 which resulted with the spread of the Mongolian army to the Golden Horde (1346) jeopardized the Genoese business in Crimea. Caffa played an extremely important role regarding the Genoese trade policy in the Black Sea; thus they aimed to divert northern Black Sea traffic to Caffa. The ports of Pera, Caffa and Trebizond were the main commercial centres where oriental wares and goods were exchanged and the security of the Black Sea route mostly depended on the Caffa-Trebizond route. The Mongol threat in the Black Sea (especially in Tana and Caffa) and the devastation caused by the Black Death affected the Eurasian commercial network of the Italian maritime republics in general, although Genoese and Venetian merchants continued to conduct their business around the Black Sea. The interruption of the overland trade and the insecurity caused by the Mongols resulted in irrevocable shifts in the economic policies of Genoa and Venice. Apparently, the local ports situated in the Eastern Mediterranean became the most important part of the long-distance trade and commercial links established with the

---

38 Coureas (2005), p. 129.
41 Cosmo (Brill, 2005), p. 394; Cosmo (Roma, 2005), pp. 282-3.

The formation of the Italian maritime powers namely Venice and Genoa together with the smaller nations such as the Florentines, Catalans, Sicilians, Anconitans and Pisans in Famagusta also provided easy access to Westerners in the Mediterranean territories in terms of commercial matters. The part the Venetians and Genoese took in the island’s economic ties and strategic importance was a prominent one. First of all, the dominance enjoyed by Venice and Genoa in the Mediterranean and Black Sea was a kind of guarantee that the Kingdom of Cyprus was safe from any possible attack from Egypt or Syria.\footnote{Mackenzie, ‘‘Consuls and Communities’’ (1994), p. 164.} At the same time, the presence of the Venetian and Genoese trading companies in Famagusta strengthened the commercial links between the island and the West. As will be seen, the Western capital, shipping and investment were substantial, which at the same time contributed to the wealth of Famagusta. Another prominent feature of the commercial dynamics was the collaboration of the Genoese and Venetian merchants even in war-time. The war between Venice and Genoa that started in 1293 and the attack upon the Genoese loggia and tower in Limassol by the Venetian fleet in 1294 politically worsened the Venetian-Genoese relations. When the Venetian fleet sailed to Famagusta, the royal castellan told Genoese merchants that he could not guarantee their safety and advised them to take refuge in Nicosia. However, despite the conflict between the Venetian and Genoese governments,
the Genoese and Venetian merchant communities in Cyprus continued to do business together effectively.\textsuperscript{44}

Moreover, Cyprus was the main centre for contraband trade with Mamluk states of the mainland. This, however, indicates how powerful the particular merchant companies established in Famagusta were. It would seem, therefore, that the papal embargos were not effective on Western merchants operating in Famagusta.\textsuperscript{45} As will be seen, the notarial acts from the period reveal violations of the papal embargo by merchants, but also the ineffectiveness of the Lusignan King in preventing piracy and providing security to the merchants conducting trade in the Mediterranean. On the other hand, the contraband trade despite the papal embargo’s, alone enough to understand the degree of economic and political liberty gained by the merchant companies established in Famagusta. In its wider context, however, the trade with the Muslim territories involved a struggle for the control of trade networks established long before the fall of Acre. Considering the supremacy of the Genoese in the Black Sea and their increasing commercial interest in the Mediterranean it was a great opportunity for them to control trade with the East which would allow them to control these regions at the same time. Also Venice was seeking possible alternatives to provide security to its merchants operating in the Eastern territories and keep its share in the Mediterranean monopoly since the Black Sea was under the Genoese hegemony.\textsuperscript{46}

Meanwhile, the fall of Acre in 1291 and its economic consequences are important to understand the changing roles of port cities. The disappearance of the Christian strongholds in the Holy Land and papal embargo on trade with the Mamluk territories (1291-1344), necessitated alternative trade routes, whereby the islands of Rhodes and Cyprus, Little

\textsuperscript{44} Coureaus (2005), p. 131; Mackenzie (1994), pp. 163-5.
\textsuperscript{45} On contraband trade see Richard, J. ‘Le royaume de Chypre et l’embargo sur le commerce avec l’Egypte (fin XIIe-debut XVe siècle)’, Croisades et états latins d’Orient, Variorum Reprints, (London, 1992), pp. 120-34.
\textsuperscript{46} For Genoese supremacy in the Black Sea trade, See; Balard. M. “Gênes dans l’histoire economique de la mer Noire (XIIIe-XVe siècles)”, in Bulgaria Pontica Medii Aevi, 2, 1988, pp. 86-127; Baletto, L. Genova, Mediterraneo, Mar Nero (secc. XII-XV), (Genova, 1976).
Armenia, Constantinople, and the Black Sea ports become main markets where the merchants of Genoa and Venice conducted their business.\textsuperscript{47} Although, the evidence presented in the following chapters does not agree with the \textit{theory} of the ‘\textit{sudden rise}’ of Famagusta, the effects of the fall of Acre on trade routes and the commercial policy of Westerners is not even negotiable. Evidently, after the loss of Crusader strongholds in the mainland, Ayas, Alexandria and Famagusta became the three main emporia of the Levant where Oriental and Western goods gathered for the import and export. From a long-term perspective, the role of Famagusta in the Mediterranean trade also reveals the changes in the topography of trade and commercial networks which were established by the Italian sea powers. The diversified economic links between the Western merchant colonies established in Famagusta and the Mamluk territories also brought new economic and socio-cultural parameters to the Levantine trade. However, that is not to say that the above mentioned factors such as loss of Crusader strongholds in the mainland, the destruction of the older trade routes, and political obstacles were the only reasons for Famagusta’s transformation. Famagusta already had trade links with the Levantine port cities due to its Genoese merchant community. Its strategic position was also an important factor that differentiated it from other port cities. Located in the Mediterranean Sea facing the coasts of Syria and its proximity to the southern coasts of Turkey, Famagusta had always attracted attention. The opportunity finally presented itself after the fall of Acre in 1291, at a time when hostility between the Latins and Muslims swiftly grew and established trade networks were damaged. Especially, during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the city of Famagusta undertook the role of a channel between East and West which was supposed to shorten the journey of Latin ships, and thus the Christian merchants from all over Europe would soon become citizens of Famagusta. Moreover,

contrary to the common belief Famagusta continued to serve the interests of Venice and Genoa during the fifteenth century.
(iv) **Salamis as a key to understanding the early economic development of medieval Famagusta**

Without examining the major reasons behind the ‘‘decline’’ of Salamis, it is difficult to understand the early economic development of medieval Famagusta. For this reason, the economic ‘rise’ and ‘decline’ of Salamis and its possible contribution to the early economic development of Famagusta is discussed in the Appendix due to the word limitation. The main aim of this section is to answer the questions such as: how and to what extent the ‘‘decline’’ of Salamis contributed to the so-called ‘‘rise’’ of Famagusta? Was the port of Salamis still active between the seventh and the tenth centuries? Can we consider Byzantine period’s numismatic, ceramic and written evidence as proving a continuity of commercial activities? Did the Famagusta port simply become important at the end of thirteenth century or it was active during the Byzantine period as well?

Asking appropriate and concise questions is a difficult task when one is seeking to examine the early economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta. Especially, the lack of archaeological evidence and paucity of the reports from excavations that took place before the year 1974 makes the subject even more complicated. Needless to say, the war in 1974 was not only caused by the territorial demarcation but also that of the cultural heritage and consequently prevented the archaeological activities in the north. Due to the above mentioned deficiencies it is not possible to develop a reliable historical chronology of Salamis without comparing the existing evidence with other urban sites (such as Pafos, Soloi, Saranda Kolones, Kourion). The aim of this section is to yield background information for the Chapter 2 where the economic development of medieval Famagusta and its commercial links will be dealt with in detail. In the following pages an attempt is made to elucidate the possible correlation between the decline of Salamis and the ‘‘rise of Famagusta’’. The first concern is
to understand the economic ‘‘rise’’ and ‘‘decline’’ of Salamis in order to discuss how/if the decline of Salamis contributed (directly or indirectly) to the economic development of Famagusta and at the same time, the wealth of the city. In this sense, the case of Salamis is significant: first, it provides a historical background for the analysis of Late Roman and Byzantine period economic dynamics. Second, it is also important to understand the commercial web established between the eastern port-cities of the island and the wider world. In order to better understand the social context of the period under discussion, the historical background and changing political and economic dynamics will first be discussed based on literary, archaeological and numismatic evidence. After that, the social and economic developments in the later Byzantine period (based on numismatic evidence) and the peculiarity of the decline of Salamis and the ‘‘rise’’ of Famagusta will be scrutinized.

Rather than following the existing hypothesis’ on the economic ‘‘rise of Famagusta’’ during the late thirteenth century the focus of this section is the reasons behind the decline of Salamis and the complex picture of the economic development of Famagusta. Considering the methodological approach of this section it is necessary to mention that due to the lack of available archaeological material (Salamis/Constantia has been excavated recently by Ankara University but reports and findings are not yet published) the method of comparative analysis is used in order to explain the economic dynamics of the period explicitly. Unfortunately, the inaccessibility of the archaeological material from recent excavation in Salamis also prevents fresh ideas about typology and chronology. In fact, another major roadblock here is the ‘‘dichotomist’’ approaches and interpretations of the existing evidence where the majority of the scholars prefer to divide Byzantine Cyprus into three periods.\footnote{In this view the first period stretches from the late fifth until the early seventh century, the second from the so-called Byzantine reconquista in 965 CE to the Third Crusade in 1192; they are separated by the ruinous Arab raids of the mid-seventh century, which ushered the island into three centuries of impoverishment.” Zavagno, L. “At the Edge of Two Empires: The Economy of Cyprus between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (650s-800s CE)”, Dumbarton Oaks Papers, (vols. 65 and 66), (2011-12), p. 121. For the traditional approaches} This kind of retrospective
approach has some obvious disadvantages, as will be seen, such as analyzing the history of medieval Cyprus with today’s political criteria. In addition to this, the limited number of coins, lead seals and ceramic findings restricts available material enough so as to make approaching the subject confidently somewhat problematic. A focus on the multiple materials and sites in order to develop comparative analysis also has some shortcomings.

A comprehensive analysis of the coinage and lead seals and pottery from Byzantine Cyprus has been done by David Metcalf and John Hayes; two important archaeologists. Hayes provided a framework for the Fine Ware ceramics found at Cyprus and developed a typology and chronology of the ceramics founded at the Salamis excavations. However, both Metcalf and Hayes used the method of ‘absence’ or ‘presence’ of the material (such as coins, ceramics and lead seals) as an indicator of ‘continuity’ and ‘discontinuity’. Their method of chronology and typology concerning Byzantine Cyprus in general have never been challenged by other historians simply because of the lack of the archaeological evidence concerning northern Cyprus and the unavailability of the newly excavated material from Salamis/Constantia. In this sense, their analysis of Byzantine Cyprus and their identification of the chronology is based on the material unearthed by earlier excavations. The idea that starting from the mid-seventh century up until the ninth century the island witnessed some
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49 On the issue of historians with traditional approaches trying to explain the seventh century conditions see Zavagno, “At the Edge of Two Empires’’ (2011-2012), pp. 122-124.

sort of economic discontinuity (especially because of the Arab raids)\(^{51}\) is challenged by the several historians and archaeologists (such as Tassos Papacostas, Marcus Rautman and recently Luca Zavagno)\(^{52}\) arguing that the Cypriot economy did not shatter until the middle of the eighth century.

Contradictory to the existing scholarly literature, most of which consists of conservative and pessimistic visions, this section follows a comparative analysis methodology to explore the so called period of “‘decline’” in Salamis by examining the several urban sites and written sources and comparing with the archaeological evidence in order to develop a more consistent chronology. As it will be seen, during the eighth and ninth centuries the administrative and socio-economic networks still existed and the available archaeological evidence is insufficient to support the idea that the monetary economy was disrupted by Arab raids. By mapping the internal and external economic networks of Salamis/Constantia, this section claims to bring a clear vision and a more consistent chronology to the patterns of economic continuity and discontinuity regarding the seventh and eight centuries that are considered a period of decline by the more conservative historians. Additionally, an in-depth analysis of the coins, lead seals and ceramics together with a new Arabic manuscript (or portulan), has enabled the author to reconstruct and slightly amend the picture of the period, with reference to urban continuity, administrative and fiscal dynamics, and networks of internal/external trade. Such an analysis makes it possible to establish a correlation between “‘decline’” of Salamis and the so called “‘rise’” of Famagusta and to identify the changing patterns of economic dynamics within the larger context of the Levantine world.


CHAPTER 2

Economic Development and the Role of Famagusta in Levant Trade from the late Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries

2.1 Economic functionality of the Limassol and Famagusta ports before the fall of Acre (1291):

Historians have produced a number of works regarding the rise of medieval Famagusta and its political and commercial relations with the western world during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\(^{53}\) However, there are still many questions left to be tackled. In the following pages, the focus will be on the themes that remain untouched or under-examined through a critical approach which re-analyses the existing theories in the current literature. For this purpose, the establishment of the merchant companies and their social and economic roles in Limassol and Famagusta will be dealt with in a broader framework based on archival documents, particularly the notarial acts. Also medieval portolans will be used in order to re-question the development of Famagusta. One of the goals of this section is to highlight the economic importance of Famagusta in the light of primary evidence. Although, the notarial acts regarding Famagusta are abundant compared to the earlier periods, the existing evidence concerning the period prior to the 1291 should not be underestimated. In the following pages the aim is to challenge existing presumptions and provide new insights to the subject.

This section explores the changing economic role of Famagusta and Limassol in the Levant trade during the period between 1200 and 1291. It re-examines the pre-existing assumptions regarding the activities of foreign merchant companies and the individuals who were engaged in commerce on the island. Interestingly enough, these merchant companies appeared before the fall of Acre in 1291, which is a significant clue shedding light upon the economic dynamics of medieval Cyprus during the early decades of the thirteenth century. The fact that the Genoese merchant community already existed in Famagusta must draw our attention to the economic potential of Famagusta already in place before the fourteenth century. Most scholars are of the opinion that the fall of Acre in 1291 provided a great contribution to the rise of Famagusta in terms of economic development, and in turn that Famagusta evolved from a moderate port city to a great emporium of the eastern world. One of the goals of this section, however, is to evaluate the existing theories regarding the connection between the ‘‘decline’’ of Limassol and the ‘‘rise’’ of Famagusta.54

In recent years there has been an increasing interest in medieval Famagusta and its flourishing economy after the fall of Acre in 1291. The invasion of Acre by the Mamluks in 1291 partially ended the military and commercial existence of the Latins in the Levant. The fall of the last major Christian stronghold of the Crusader Kingdom of Jerusalem led the Latins to seek new strongholds in order to re-establish their position in the Levantine maritime world.55 In this sense, Cyprus was the only Christian kingdom left to provide the Latins with a secure military base. After the invasion of the Mamluks, Cyprus received a large number of immigrants fleeing from Acre. The refugees of 1291 were primarily Franks and Syrian Christians who had lost their lands and other property. This arrival of the Franks
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and the noble families from the fallen cities of Jerusalem, Acre and Syria ushered in a new era for the island in terms of politics, social life and juridical matters. Recent observations have indicated that Famagusta had an essential role in the late medieval Levantine trade. So far, however, there has been little discussion about the relationship between the decline of Salamis, the ‘fading’ of Limassol and ‘rise’ of Famagusta. Due to the lack of archaeological evidence it is not possible to give a certain answer to the question of whether the decline of Salamis fully contributed to the economic development of Famagusta. Nevertheless, the observations on available numismatic evidence (see Appendix), suggest that Salamis must have been a contributing factor to Famagusta’s economic rise at some level, if not fully. As the issue of the possible relationship between Salamis and the transition of Famagusta will be discussed in a separate section, also, the role of Limassol before the fall of Acre also needs to be reconsidered here in order to reflect the gaps in and approaches to, the earlier period (1200-1291). Traditional discourse on this subject has taken as its starting point the question of the correlation between the large influx of Frankish nobles and Christian Syrians and the rise of Famagusta. David Jacoby and Jean Richard were the first historians to present the theory of direct relation between the economic rise of Famagusta and the substantial growth in the population. To them, the immigrants who settled in Famagusta before and after the fall of the Crusader states in the Levant and papal restrictions were the main reasons behind the development of Famagusta. The correlation that Jacoby and Richard established between demographic and socio-economic factors has continuation in the views of modern authors such as Nicholas Coureas and Peter Edbury.57

I, however, look at the issue from a different standpoint: the changeable role of the Levantine port cities, and choose not to apply or rely on those dichotomist approaches. One should properly re-construct the economic structure of Famagusta in earlier periods rather than viewing Famagusta as abandoned or economically inactive until the late thirteenth century and the economic role of Limassol should not be underestimated. By relying on limited evidence, the generalization of the economic stability and changes before the thirteenth century raises important questions, which need to be explained. First of all, if scholars prefer to explain the ‘rise’ of Famagusta simply by economic and demographic factors triggered by the fall of Acre in 1291, why then did elites, peasants and merchants choose not to settle in Limassol which already lodged a considerable amount of Venetian and Pisan merchant families?

It does, of course, makes sense to argue that the loss of Acre was rather a ‘decisive point’ and it is possible to establish a correlation between the demographic and socio-economic factors that contributed to the so-called ‘rise’ of Famagusta. However, the demographic realities of the period alone are not enough to suggest that refugees from the fallen Crusader states were one of the main factors in transforming Famagusta into a trading centre.58 The stimuli such as the decline of Salamis, the fall of Acre in 1291, the large numbers of immigrants from Levantine port cities, the elites who lost their status, and the convenient anchorage facilities of Famagusta port, no doubt possess a certain degree of validity. But prior to that, the main reasons behind the decline of Limassol need to be revealed by scholars claiming that its port hosted a considerable number of foreigner merchants.

58 For that idea of immigrants playing a major role in Famagusta’s rise, See; Richard, (1979), pp. 168-70; Jacoby (1989), pp. 150-4.
The ‘‘transition’’ of a city has its own idiosyncratic features and a chronology of development, which should not be perceived only in terms of conjunctural and longer term political developments. In fact, we need a substantial amount of evidence in order to limn the so-called ‘‘decline’’ of Limassol, for example demographic catastrophe, long wars, or the disappearance of trade links with the wider world. At this point come the important questions: did any of the aforementioned factors contribute to Famagusta’s so-called ‘‘sudden rise’’ and enable it to displace Limassol? And did Limassol’s port function at any level from the mid-thirteenth century to the late fifteenth century? These are the two questions among many that are of vital importance and need to be answered properly in order to understand the real facts behind the economic dynamics of later periods.

As already mentioned by Nicholas Coureas, despite the fact that the city of Limassol suffered from several calamities and earthquakes, the city continued to play an important role in the commercial life of the island, both before and after the fall of Acre in 1291.59 In addition to the foreigner merchant community living in Limassol, the hinterland of Limassol also played an important part in the Cypriot economy. As it is clear from the notarial acts among many other goods that took their place in the Limassol market; cotton, grain, sugar, wine, carob and salt were largely cultivated and exported to the wider world from the port of Limassol during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.60 Unquestionably, the sugar plantations around Limassol were an important part of the Cypriot economy both before and
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after the fall of the Crusader states in the Levant. In fact, the sugar industry provided Limassol with the great advantage of being an important port on the island. Considering the large number of plantations around Limassol that belonged to the Cornaro family, it is clear that the port of Limassol was still being used for the sugar trade in the late middle ages.\(^{61}\)

However, what is not yet clear is the economic link between Limassol and Famagusta, which will be challenged in order to determine the functionality of Famagusta during the earlier periods. As will be shown in the following pages, scholars have paid little attention to the role of Famagusta during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. One major theoretical issue that has dominated the field for many years concerns the superiority of Limassol harbour and its leading role compared to the other port cities of medieval Cyprus. Indeed, the theory of the superiority of Limassol and its harbour during the earlier periods relies on a small amount of existing Venetian notarial evidence, which will be scrutinized in the following pages. One of the weaknesses of this explanation is that it does not explain the connection between the so-called ‘rise’ of Famagusta and ‘decline’ of Limassol. Apparently, notarial acts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries referring to Limassol clearly reveal that port was actively used by the merchants.\(^{62}\)

The evidence related to early medieval Famagusta suggests that the western merchants had already settled there before the fall of Acre. Considering that the hinterland of Famagusta functioned probably as one of the main production centres from the early
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medieval period onwards, the port of Famagusta was likely to offer an alternative route for the merchants in transporting grains and goods from its hinterland. Thus, the appearance of Genoese merchants, on the evidence provided by the notarial acts regarding Famagusta, proves that the port already had a commercial traffic at a certain level.

It is also worth considering that Famagusta was the only harbour providing good anchorage facilities in the northern coast of the island after the decline of Salamis. This raises questions about the role of Famagusta during the early thirteenth century, which is the main concern of the following pages. Due to the lack of written and archaeological evidence concerning the periods between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries, the focus has always been on the small amount of written and existing monumental evidence for the twelfth century and the later period’s Genoese notarial acts concerning Famagusta used as the main evidence to explain the economic life of Famagusta. Given the scarcity of evidence, sources referring to Limassol before the fall of Acre are not adequate to claim that Famagusta, Paphos and Kyrenia harbours were not contributing to the Levantine trade. In addition, some of the Genoese notarial acts from Armenia are referring to the Genoese merchants living on the island who mainly settled in Famagusta. In this sense, before starting to examine later periods, this section aims to spot the discrepancies between the relationship of the fate of Limassol and the rise of Famagusta as it has not yet been examined.

In terms of the economy of late medieval Cyprus, the period from the twelfth to the fifteenth century must be divided into three sections in order to take account of changes and evolutions. The first period consists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The period between 1191, with the conquest of Cyprus by Richard the Lionheart of England, and 1291, with the fall of Acre wherein Famagusta becomes the ‘‘chief’’ port of the island, is the key point to understanding the so-called ‘‘transformation’’ from small medieval city to Emporium. The second period covers the end of the thirteenth century until the Genoese
takeover of the city in 1374. In this period, Famagusta enjoyed an almost legendary reputation both in the East and West as a hub of international commerce and fabulous wealth. The third period begins with the Genoese hegemony on the island, which is often described as a period of decline for Famagusta. As there is adequate notarial evidence to examine the last two periods, the first period will be examined in the following pages in order to draw attention to the importance of the subject and fill in the gaps.

The economic dynamics of the first period are difficult to define precisely due to the lack of primary evidence. A small amount of travellers’ notes give us a hint of the period when notarial acts are silent. Shortly after the conquest of Richard the Lionheart, a German traveller called Wilibrand von Oldenburg visited the island in 1211 and described Famagusta as a ‘‘civitas sita iuxta mare, habens portum bonum, non multum munita’’. Also, Wilibrand von Oldenburg specifies that the town of Kyrenia was well fortified and its chief boast was its good harbour. However, although Limassol was slightly fortified compared to Kyrenia, its harbour was frequented more than other harbour towns in the island. The commercial manuals called Pratica della Mercatura composed in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries give hints about the Levant trade for a relatively brief period. The earliest Pratica della Mercatura was compiled in 1278 by a Pisan notary and does not refer to Cyprus once. The second so far unpublished manual, compiled in Acre, similarly suggests that Cyprus at this stage was relatively insignificant, although it refers to Cyprus three times. However, it is clear from the state reports and a scant number of notarial acts that Western trading companies settled on the island during the twelfth century. Venice was granted the right to
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64 ‘‘... [we] reached Lamezis (Limassol). This is a city but slightly fortified, lying by the sea, with a much frequented harbour. Here is the first suffragan see of the lord bishop of Nicosia.’’ Cobham, C. Excerpta Cypria, pp. 13-14.
trade in Cypriot harbours during 1136 and the growing importance of Cyprus as a commercial hub was legitimized in 1148 by the grant given to the Venetians by John II Comnenus.\textsuperscript{67} The Venetian trading companies settled mainly in Limassol and Pafos as shown by the notarial acts of the period mentioned.\textsuperscript{68} On this basis, Jacoby’s idea of the ‘function of the island in the maritime relations [being] restricted by geographic and political factors’\textsuperscript{69} is clearly flawed.

As one can see, the economic and social features of Cyprus before the year 1291 have not been searched deeply enough and remain as a matter of debate. Nonetheless, the lack of knowledge concerning especially the early medieval cartography of Cyprus brings serious problems in identifying the function of the port cities on the island. These problems, indeed, contribute to the temptation to link Famagusta’s commercial fame with the fall of Acre. The rarity of late twelfth and early thirteenth century travellers’ accounts, portolans and maps with the representation of the coast line and ports referring to the Famagusta port and other coastal cities on the northern side prioritised the port of Limassol. The main reason of such inductive inferences is based on the lack of archaeological and cartographic evidence. In this case, recently discovered Arabic and Latin manuscripts shed light upon the earlier periods concerning the function of the ports in the Levant.

As it is mentioned in the previous section the Arabic manuscript called the \textit{Book of Curiosities} provides a detailed map of the Mediterranean and depictions of the islands of Sicily and Cyprus with the schematic rectangular shape (while others are indicated with small

\textsuperscript{69} Jacoby (1989), p. 145.
dots) indicating the commercial importance of these islands. The ovoid shaped Mediterranean map includes important port cities such as Constantinople, Tarsus, Mylai (the main port of Silifke), and Rhodes with whom we know Cyprus had commercial links. The mention of the ports of Salamis/Constantia and Famagusta both in the Mediterranean and Cyprus maps is important. Bearing the title of the earliest map of Cyprus known to us, it is clear that the author mentioned only port cities commercially active where he sometimes added the capacity of harbours and principal exports from island.

![Mediterranean Map](image)

Fig. 1 Visualisation of the port cities mentioned in the map of Mediterranean.

In the unique map of medieval Cyprus, there is a mention of a fortress together with Salamis/Constantia. This, however, seems like a typo made by the author probably confused

---

70 Emilie Savage-Smith and Yossef Rapoport (eds.) *The Book of Curiosities: A critical edition*. World-Wide-Web publication. (www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/bookofcuriosities) (March, 2007), fol. 30b-31a Ch. 2.10 (Mediterranean map). Hereafter cited as: *MS Arap*.

71 Ibid, Ch. 2.15, fol. 36b. (*Cyprus map*).
with the fortress of Famagusta. As it is well known from the excavations there is no fortress dateable to the eleventh century from Constantia. In fact, the mention of a *castrum* at the time of Richard of Lionheart’s conquest in 1191 brings that possibility into question.\(^{72}\)

Furthermore, some conclusions also can be drawn from the comparison of Mediterranean and Cyprus maps as well. Unlike the Mediterranean map, there is no mention of Limassol in the map of Cyprus. There is no information about Limassol or any other port city nearby (such as *Hagios Georgios*) that is mentioned in the Mediterranean map. Nor is there any insertion of geographical or topographical information about them. The map of Cyprus includes important ports and some of them described with their capacity. As it is also suggested by Metcalf the omission of Limassol was probably due to political reasons (papal bans or tension between the Latin and Muslim merchants) or that the merchants of Egypt and Syria preferred to sail north coast of Cyprus for some reason.\(^{73}\) The ports of Pafos (*'it has 950 ships'*, Palaia Paphos, al-Atritus, and Kourion are mentioned in the map which are located on the southern coast of the island and anchorages of the River of the King, Lablanas (*'which has a church'*), Kiti and al-Gh.r.yas (unidentified) are the ones located on the eastern half of the south coast.

In addition, nine port cities from the north coast namely al-T.b.s (unidentified), Aqamah, Sulis (*'Soloi; 'in it are the ships of the merchants of Cyprus'*), Lapithos, al-B.laj.rah (or al-Malakharah), Al-Afris, al-Hadi (or al-Khasa), Karpasih (Karpasia), and al-Agri (Cape Apostolos Andreas?) are mentioned including information on wind directions. The anchorages of Salamis/Constantia and Famagusta (east coast) are also mentioned by the author stating that Salamis ‘does not protect from any of the winds’ and ‘harbour of Famagusta protects from all winds except the Euros’.\(^{74}\)

---


\(^{73}\) Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, p. 510.

\(^{74}\) MS Arab, Ch. 2.15, fol. 36b. (*Cyprus map*).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ra's al-`Abbas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(... of Jurjis (Hagios Georgios?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Makhusah (Famagusta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.t.Bun (Bisun)</td>
<td>(Unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qurah (Kourion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A_tbs (or al-B.t.s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqamah (Cape Arnaoutis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulis (Soloi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labis (Lapethos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-B.laj.rah (Ancient port of Makaria)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Afris (Akanthou)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-Hadi (or al-Khasa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karfasiyah (Karpasia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Agri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Agri (Akraia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrubunah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dades (mod. Cape Kiti)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2 A sketch of the map of Cyprus, from the *Book of Curiosities.*
Turning now to another portolan called *Liber de existencia riveriarum* which dates back to ca. 1160 – ca. 1200 edited by P. Gautier-Dalché, this is the earliest among known medieval portolans covering the entire Mediterranean.\(^{75}\) The early portolan was copied out around 1200 and has some insertions about the places and ports. As it includes towns that had been destroyed by the 1100s, at the same time, it refers to the ports that flourished in the thirteenth century. Apart from the Mediterranean, the *Liber* describes the route to the Black Sea starting from the Aegean coast of Asia Minor reaching to Constantinople and from Constantinople to the Black Sea.\(^{76}\) Nevertheless, it provides detailed information about the ports and places in the Mediterranean beginning with northwest Africa and Iberia. Regarding the section of islands the Liber starts with Cyprus and continues with Crete, Sicily and Sardinia.\(^{77}\) It refers to Pafos, Limassol and Famagusta (twice),\(^{78}\) where, unlike the Arabic manuscript, detailed information concerning the cities is not given. However, regarding the Black Sea section David Jacoby believes that the compiler of the Liber relied on information obtained from the Pisan traders operating in the Black Sea. Therefore, it is possible to re-date the section on the Black Sea to the first three decades of the thirteenth century.\(^{79}\) In addition to the Liber, another unpublished nautical guide called *M* is still standing as undated and different when compared to the existing portolans.\(^{80}\) Although, one cannot be sure about the exact date of the manuscript one of the sections of the portolan can be dated to ca. 1270 according to Jacoby. It contains itineraries from Acre to Venice where the ship sails first from Acre towards the Cape St Andreas (nort-east of Cyprus- modern Zafer Burnu) and continues
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\(^{77}\) *Liber*, pp. 171-178.

\(^{78}\) *Liber*, pp. 129 and 171.


\(^{80}\) The title of the nautical guide is *Portolano Dell’Adriatico E Mediterra M.S.S* and was written entirely in Italian. It has been copied during the fifteenth century and derives from the thirteenth century. For the detailed information about the history and preservation of the manuscript see D. Jacoby (2012) ‘Unpublished Medieval Portolan of the Mediterranean in Minneapolis’.
without stopping at the island. However, in another itinerary a ship directly sails from Acre to Limassol.\textsuperscript{81} \textit{M} provides detailed information concerning the island of Cyprus and it also includes the sailing instructions and entries on the port of Famagusta as well. The mention of a tower at the entrance of the port which is attested by 1232 strengthens the idea that the section on Cyprus was compiled or revised around the late thirteenth century. In this case, David Jacoby argues that the rise of Famagusta began around the 1260s and it reached its peak after the fall of the Frankish states in the Levant in 1291. According to him this is the exact period in which the information on Famagusta was added in \textit{M}. However, it should be taken into consideration that the city of Famagusta was displayed on the Pisan map of 1290 and it is missing in the 1296 copy of another portolan called the Compasso. Taken together, the non-appearance of Famagusta (or Cyprus) on the nautical guides, portolans or maps might not always indicate non-activity.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\caption{Visualisation of the Mediterranean islands mentioned in the \textit{Liber}.}
\end{figure}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item [\textsuperscript{81}] Jacoby (2012a), p. 71.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Of course, more written evidence on the economic developments regarding the period prior to 1291 would make this subject clearer. Documents of the twelfth century reveal that Cyprus had commercial contacts with Egypt (Damietta), Acre, Tyre and Constantinople, and it is certain that Venetian companies were active in the ports of Cyprus during the early twelfth century especially in Limassol and Paphos. Although, the Italian nautical guide composed during the thirteenth century only mentions Limassol and Paphos while no mention was made of trade activities in Famagusta, fiscal reports from the twelfth century suggest the opposite.

The evidence of the Venetian settlement and commercial activities revealed by the undated report of thirteenth century mentions 58 town-based and 34 region-based Venetian properties on the island. Unsurprisingly, the large sugar plantations held by Venetian families in and around Limassol and the export of large amounts of sugar to Venice from Cyprus from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries attracted a large amount of the Venetians who constituted the largest merchant community in the city. Most of the families also held rural estates both inside and outside of Limassol. Indeed, the existence of 46 shops and more than 100 houses, which made up the Venetian quarter of Limassol, and rural holdings obviously indicates the agricultural and mercantile activities of the Venetians across the island. In addition to the Venetians, the Pisan community was granted commercial rights and exemptions during the reign of Guy de Lusignan in 1192. It is clear from the Venetian report of the year 1243 that a Pisan community was settled in Limassol which was allegedly more

85 Ibid, p. 497.
active and more intensely frequented than the Famagusta port.\textsuperscript{86} In fact, the earliest evidence of Pisan settlement in Limassol appears in the year of 1210. Even more striking evidence of the island’s commercial importance and Pisan activity during the early thirteenth century comes from an Arabic source. In 1207, Pisan and Venetian merchants departed from Beirut to Alexandria and on their way they stopped in Cyprus in order to buy some merchandise.\textsuperscript{87} Also a Pisan noble called Girard of Maske was mentioned in the records as the owner of a house in Limassol in 1210. The Venetian report of 1243 also mentions Pisans who possessed a courtyard, graveyard, a quarry, shops and a house in Limassol owned by Hugo de Clara.\textsuperscript{88} Therefore, parallel to what the primary evidence suggests, one can argue that the Pisans were a settled and organized community and they most probably had a commercial quarter of their own in Limassol.

The ampleness of the evidence on the Venetian and Pisan habitation in Limassol and rural sites is, in itself, a telltale sign of commercial and agricultural vitality on the island. The appearance of Venetian society together with other foreign merchants in the same city clearly indicates the economic links between Venice and her citizens overseas. And the frequency and pervasiveness of western settlers alongside the merchants by the end of the thirteenth century indicates that they were involved in agricultural production and trade activities. As fiscal documents also reveal, a considerable number of Venetian landowners possessed vineyards, olive groves, mills and orchards not only in Limassol but also in the villages of Pelendri and Trimikline and the southern slopes of the Troodos.\textsuperscript{89} Nevertheless, it is quite incomprehensible that despite the large agricultural production in the hinterland of Famagusta

---

and south-western parts of the island, there is not any mention of the level of merchant activities in the ports of Kyrenia and Famagusta.

Obviously, the lack of sources mentioning Famagusta and its port is the main reason why most historians prefer to attribute Famagusta’s wealth to the fall of Acre in 1291. Most of the studies have also generally adhered to Jacoby, Richard and Ballard’s conclusions about the rise of Famagusta and its role in the Levantine trade. They claim that the island (especially the port of Famagusta) functioned as a commercial hub between the East and West after 1291. Although, these works have proven invaluable for pioneering the study of the socio-economic history of late medieval Famagusta and commercial links between Cyprus and the West, they did let important questions slip from their research. If we are going to assume that the fall of Acre is key to understanding Famagusta’s complicated economic and social development, then one needs to explain why Limassol fell into decline while it was a main centre for commerce. Likewise, it is important to find an answer to the question: was the agricultural potential centred at the southern part of the island? Generally speaking, merchant communities were a prerequisite for a port city to be named as an emporium; however, agricultural production and agrarian producers must be regarded as an important supplying element that made those cities thrive.

As it is well known, Kolossi, and Episcopi near Limassol, and Mamonia, Phinika, Emba, Lemba, Akhelia, and Kouklia near Paphos, had the best sugar plantations. Without doubt, the sugar monopoly, controlled mainly by the Venetians and the Hospitallers, was the most important part of the economy and these aforementioned places were the sugar suppliers


of Venice and Genoa. The intense sugar production and exportation from Cyprus to the wider world also revealed in the Genoese notarial acts from the late-thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. On the other hand, in the west the Solia valley was famous for its fruit trees, vines and olives and the coastal plains of the south were equally well watered.\(^\text{92}\) While the aforementioned places remained important suppliers to the growing economic potential of medieval Cyprus, it is necessary to examine the role of the northern hinterland and its contribution to the economic growth.

Similar to Episkopi and Kolossi, the cultivation of sugar also took place in the areas of the north with access to water such as Kouklia, Paleokytro (Balikesir) and Kanakaria in the northern plain and also Lapithos (Lapta) in Kyrenia, Morphou (Omorfo) and Lefka (Lefke). Moreover, the northern narrow coastal plain called Kyrenia was famous for its forests. It is highly likely that Kyrenia acted as an important centre for the timber used in ship building.\(^\text{93}\) Apparently, from the twelfth to sixteenth centuries, the Mesaria plain was the centre of grain production. The cultivation of crops such as barley (harvested 1.6 million bushels in late fifteenth-early sixteenth century), oats, legumes (beans between 13,000 and 40,000 hectolitres), peas, lentils, chick peas and black vetches), onions (represented one of the most important export productions of the island) and the cotton in the Mesaria plain indicates that a considerable amount of manpower was needed for the harvest. In most of the villages the lords had their holdings (\textit{demaine}) adjoining the lands cultivated by the peasants, which indicates that the Mesaria region held its place in the medieval Cypriot economy.\(^\text{94}\) The \textit{Pedieos River} (Kanlı Dere) flowed through the northeast, providing water to the Mesaria plain and eliminated the common problem of drought. Due to its potential profitability, the sugar industry spread to the northern hinterland. It is not known, however, if the sugar
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\(^{93}\) Ibid, pp. 333 and 341.
\(^{94}\) Ibid, pp. 334-340.
plantations of the north were as large as the Episkopi plantations, which were considered to be the heart of the Venetian Cornaro family’s estates. The plantations in the north were managed by the Corner family who possessed the sugar plantations in the vicinity of Kyrenia, in the royal domains of Lapithos, Lefke and Morphou.95

When considering the aforementioned realities, the theory of the ‘sudden rise’ of Famagusta in relation with the fall of Acre needs to be revisited in more detail by examining the earlier economic and social dynamics of the island. There are, however, other possible explanations for Famagusta’s function as a commercial hub before the thirteenth century. As in many other aspects of the institutional structuring and economic relationship between the Latin merchant colonies and the Lusignan administration, the small amount of remaining evidence can, though, be a misleading guide to this issue. As far as the Latin merchants of Cyprus were concerned, it appears business was not centralised merely in Limassol but in Famagusta as well. As trade routes changed and financial diplomacy between East and West gained new momentum after the loss of Crusader outposts in the Levant, bureaucracy and a record of the movement of trade become more important and all merchants and their goods were registered on entry. As a result of such implementation, the abundance of documents concerning the trade activities in Famagusta during the later periods cannot be compared to documents relating to the economic activities between Limassol and the West during the earlier periods. However, the rare appearance of Famagusta in the documents belonging to the former periods does not mean that the city did not function economically at all. The development and administrative process of port cities in medieval Cyprus before the late thirteenth century remains a problem for historians to clarify. There is not adequate documentation to understand and examine the economic and governmental dynamics, which have led scholars to divide the history of Famagusta into ‘‘before and after the fall of Acre’’.

The evidence of the foreign inhabitants of Limassol, of course, constitutes the heart of the hypothesis of ‘Limassol’s superiority against Famagusta until 1291’.

Nevertheless, recent works overlook the Genoese presence and their activities on the island which is one of the key points to understanding Famagusta’s earlier role. Latin merchants had been settled on the island as early as the Byzantine era. More were induced to conduct business on the island even by the conquest of the island in 1192 and they were the main reason for the large merchant settlement in Limassol, where their presence may have influenced Venetian and Pisan merchants who specifically choose to settle in Limassol. The efforts of Guy de Lusignan to buy the island from the Templars in 1192 were interrupted by a lack of money. He was given two months by the Templars to find 60,000 bezants as a down payment on 100,000. In this matter, Guy appointed his chancellor Peter of Angouleme, who according to the chronicle of Guillaume de Tyr raised the money from merchants in Tripoli in a few weeks. It was most likely Genoese merchants that provided large sums of money to Guy de Lusignan initially to pay the first instalment in order to buy the kingdom from the Templars.

One point that requires attention is the matter concerning the appearance of the Genoese in the documents as ‘‘burgenses Cypri’’ by 1200. Nevertheless, the agreement of 1218 with the King of Cyprus that led the Genoese community to appoint their own consuls in the island is the indication of a substantial presence of the settled Genoese on the island. The political relations between Genoa and Cyprus become closer in 1232 when King Henry I signed a treaty with two Genoese representatives called Guglielmo dell’Orto and Ugo Ferrario. The treaty of 1232, however, can be perceived as an improved form of the

agreement of 1218. After having gained the right to be represented by their own consuls for civil cases, the Genoese citizens obtained another right to have their own courts in the case of criminal matters. Those who benefited from the agreement were mentioned as ‘‘omnes et singuli Januenses et dicti Januenses et omnes descendentes ex eis’’. Meanwhile, as Guglielmo dell’Orto and Ugo Ferrario were described as ‘‘consules et vicecomites Januensium in Syria’’ and there is no specific mention of the Genoese officials of Cyprus, it might be suggested that they were subsidiary to their compatriots in Syria. At this point, the dependence of Genoese officials in Cyprus upon the Genoese consuls in Syria might suggest a possible commercial relationship between Cyprus and Syria undertaken by Genoese merchants during the first decades of the thirteenth century. Indeed, another treaty signed in 1233 clearly supports this hypothesis. After the negotiations between the King Henry and the Genoese representative Catellano de Savignono both parties agreed that King Henry would protect all Genoese possessions in Syria and Cyprus in return for Genoese support for the King and his barons in all cases.100

Genoese notarial records from Armenia in the 1270s reveal the economic traffic between Cyprus and the mainland, which also gives proof to the Genoese merchant presence on the island.101 The Genoese merchants are attested on the island as early as 1203 and in 1218 they were granted various privileges from Queen Alice, the widow of King Hugh I. In addition to the freedom to sell and buy and to import and export, the Genoese merchant community of Cyprus owned properties in both Nicosia and Famagusta.102 Moreover, the

cooperation between the Genoese and King Henry I during the Civil War of 1229-33 against the German Emperor Frederick II (which resulted in the takeover of Kyrenia harbour from the Cypriot adherents of Frederick) tightened the relationship between Genoa and the King of Cyprus. The support of the Genoese was recompensed generously by the King Henry I in 1232 with a new treaty, which enhanced their legal rights and commercial privileges.\textsuperscript{103} During the same period, the Genoese community continued to expand, gaining houses in Nicosia, the shore tower and the royal customs house in Limassol and houses in Paphos. In addition to these, they benefited from King Henry’s protection, which guaranteed the protection of persons and properties subjected to Genoa on both land and sea.\textsuperscript{104} Mention should also be made of a Venetian portolan compiled around 1270. The incomplete Venetian portolan suggest that commercial links between Acre and Europe included Cyprus but mention only Limassol rather than the ports of Famagusta, Kyrenia or Pafos. Again, the Venetian commercial handbook of Zibaldone da Canal gives the same impression by mentioning only the link between Acre and Limassol. Moreover, at the beginning of the 1280s and into the 1290s it appears trade between Cyprus and Venice become more frequent. Admittedly, the visit of Venetian ambassadors respectively in 1285, 1286 and 1288, for political and commercial purposes would be sufficient to illustrate Cyprus’ importance in Levantine trade and that its strategic potential attracted Venice’s attention well before the fall of Acre.\textsuperscript{105}

In the case of the Genoese merchants, even though the notarial documents hold limited evidence concerning economic activities in Famagusta during the early thirteenth century, their appearance in the commercial contracts suggest that there were links between the Genoese merchants of Famagusta and other Genoese colonies established in the

\textsuperscript{103} Coureas (2005), p. 123.  
\textsuperscript{104} Ibid, p. 124.  
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid, p. 125.
Levantine port cities. Indeed, considering that the western maritime nations’ economic success in the overseas was depending on existence of the merchant colonies settled in different port cities, one can claim that the scarce appearance of merchant activities in Famagusta during the early thirteenth century can be explained with the lack of notarial and archaeological evidence concerning Famagusta and Cyprus in general during the mentioned period. However, considering that the Genoese, Venetians, Tuscans and Catalans dominated the external carrying trade during the thirteenth century and that the growth of merchant colonies were based on small commercial networks between the foreigner port cities, the importance of the Genoese merchant community in Famagusta should be taken into consideration. Another important point to be considered is the collaboration between different merchant companies. The documents relating to the Genoese trade activities between Sicily, Tunis and Majorca where they had colonies reveal that the Genoese merchants were collaborating together with the Pisan, Catalan and Majorcan merchants. Nevertheless, the names appearing on the notarial acts regarding the shipping licenses both in Majorca and Tunis show that the Genoese merchants were also operating together with other foreign merchant companies.\(^\text{106}\) It is possible that the Genoese merchants in Cyprus were working in co-operation with the Venetian and Pisan merchants who settled in Limassol. However, it is not possible to know if the acts that referred both to the Venetians and Pisans are including Genoese merchants as their short-term partners. The notarial acts are obscure regarding the names, as they do not specifically mention national identities except for individuals bearing the distinctive surnames and well-known noble families. Therefore, it is generally difficult to differentiate the identities through the merchants’ names in the notarial acts.

The difficulty of differentiating the identity of merchants by examining their names becomes more comprehensible when one considers the merchants of minor trading powers

who were bearing more than one identity. In the case of the foreign merchants in Cyprus, the “minor trading powers” and their activities on the island are worth mentioning in order to understand how western merchant establishments worked. Especially, during the second half of the thirteenth century trade between Mamluk dominions and western trading nations become more intense. The Pisans were active in trade with Egypt especially before the fall of Acre. Together with them, merchants from Florence and San Gimignano established a commercial link between Acre, Damietta and Alexandria from 1270 onwards. By conducting business together with the Pisans, both merchants from Florence and San Gimignano claimed to be the citizens of Pisa.  

At this point, the Pisan community in Cyprus most probably included merchants from different nations who would not be able to obtain any commercial privilege in Cyprus. In addition to them, the merchants of Ancona and Provence were also involved in trade with Cyprus. Although the Anconitan merchants appear to be in the island towards 1272, Provençals obtained commercial privileges at the beginning of Frankish domination. In October 1198, the King Amaury, gave privilege to the merchants of Marseille and exempted them from the tax concerning entering and leaving the port. In fact, when the Marseillan consul of Acre visited the King of Cyprus in 1236 the same privileges were extended to the other Provençal cities as well. According to the second treaty, for the articles carried to the ports of Cyprus from Syria, the Konya sultanate, or west coast of Asia for the purpose of selling by the Provençal merchants they should pay 1 besant. In the case of unsold merchandise from Syria they were allowed to re-export it without any payment.  

From this point of view, one can suggest that the Pisan community of Limassol was not consisted of Pisans only.

Indeed, Venice and Genoa were the ones that dominated the European trade with the Moslem Levant during the second half of the thirteenth century and it expanded in regard to the international trade that reached its peak during that period. The treaty signed in Cairo in 1275 strengthened the position of Genoa in the Levant which also aimed to connect shipping routes between Crimea, Egypt and Syria. Despite the fact that part of the Genoese navy joined the Crusaders against the Mamluks, they were successful in holding their position in Alexandria. In 1288, when the Genoese diplomat, Benedetto Zaccaria, made a treaty with the king of Cyprus against the sultan of Cairo, it was disapproved of immediately by the Genoese government.\(^{109}\) On the other hand, together with the Genoese community, Pisan and Venetian merchants were also involved in the Levantine trade during the 1270s. Primary evidence reveals that merchants from Pisa, Florence, and Venice were active in Alexandria and that Pisan merchants held a privileged status in Egypt.\(^{110}\) Indeed, as is mentioned before the Pisans were granted privileges from Guy de Lusignan in 1192. Their appearance on the island conducting business in 1207 while travelling from Beirut to Egypt suggests that they were involved in Levantine trade long before the 1270s.\(^{111}\) Regarding the presence of “Italian trading nations” in the Levantine port cities and the reality that western merchant companies were in contact with their compatriots settled in different port cities, it can be proposed that foreign merchant companies in Cyprus were in contact with their compatriots. When considering the Genoese supremacy in the Levantine trade, there must have been commercial links between Genoese merchants settled in Egypt, Syria and Famagusta.

It is not, however, a surprise that Venetian documents mention only Limassol’s port, since almost all the Venetian and Pisan merchant community preferred to live in Limassol. It is clear from the documents that the Genoese were the only merchant community among
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\(^{109}\) Ashtor, E. *Levant Trade*, pp. 10-11.


others who were interested in Famagusta during the early and middle thirteenth century. Evidently, Genoese presence in Famagusta before 1291 gives us some hints about the functionality of Famagusta and its harbour. As shown by the Genoese notarial acts from Armenia, in addition to the Venetian and Pisan merchants of Limassol, the Genoese merchants of Famagusta developed trade links between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia. According to the acts drawn up by Pietro di Bargone in 1277-79, a Genoese notary resident in “Laiazzo” (Ayas), a Genoese merchant, Otto Blanchard, stated that he owned a ship with another Genoan, John of Quarto, of Famagusta, and they conducted trade three times with that ship. In 1277, Rici di Noli sold iron to John of Camarlengo, a load which was supposed to be on its way to Nicosia. In this case, Nicholas Coureas rightly suggests that although the above-mentioned transaction omits the port of unloading, J. Camarlengo might have unloaded his goods either in Famagusta or Kyrenia, rather than Limassol due to their proximity to Nicosia. In April 1279, a Genoese merchant, named Peter of Giusulfo, appointed Arancio of Limassol as a procurator to act for him and whose name suggests that he was a resident of Limassol. Arancio appears to have been most active in Laiazzo as a merchant and general representative for others at the same time. In another transaction dated back to 1279, Roland appointed a procurator in order to recover a debt from William di Addone sive Cypro, however, no specific town is mentioned.112 Most probably, the Genoese merchants of Famagusta had commercial links with Laiazzo just as their compatriots residing in Limassol had. The presence of these Genoese merchants both in Limassol and Famagusta suggests that there was commercial potential in Famagusta at some level. Notarial evidence allows us to talk about a community in Famagusta, although it is not possible to draw a clear picture as to exact numbers of these merchants. The main limitation of the aforementioned notarial acts is the question of a number of them being permanent settlers, which remains entirely unclear. It

112 Coureas (1995), pp. 126 and 150; CSFS 53 [2], nos. 46, 72, 118, 128.
is possible that, along with the Genoese population in Famagusta, also, other merchants from different nations also conducted trade in Famagusta. However, if they did not have their own consular representation (such as the Venetians and Pisans) they may likely have traded under the banner of a larger nation, which would leave no trace and make them impossible to find.

It should not be forgotten that one of the main reasons behind the creation of merchant establishments in foreign ports was the need for security. It is highly possible that such establishments served the Genoese merchant community in Famagusta as they did in Limassol.

To sum up, Famagusta port with its natural protection probably served as a refuge for the displaced populace from what is now called Salamis (Byzantine Constantia) long before it welcomed refugees from Acre and Tyre. It is still not certain what function the refugees from Salamis served. However, the large amount of immigrants from Syria and Palestine in 1291 to Famagusta should not be interpreted as the only reason for Famagusta’s so-called ‘sudden rise’. One should also remember that the knowledge of the demographic and political dynamics of Famagusta before and shortly after the fall of Acre is an important factor in understanding the nature of hybrid society and the political conflicts but not the economic framework and functionality of the port. In this case, it is not true to attribute Famagusta’s economic fame to the large influx of immigrants or political strides. Another important point that needs to be mentioned here is the process of economic preparation and transformation of the port. The transformation process of medieval Famagusta from port city to entrepôt must have happened gradually as it is not possible to turn a city into an entrepôt that has no external commercial links, international market and long-run potential economic growth. Considering the later periods, the Genoese merchants’ presence in Famagusta reveals much about the potential trading activities in the city even though they were far fewer than the Venetians and Pisans who resided in Limassol. However, existing evidence is still not enough
to evaluate the entire dynamics of the early to the mid-thirteenth century and the role of Famagusta. Considering that the Genoese community in Cyprus primarily dealt with commerce, their properties in Famagusta and Nicosia indicate that they were active in both cities at least by 1218. To this should be added the possibility of connections with other regional markets. As opposed to the reductionist and single-factor approaches, it is clear from the notarial evidence that commercial business between Laiazzo and Famagusta took place already during the early thirteenth century. This indicates that Genoese merchants were already active in regional trade and most likely received external support from Genoa. Exactly, what the triggering factors were for Genoese merchants to settle in Famagusta while Venetian and Pisan merchants chose Limassol during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries is another question, which is not entirely clear due to the lack of archaeological evidence. But it is certain that the Genoese merchants of Famagusta were involved both in internal and external trade. Regarding their commercial activities, it is clear that trading companies and individual merchants were active in Limassol and Famagusta both before and after the fall of Acre. Working from this consensus, it is not possible to say that Famagusta’s fame depends on the events of 1291; the same applies to Limassol as well. Although I disagree with any single-factor approach in history, it is true that after the loss of Acre and Tyre, the great numbers of refugees arriving in Famagusta necessitated a balance between population and resources, which contributed to the economy in a positive way. Does this take us to economic determinism? Certainly not; the sudden population growth does not mean that the history of medieval Famagusta can be explained only by demographic rises or falls. Nonetheless, one may ask the question why did such great numbers of foreign merchants still prefer to do business in Limassol during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries rather
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113 See Papacostas (1999b); Coureas (1995), p. 257; For original source, see Mas Latrie, ii, p. 39.
114 For the trading activities in the Limassol port in the light of notarial acts during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, See Coureas, N. “Commercial Activity in the Town of Limassol during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries” in EKEE, 28 (Nicosia, 2002).
than enjoying the great commercial opportunities in Famagusta? It is more likely that both port cities functioned together and their roles and importance were changeable according to the political dynamics. Moreover, it should be noted that although the demographic dynamics occasionally depend on economic changes, it is essential to examine the process and rate of urban self-supply and small-scale family production, which will allow historians to re-interpret the role of medieval Famagusta in the Levant. Future research should therefore concentrate on the investigation of archaeological evidence in order to determine the rate of agricultural production in the hinterland of Famagusta and the nature of its population. Although historical documents refer partially to the economic and socio-cultural life of late medieval Famagusta, it is not possible to draw a complete picture of both the early and medieval period without further archaeological evidence.

Finally, the analysis of the Byzantine and Early Frankish archaeology of Famagusta is not yet even started due to the political restrictions. For this reason, the methodological approaches concerning medieval Famagusta are constrained in various ways. The abundance of notarial evidence concerning the later periods and the appearance of Famagusta in them often misleads historians into applying a reductionist approach. However, in the case of Famagusta there are still the missing notarial acts of other foreigner nations which led historians to rely on documents belonging to the Genoese notaries for the later periods. Thus, the lack of archaeological data concerning Famagusta and rural centres in the north prevents possible comparative analysis in order to reveal the development of Famagusta step by step from the Middle Byzantine to the end of Frankish period. But, as it is mentioned before, it is becoming clear that Famagusta took its place in the Levantine trade long before the fall of Acre in 1291. It is already almost certain that a Genoese merchant community settled in Famagusta was involved with the wider trade despite their colleagues from different nations choosing to be settling in Limassol. The aspects of the early Frankish period of Famagusta
should not be examined only by available notarial documents and existing monumental evidence. Considering the period of the early Frankish era, we should admit that neither the archaeological data, nor the historical documentation, nor the hinterland of Famagusta, are yet sufficiently understood. Therefore, regarding the period 1191 to 1291, the absence of evidence is not ‘evidence of absence’.\textsuperscript{115}

\textsuperscript{115} Opposite to the reductionists approaches in general, See Dunn, A. “The rise and fall of towns, loci of maritime traffic, and silk production: the problem of Thisvi—Kastorion” in E. M. Jeffreys (ed.) Byzantine Style, Religion and Civilization (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 38-71 and 50.
2.2 Political and Commercial Dynamics: Famagusta and Levant Trade from the late 13th to the mid-14th Centuries

2.2.1 Commercial Relations between Famagusta and the Muslim East in the Light of Notarial Registers (from 1270s to 1350):

The pivotal role maintained by Famagusta between the East and West during the late medieval period is not only revealing the political dynamics between Christians and Muslims but also the volume of trade between Europe and the Muslim East. The economic aspect of the relations between Latins and Muslims is an extremely important issue that lets us visualize the socio-cultural and socio-economic dynamics of the medieval Mediterranean. At the same time, the economic history of the Medieval Levant and Mediterranean is related to the main political dynamics which have been well scrutinized by prominent historians.\footnote{See, Heyd, W. Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-\'age. \`ed. fran\'caise r\'efondue et consid\'erablement augment\'ee par l\'auteur. trans Furcy Raynaud \`2e r\'eimpression, 2 vols, (Leipzig, 1936); Ashtor, E. ‘‘Levant Trade’’ (1983); Ashtor, E. ‘‘Observations on Venetian Trade in the Levant in the 14th Century’’ in E. Ashtor (ed.) East-West Trade in the Medieval Mediterranean (London, 1986), pp. 533-86; Ashtor, E. ‘‘The Venetian Supremacy in Levantine Trade: Monopoly or Pre-Colonialism?’’ in E. Ashtor (ed.) Studies on the Levantine Trade in the Middle Ages (London, 1978), pp. 5-53; Lopez, R.S. ‘‘Market Expansion: The case of Genoa’’ in Journal of Economic History, vol. 24, no.4 (1964), pp. 445-64; Pistarino, G. ‘‘Genova e l’Islam nel Mediterraneo occidentale’’ Annuario de Estudios Medievales 10, (1980), pp. 189-205; Thiriet, F. La Romanie venitienne au Moyen \'Age. Le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial venitien (XIIe-XVe siècles), Ecoles Francaise d’Athenes et de Rome 193 (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1959); Goitein, S. D. A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities and the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), Vol. I.}

Italians were established in the Latin East long before the fall of Acre in 1291. Acre was conquered by Christians in 1104 and served as a main port of Syria and major market for the eastern caravan wares. Venetians, Pisans and Genoese possessed shops and properties in Acre, Tyre, and Jerusalem in the twelfth century and merchants from cities such as Florence and San Gimignano travelled to Damietta and Alexandria in order to conduct business around
the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{117} Moreover, prominent merchant colonies from the maritime cities, namely Venice, Genoa, Pisa and Marseilles held quarters in Acre during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as attested by the notarial evidence.\textsuperscript{118} The port of Acre served as a major cotton market until the last decade of the thirteenth century. It largely exported to Genoa, Venice, Ancona, Apulia, Messina, Montpellier, Marseilles, Florence, Pisa and Naples. Also, the Franks maintained the Arabs’ textile industry and exported cloth to the West from the ports of Tyre, Antioch and Tripoli.\textsuperscript{119}

The commercial relations between the western Mediterranean and Muslim East were intense even during the Roman period. Oriental luxuries were imported from the East and at the same time silver was exported to the East by Latin merchants. Through the eleventh century Byzantine Italy was even more interested in the Levantine trade “where the flow of gold from the Muslim world encountered the flow of goods from Byzantium”.\textsuperscript{120} The commercial relations between Latins and Muslims around Anatolia can be dated to the period of the Seljuk Empire. That large numbers of Latin merchants frequented the Anatolian, ports of the Black Sea and Mediterranean shores is attested by the official records. Regarding the Anatolian trade, several commercial privileges obtained by the Venetians from the Seljuks in early thirteenth century are well known. Also, the Cilician Armenia and the city of Antioch were at the centre of interest of the Latin merchants both before and after the fall of Acre


\textsuperscript{118} Mazzaoui, M. F. \textit{The Italian Cotton Industry in the Later Middle Ages 1100-1600} (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 29-36.

\textsuperscript{119} For general outline; Maurice, Lombard. \textit{Les textiles dans le monde musulman du VIIe au XIlie siècle} (Paris, 1978).

\textsuperscript{120} Day, J. “The Levant Trade in the Middle Ages” in Angeliki Laiou (ed.) \textit{The Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century} (Dumbarton Oaks, 2002), p. 807.
(1291). It is known that the Genoese were granted privileges at Port Saint Symeon in 1101 and the Venetians at Antioch in 1143.\textsuperscript{121}

As important as these concessions are as an indication of the commercial relations between East and West during the earlier periods, trade patterns of the Levant and Central Asia underwent an intermittent series of major political and economic changes throughout the thirteenth century. Undoubtedly, the economic dynamics of Levant trade and the role of Famagusta cannot be revealed without analysing the major political upheavals of the thirteenth century. A new phase in the Levant trade began after the battle of Köse Dağ in 1243 which ended in a victory of the Mongols against the Seljuks. Mongol expansion towards Anatolia until the mid-thirteenth century changed the patterns of trade between Europe and the Middle East. Caravan traffic from the Persian Gulf through Asia Minor, and from Western Asia to Russia and to the Mediterranean began to challenge the main route from the Red Sea to the Nile and Syria.\textsuperscript{122} Then the conquest of Baghdad by the Ilkhanid Tatars in 1258 and the Mamluk victory over the Mongols at the battle of ‘Ayn Jâlût in 1260 paved the way for a tumultuous period in the Levant region. The victory at ‘Ayn Jâlût enabled the Mamluks to gain control over large parts of Syria, and Baghdad lost its importance as a main international trading centre and was then later was replaced by Tabriz.\textsuperscript{123} More importantly, the caravan route connecting the Persian Gulf with the Eastern


Mediterranean was transferred to the north. The Oriental markets frequented by Latin merchants, namely Egypt and Syria, were unsafe due to the political instability and Upper Egypt was under the control of the Bedouins.

The loss of strategic Crusader strongholds in the East was a heavy blow for the Latins. Indeed, the most striking consequence of the Mamluk advance in the Middle-East was the Mongol-Christian alliance. The sudden shift in trade routes brought Cilician Armenia into a new position functioning as a bridge between the alliances and the Mediterranean and inner Asia. The caravan road starting from Ayas (Laiazzo) to Tabriz via Sivas, Erzincan, and Erzurum was the most preferable route for the Venetian and Genoese merchants where they had access to the Oriental merchandise. However, the strategic importance of the Kingdom of Cilician Armenia regarding the Levant trade brought it into a vulnerable position against the Mamluks. In order to secure the kingdom against any possible Mamluk attack Armenians allied themselves to the Mongols. Actually, the Mongol-Christian alliance in the East was supported by the Franks and Kingdom of Cyprus even before the 1260s. In 1249 Cypriot knights participated in the St Louis’ expedition to Damietta and in 1258-9 Frankish knights joined Armenian tributaries of the Mongols in raiding Northern Syria. However, the so-called ‘Mongol-Christian’ alliance against the Muslims was soon to be reversed. The Mongol power in Syria weakened after it was defeated at ‘Ayn Jâlût and despite the formidable
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125 Irwin (1986), pp. 43-45.  
efforts of the Mongol-Christian alliance to defend Cilician Armenia, important cities namely Mamistra, Adana, Ayas (Laiazzo), Tarsus and Sis were devastated by Mamluk forces in 1266.¹²⁸

Meanwhile, in 1268 Antioch, Jaffa and Beaufort fell into the Muslim hands and in 1271 Sultan Baybars captured the Hospitaller castle of Crac des Chevaliers and the Castle of Montfort, the principal possession of the Teutonic Knights in the East.¹²⁹ Having the Latins trapped defenceless in the East and obtaining concessions from the Franks, including partitions of territory and revenues jointly administered by both sides, Sultan Baybars organized a naval expedition against Cyprus which was destroyed near Limassol by the Cypriot naval forces. Allegedly, this was planned by Sultan Baybars aiming to distract King Hugh’s attention from mainland Syria and prevent him from sending aid to Prince Edward of England in Acre.¹³⁰ Shortly after the unsuccessful attempt of Baybars in conquering Cyprus, a truce between him and Hugh III, the king of both Cyprus and Jerusalem, concluded in 1272 which enabled the Franks of Acre to maintain peaceful relations with the Mamluks until the final conquest of Acre in 1291.¹³¹ Indeed, the Mongol incursions into Syria and Hugh’s efforts in providing military assistance to the Mongols in 1281 had no effect on preventing Mamluk advancement in the East. As a result of the Mamluk expeditions into Cilician Armenia in 1283 and 1284 the Armenian king Leon agreed to sign a 10 year truce and to pay 250,000 dirhams annual tribute to the Mamluks. According to Irwin, the major concern of the

¹³⁰ Edbury, (1991), p. 92; Irwin (1986), p. 48. Sultan Qalawun also maintained peaceful relations with the Crusaders in the Latin East. In 1282, a new agreement was made with the Templars of Tortosa and in 1283 a truce with Acre was made. See; Irwin (1986), p. 68.
Sultan was to guarantee the secure passage of Muslim merchants reaching Mamluk lands via Cilicia.\textsuperscript{132}

To what extent the Christian-Mongol coalition served the Eastern strategic policy of the West is open to discussion. However, there was also a ‘commercial’ side of the coalition that aimed to put ‘economic’ pressure on the Muslim states in the East. As is known, a first economic boycott against Muslims in the Latin East was implemented during the second half of the twelfth century. In 1162, Pope Alexander III declared at a regional Church council held in Montpellier that the transportation of the arms, lumber and iron to the Muslim lands is prohibited. However, according to the scholars the Third Lateran Council in 1179 ‘‘marked the beginnings of the papal use of economic sanctions’’ where Pope Alexander’s ‘‘initiative achieved a wider audience’’.\textsuperscript{133} Later in 1215, the Fourth Lateran Council repeated the same regulations by prohibiting trade with the Muslim countries for the next four years.\textsuperscript{134} Towards the mid-thirteenth century, new geographical limitations imposed by Pope Gregory IX tried to strengthen the bans by prohibiting trade with the Iberian Peninsula together with the Muslim East. However, the Papal efforts proved to be ineffective preventing commercial contacts between Latins and Muslims. For instance, in 1246, Innocent IV complained of Genoese, Venetian and Pisan merchants transporting slaves to Egypt and in 1271 Prince Edward of England complained about Venetian merchants conducting trade with Egypt.\textsuperscript{135} The function and effectiveness of the Papal sanctions was also questioned among the nobility in the West. Marin Sanudo (ca. 1270-1340), a Venetian from a prominent family, suggested that the West did not need Egypt to have access to Oriental merchandise (sugar, silk and flax) while it was possible to grow them in Apulia, Sicily, Crete and Cyprus. According to him, to

\textsuperscript{134} Menache, (2012), pp. 238 and 243-4.
\textsuperscript{135} Menache (2012), pp. 244-5.
achieve its full effect more strict regulations needed to be imposed on the Latin merchants who supplied Egypt with slaves, timber and iron. Without doubt, Papal embargoes against Muslims were one of the major reasons for the occupation of Cilician Armenia by the Mamluks. It is not by chance that Sultan Qalawun’s main concern was to attack Cilician Armenia while he had a chance to conquer Acre which was weakened after the fall of important Crusader strongholds. Indeed, it was the fear of embargoes that urged him to attack Cilician Armenia (particularly Ayas-Laiazzo) which would guarantee the flow of slaves and timber to the Muslim Lands.

Apparently, despite the political instability and Papal prohibitions Latin merchants continued to operate in the Muslim East. After the War of St Sabbas, a truce was signed between Venice and Genoa in 1270, and Genoese merchants started to re-operate in Acre. Similarly, the convoy of galleys from Venice was visiting Acre and Alexandria annually in the 1270s and according to the records Venetian merchants continued to export metals, timber and iron to Alexandria despite the Papal restrictions. However, the most active merchants in Anatolia and more generally in the Middle East were relatively the Genoese. Genoa maintained close relations with the Palaeologi and established a colony at Caffa around the 1260s which enabled them to have easy access to the Oriental merchandise and control the slave trade in the Black Sea. They were actively trading in Alexandria, Tripoli and Antioch from the twelfth century onwards and obtained several concessions in the Muslim lands. Genoa maintained a large scale of trade in Alexandria and Syria which

allowed them to become an arbiter in Levantine trade together with Venice.\textsuperscript{140} The access to the Syrian and Egyptian markets also led Genoa to partly control the Oriental market where they become the main distributor of Oriental spices during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{141} Nonetheless, the control of the Levantine trade was not provided by Genoa itself but prominent Genoese families that established themselves in the Latin East.\textsuperscript{142} Mostly, the members of the prominent Genoese families such as the \textit{Embriaco, Spinola, Bulgaro} and \textit{Napitella}, often travelled to the Muslim East and Latin East and were involved in trade there. But besides, their commercial activities the members of the aristocrat families also held important political position. For example, during the Third Crusade Guidola Spinola was appointed as the consul of the Genoese in Tyre.\textsuperscript{143}

Alongside the Latins’ political acquisitions in the Middle East, there were more important developments happening in the Mediterranean and Black Sea region. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea witnessed an economic ‘boom’ which strengthened the trade networks established by Venice and Genoa.\textsuperscript{144} Especially, the dominance of Genoese in the ports of the Black Sea, Pera and Alexandria enabled them to establish a strong commercial network that included Famagusta in the

\textsuperscript{140} For the earlier evidence, see Jacoby ‘‘\textit{The Economy of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia}’’ and for the notarial evidence from 1274, see Cornelio Desimoni, ‘‘\textit{Actes passés en 1271, 1274 et 1279 à L’Aïas. (Petite Arménie) et à Beyrouth par-devant des notaires gênois}’’. \textit{Archives de Orient Latin}, Tome I, (1881), nos. II, IX, X, XIII, XIV, XIX, XXIX, XL, XLI, XLIV, LIV, LIX, LXVI, LXXII, XXXV, XXXVI, XLVIII, LI, LIII, XII.


\textsuperscript{143} Meray (2003), pp. 99 -100 and 168.

\textsuperscript{144} For the Black Sea; Ciociltan (2012); Brătianu, G. ‘‘\textit{La mer noire, plaque tournante du trafic international à la fin du Moyen Âge}’’ in RHSEE (21), (1994), pp. 36-69; Brătianu, G. \textit{Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la Mer noire au XIIIe siècle}, (Paris, 1929).
Eastern Mediterranean as well. The crucial position of Genoa in the Levant trade was strengthened by a new treaty with the Mamluk Sultan in 1275. Genoese hegemony over the trade route connecting Caffa with Egypt and Syria enabled them to claim the lion’s share of the profit in Levant trade during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. A cursory glance at notarial acts of Pera and Caffa from 1281 to 1290 would seem to verify the Genoese dominance. In the light of the evidence derived from the notarial acts, Genoese merchant families were active in Samsun (Simisso), Sivas (Savasto), Izmir (Smyrna), Sinop (Sinopoli), Trabzon (Trebizond), Alexandria, Tabriz, Khazarie (Crimea), Cyprus, Pera and Caffa.  

Cyprus, indeed, maintained intense commercial relations with the Muslim world during the early thirteenth century, as is attested by the chronicles and official documents. For example, in 1207, merchants of Cyprus arrived at Alexandria from Beirut and after they paid customs fees they were arrested by the authorities for uncertain reasons. As the chronicle makes it clear, they were Pisans and Venetians operating both in Cyprus and the Muslim East and they were carrying large amount of merchandise, that is, of mullets (salted fish) while they were detained by the Sultan. Moreover, the importance of Cyprus in Levantine trade is also verified by the official letters. In 1214, Hugh I answered to letter of Kaikaus I, the Sultan of Iconium (mod. Konya), stating that the Muslim merchants and their vessels from Iconium are free to trade in Cyprus without any obstacles and merchants of Cyprus shall be
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146 Brătianu, G. Actes des Notaires Genois de Pera et de Caffa de la fin du Treizième Siècle (1281-1290), (Bucarest, 1927).
147 Ibid, Samsun (Simisso), nos. 216, 306; Sivas (Savasto), nos. 23, 24; Smyrna (Izmir), nos. 173, 290; Sinop (Sinopoli), nos. 35, 174, 306; Tana, nos. 235, 292, 293, 294; Caffa, nos. 223, 225; Pera, 230. 232; Khazarie (Gazaria) Crimea, no. 298; Tabriz, nos. 279, 316; Trabizon (Trabzon), nos. 215, 217, 220, 226, 236, 286; Cyprus, no. 265; Alexandria, no. 170. For commercial activities of the Spinola family, nos. 45, 173, 200, 212; Squarciapino family, nos. 17, 34, 73; de Mart family, nos. 24, 147. For the Genoese hegemony in Black Sea, see Ciociltan, Virgil. The Mongols and the Black Sea Trade in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries (Brill, 2012).
treated likewise in the territories of the Sultanate.\textsuperscript{149} Another letter of 1216, sent by Hugh to Kaikaus, reveals that Muslim merchants trading in Cyprus were exempted from heavy tax duties and only obliged to pay the usual commercium (customs duty). Moreover, King Hugh guaranteed that if anything happens to the merchants or ships belonging to the Sultan, the security of the people and their possessions will be provided by him.\textsuperscript{150} The political stability between Iconium and Cyprus prevailed until the late 1230s. For instance, in 1236, the Sultan Kaikobad I and Henry I de Lusignan made an agreement that the alum going from Iconium to Marseilles will be transported by Cypriot vessels. However, commercial relations between Sultanate and Cyprus seemed to be interrupted by Mongol incursions in Anatolia towards the late 1230s.\textsuperscript{151} Merchants of Cyprus also conducted business in the Latin East before the fall of Acre. For instance, a Muslim chronicle Ibn Hawqal mentions mastic, storax, silk and flax in his book called \textit{Kitab \textit{Ṣūrat al-ʿArḍ} in connection with Cyprus during the tenth century.\textsuperscript{152} Also in the early thirteenth century, the Genoese largely imported expensive silks from Cyprus and had a quarter in Tripoli, Antioch and “Satalia” (Attaleia-modern Antalya) where they had access to Islamic silk textiles.\textsuperscript{153} According to the chronicles unrefined silk and silken fabrics from the Sultanate of Konya and Syria were imported to Cyprus together with alum and wool.\textsuperscript{154} In 1274, Symona, the wife of Enrico Craiga, received a loan from Gabriele Pinello in Genoa in order to make investment either in Syria, Cyprus or Cilician Armenia and repay it after her return to Genoa.\textsuperscript{155} Moreover, on 3 May 1289, another merchant of Cyprus appeared in the act concluded in Caffa as a witness called Vassallo of Cyprus where

\textsuperscript{150} Ibid, pp. 141-142.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid, pp. 139, 140, 144, 145 and fn. 1 in p. 145.
\textsuperscript{154} Coureas (2005), p. 121.
Guglielmo Lercari received unspecified merchandise worth 14,000 *aspers* of Alexandria from Obervali.\(^{156}\) As displayed in the previous section, Cyprus already maintained commercial links with the southern coasts of Turkey and Lesser Armenia before the fall of Acre, and merchants of Limassol traded with their compatriots who were already actively involved in trade in the Latin East during the twelfth century.

However, in 1291 Acre and the other remaining Crusader strongholds of Syria and Palestine were conquered by the Mamluks. Cilician Armenia was the only Christian state on the mainland of the Latin East, and Cyprus was the only Latin Kingdom in the Levant where Christian ships can safely anchor. The collapse of the crusader states of the Levant in 1291 introduced significant political and economic changes to the Levantine trade. These fundamental changes also affected the overall shape of Mediterranean trade, not just Levantine port cities themselves, but also Venetian and Genoese colonies and their possessions mainly in Egypt, Syria, Cilician Armenia and Turkey.\(^{157}\) In the same year, the papal ban was imposed on trade with the Muslim territories pronounced by Nicholas IV and a series of bans continued in the next century. The trade with Egypt was no longer legal and the Sultan of Egypt also prohibited any direct trade with his ports in response to the papal bans.\(^{158}\) Access to the Eastern markets was restricted and patterns of trade and shipping networks in the eastern Mediterranean took place in new circumstances.\(^{159}\) However, the loss of Acre did not seem to affect the supremacy of Genoese and Venetians in the Levantine trade. The cities like Ayas in Armenia, Trebizond in the Black Sea, and Famagusta in the

---

\(^{156}\) Bratianu (1927), no. 168. Latin asper, Greek aspron and Turkish akce were all silver coins.  
\(^{159}\) Jacoby (2009a), p. 60.
eastern Mediterranean, become major centres of the Latin merchants where Oriental merchandise was exported to the West.\textsuperscript{160}

The unequivocal importance of Famagusta as an emporium in the eastern Mediterranean and its strategic position that allowed Latin merchants to trade easily with the Mamluk territories brought the island into the position to shape the patterns of long-distance Mediterranean trade.\textsuperscript{161} In Famagusta, there was an enormous concentration of Latin merchants including the leading banking houses and prominent families.\textsuperscript{162} As it will be seen, merchants of Famagusta occupied a specific social niche just as the nobles occupied theirs. They varied from Venetians, Genoese, Pisans, Florentines, Sicilians and Catalans to southern French. The trading companies were powerful enough to ignore papal bans and maintain close relations with the Mamluk territories. However, regarding the trade between the West and the Muslim East, one should open separate brackets to the Genoese merchants. In the late thirteenth century, the role of Genoese aristocrat merchants in Levantine trade increased, as they maintained close contacts with Muslim port cities after 1291, and become much more powerful comparing to the ‘minor trading powers’ in terms of access to Oriental markets. The Genoese notary Lamberto Sambuceto lists a large number of Genoese merchants operating in the Eastern cities. Among the places most frequented by Genoese merchants were Ayas (Laiazzo, modern Yumurtalik) and Tarsus in Cilician Armenia, and Satalia (Adalia, modern Antalya), Candelor (Alanya), Makri (Fethiye), and Phokaia (Foca) on the southern coast of Turkey, Syria and Egypt.

The ports of Cilician Armenia were one of the most preferred markets together with Syria and Egypt where the Genoese companies were heavily involved in grain shipping. Its

\textsuperscript{162} Some of the Aristocrat families and banking houses that involved in trade in Cyprus, see Genoese aristocrat families; \textit{de Mari}, Spinola, Doria, Squarciaffico, \textit{de Nigro}, Guisulfi, Tartari, Fanzioni, Grimaldi, Cigala, Bestagni, Lercari, Piccamiglio, Ceba, Cibo; Piacenzi banking houses; Cavazoli, Diani, Scozzi, Borrini, the Guagnabene; Florentine banking houses; Bardi, Peruzzi and Mozzi.
closeness to the caravan routes from Tabriz and Siwas attracted Genoese merchants long before the fall of the Crusader states. The fact that the merchants of Genoa already exported cotton from Ayas is proven by notarial contracts from 1274. Indeed, their interest in Armenian trade continued well during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, this time supplying impressive amounts of grain to the particular ports of Little Armenia, southern coasts of Turkey, Syria and Egypt. Relatively, grain was the most important commodity that Genoese merchants were involved with and they played a major role in its transportation. Also, allegedly it was the only reason for the crusade against Aydin in 1344 according to the chronicle called Marcha di Marco. The Genoese were active in Bulgarian ports, particularly in Mesembria (modern Nesebar) and Anchialos (modern Pomorie), transporting grain to Constantinople, Pera and occasionally Famagusta. For instance, in 1290 a cargo of 4,100 quintals of grain transported on the ship called the San Matteo from the Black Sea to Famagusta clearly indicates that Genoese merchants imported grain to Famagusta before the fall of Acre as well. Apart from the Black Sea, merchants of Genoa also frequented western Anatolia which was an important grain producer and supplier at that time.

However, the most important and strategic distribution centre of grain in the Eastern Mediterranean was Famagusta. As notarial acts affirms, which will be under the examination in the following pages, Famagusta opened an enormous market for Eastern and Oriental commodities (especially grain, cotton, sugar and spices) in the Mediterranean; where these

164 Fleet, K. “European and Islamic Trade” (Cambridge, 1999), p.59. For importance of the grain trade for Genoa in thirteenth and fourteenth centuries see also; Balard, M. La Romanie génoise (Xle-début XVie siècle), 2 vols. (Genoa-Rome, 1978).
166 Fleet (1999), pp. 59 and 63. Also for Genoese merchants transporting grain from Phokaea (Foça) to Famagusta during the late fourteenth century, See Fleet, (Cambridge, 1999), p. 63 and fn. 33.
products were imported and then re-exported to the West. With few exceptions, the grain trade was controlled by prominent Genoese families. The Bestagni and Salvone families were two of them and they occasionally collaborated while buying, selling and carrying grain from the East. For instance on 31 January 1300 Manuel and Leo Salvagius received 100 salmes of wheat from Salvinus (Savone) Bava that is loaded to the ship of Branca de Castro. They promised to pay 9,500 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 2,714 white besants or 678.5 Venetian ducats) in fifteen days as soon as the ship arrives there. In February 1300 Francesco Bestagni received 100 salmes of wheat worth 5,000 dirhems (ca. 357.14 Venetian ducats) of Cilician Armenia from Salvinus of Savone. The wheat was loaded to the ship of Branca de Castro and Francesco promised to pay the money in Ayas in thirteen days which suggests that Savone family were also operating in Ayas. Another point that needs to be clarified is the appearance of Branca de Castro as a ship-owner. He was probably hired by the Genoese companies for the transportation of grain from/to Famagusta. On 2 February, Francesco Bestagni, acting as a procurator of Matheus Bestagni, received 6,914 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 493. 85 Venetian ducats) from Adalano Bucanigre for 400 modi of wheat that Adalanus sold in Ayas. Bestagni, Savone and Clavaro family members appear in Sambucetos’ acts often lending money to other agents in order to invest it either in Ayas or Tarsus or as a witness of each other’s testimonies.

Furthermore these families collaborated with even more powerful Genoese families such as de Mari and Doria. In an act drawn up in February 1300, Albaxius Doria bought wheat from Salvinus of Savone and promised to pay 10,530 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 752

---

168 LS [Desimoni], nos. 37 and 56.
169 LS [Desimoni], no. 62.
170 LS [Desimoni], no. 54.
171 LS [Desimoni], nos. 40, 48, 51
Venetian ducats) in Ayas within eight days. Another interesting feature of this contract is that the said Albaxius also acknowledged that he had presented 19,000 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 1357 Venetian ducats) to Bernardus from the Bardi society on behalf of Salvinus. This, however, suggest that Genoese merchants and certain Pisan banking houses collaborated in terms of lending money and business partnership. An even more interesting example comes from the will of 4 February 1300 of a Pisan called Zelemelo who received barley worth 1,515 white besants (c. 378 Venetian ducats) from Oddo de Sexto, another important Genoese merchant, loaded on the ship of Branca de Castro. According to the agreement this barley should be invested in Ayas and profit from the sale should be returned back to Cyprus on the ship of Albaxius Doria. Usually, transportation of the grain was provided by ships that belonged to the Castro and Doria. The act of 23 February 1300, reveals that Salvinus Savone sold wheat to Stephanus and Guillielmus worth 11,500 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 821.42 Venetian ducats) which will be transported on the ship of Castro to the port of Pallibus. 

---

172 LS [Desimoni], no. 64. 
173 See Spufford, (1986), p. 298-9. “In Cyprus white besants and carats were commonly used in business affairs. The white besant was principal unit of account which divided into 24 carats like the Byzantine hyperpyron. The coinage of fourteenth century Cyprus consisted of silver grossi and billon denari cipresi. The white besant of Cyprus was equivalent to 2 grossi and 4 soldi of cipresi.; According to Makhairas ‘the commonest coin mentioned by [chronicle] Makhairas [in his work] is 'the white bezant of Cyprus'. The besants coined in Cyprus in imitation of the bezant of Constantinople, the hyperper, were called white, because of the paleness of the gold, and were of an alloy of 3 ½ carats gold, 4 ¼ carats copper, and 14 carats silver. [Moreover] Franks called it [hyperper] bezant because it was coined at Byzantium. In the passage of Makhairas 2 [white bezants of Cyprus] were equated to 1 Byzantine hyperperon. ...[also] 2 Aspers=1 gold bezant [during the earlier times]. However, the Cypriot asper fell steadily, first against the gold bezant and then as against the ducat. According to Pegolotti, during the early fourteenth century 10 aspers= 1 gold bezants.” Makhairas, Leontios. Recital concerning the Sweet Land of Cyprus entitled ‘Chronicle’, (ed. and trans.) R. M. Dawkins, vol. ii, (Oxford, 1932), p. 46. According to Makhairas: ‘The Venetian ducat was worth 2 bezants and 3 ½ gros; 2 gros go the bezant; and therefore he [Makhairas] puts the ducat at 3 ¼ bezants, that is, white bezants of Cyprus. [...] This agrees with [chronicles] Amadi and Fl. Batron, who in this passage value the ducat at 3 bezants, 18 carats; 24 carats go to a bezant, therefore their valuation is again 3 ¼ bezants. [Also] The silver gros was worth half a bezant of Cyprus, and this brings the value of the ducat to 5 bezants, instead of 3 ¾. [Yet] this discrepancy is due to the rapid fall in value of the white bezant in relation to the standard value set by the Venetian ducat.;’ Makhairas, vol. ii, p. 148. Also in 1320; 1 Venetian ducat was equal to 4 to 5 white besants of Cyprus. Therefore, 1,515 ÷4= 378.75. 
174 LS [Desimoni], no. 67.
the Alexandretta Gulf” and a day later Savone received a quarter profit of barley from Oddo de Sexto that was transported to Ayas in the galley of Doria.\textsuperscript{175}

Among the other operators, the most active Genoese merchants in the grain trade were members of de Sexto family. Large amounts of notarial contracts indicate that de Sexto members also collaborated with other prominent Genoese families such as Bestagni and Clavaro. On 29 November 1300, for instance, Corrado of Clavaro received wheat worth 954 white besants (ca. 238.5 Venetian ducats) from Oddone de Sexto and Nicholas of Signago that was to be loaded in Paphos and shipped to Tarsus. In December of the same year, Antonio Mussi received wheat worth 100 white besants (ca. 25 Venetian ducats) from Oddone de Sexto to trade in Tarsus and Armenia.\textsuperscript{176} Next year, in May, this time Domenico of Rapallo received wheat and barley worth 2,382 white besants (ca. 595.5 Venetian ducats) from Oddone de Sexto for commerce in Armenia.\textsuperscript{177} Oddone de Sexto continued to send regular cargoes of wheat to Tarsus, Ayas and other parts of Lesser Armenia during 1302 as well. On 14 March 1302 he sent a shipment worth 591 white besants (ca. 147.75 Venetian ducats) to Tarsus with Giorgio Cores and in 27 March a shipment to Ayas and Tarsus worth 605 white besants (ca. 151.25 Venetian ducats) this time with Domenzius Osbergatus.\textsuperscript{178} More importantly, the appearance of the de Sexto as grain suppliers on his behalf on every occasion also indicates that the local production in Cyprus was sufficient enough to export to the Muslim east as well.\textsuperscript{179} Considering that the Mamluks were dependent on imported grain

\textsuperscript{175} LS [Desimoni], nos. 69 and 70. See also; 141.
\textsuperscript{176} LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 134, 139. Also, on 21 October 1301, Corrado of Clavaro received grain worth 1,660 white besants from Giacomo de Signago and Giovanni Lanfrancus in order to invest in Armenia. LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 228 and 229.
\textsuperscript{178} LS [Pavoni] 49, nos. 120, 138.
\textsuperscript{179} On 19 October 1300, Oddone de Sexto instructed Corrado Donato to buy wheat and barley in Paphos worth 1,000 white besants. See LS [Polonio] 31, no. 56.
for several reasons, it is no surprise at all that members of *de Sexto* operated as grain suppliers.\(^{180}\)

No wonder, then, that families like *Bestagni*, *Savone*, *de Sexto*, *Clavaro*, *Doria*, *Grimaldi* and *Zaccaria* made Famagusta their capital.\(^{181}\) However, in general terms the trade monopoly was controlled by more powerful Genoese aristocrat families. In Famagusta the *Spinola* family was the most substantial group and apparently had special interest in Levantine trade, importing and exporting large quantities of merchandise from Famagusta to Lesser Armenia, Anatolia and Mamluk territories. Occasionally, they collaborated with the other aristocrat families such as *Squarciafico* and *de Nigro*. As notarial contracts reveal, they owned at least three galleys and one ship.\(^{182}\) This aristocrat consortium also operated as both pirates and merchants at the same time and they were independent of the state bureaucracy. These families gained enough power to disregard papal bans and restrictions of the state and continued to organize trade ventures to the Muslim East.

As is known, after the fall of Acre to the Muslims, the Popes imposed papal embargos on trade between Muslims and Western merchants. Although Genoa prohibited trade with the Muslims in general terms, Venice prohibited only the export of war materials and slave trade with the Muslim dominions.\(^ {183}\) Moreover the reports of the Aragonese magistrates also include the case of merchants who were imprisoned due to contraband trade with the Mamluk

---

\(^{180}\) MacKenzie, (1994), pp. 195-196. Especially, *Oddo de Sexto* was an important merchant mentioned often in the deeds drawn-up by Lamberto Sambuceto. According to the Lamberto the house of the rich Genoese merchant called *Oddo de Sexto* stood opposite to the Templar church (*in domo Templi*). Edbury, P. ‘‘*Famagusta in 1300’’’, p. 345 and fn. 74.

\(^{181}\) For more notarial evidence, See; *Bestagnus*: LS [Desimoni], nos. 51, 54, 56; *Savone*: LS [Desimoni], nos. 37, 40, 62, 57, 70; *Grimaldi*: LS [Desimoni], no. 60; *Zaccaria*: LS [Desimoni], nos. 143-144; *Rivardo*: LS [Desimoni], nos. 155-156; *San Siro*: LS [Desimoni], no. 48, 106, 107. Also LS [Polonio] 31: nos. 96, 212, 143, 159.

\(^{182}\) LS [Balard] 39, nos. 104, 105 [*dominorum et patronum galearum tres*] and LS [Desimoni], nos. 285 [Sale of a ship called St. Martinus] and 266 [galearum nostrarum et sociorum nostrorum].

\(^{183}\) Ashtor, E. ‘‘Levant Trade’’, p. 17; Coureas, N. ‘‘The Influence of the Kingdom of Aragon in Cyprus, Rhodes, Latin Greece and Mamluk Egypt during the Later Middle Ages, 1276-1479’’, *Κυπριακαί Σποσδαί, Τόμος ΣΒ’-ΣΓ’ 1998-1999* (Nicosia, 2000), pp. 214-216.
lands.\textsuperscript{184} According to the regulations, anyone caught conducting trade with the Muslim East shall be excommunicated, charged with the value of the same amount of goods involved in the traffic, and they may being reduced to ‘servitutem et captionem’, and all their properties may be confiscated.\textsuperscript{185} In 1306, the treaty signed between Venice and Cyprus stated that merchants of Venice are not allowed to carry any kind of merchandise to the land of the Sultan that they procured in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{186} Also, King Henry II of Cyprus stated in his report to the royal council (1311 or 1312) that all Western nations should impose general restrictions on trade and control their merchants not to transport metal and wood to Egypt before the new Crusade. Furthermore, it was also suggested that pilgrimages should be banned from visiting the Holy Land since a certain amount of the Sultan’s revenues consisted of the taxes paid by pilgrimages.\textsuperscript{187}

King Henry instructed a small number of galleys to monitor the Cypriot sea in order to prevent illicit trade and military orders were also put in place to enforce the ban especially against the Genoese merchants who attempted to break the embargo.\textsuperscript{188} Indeed, their efforts were partly successful. On 11 June 1300, Iacobo Rogerio was charged 12 white besants for being involved in illicit trade.\textsuperscript{189} In July 1301, Antonio de Talio and Blancheto de Savona guaranteed the castellan of Famagusta that they would not sail to the prohibited areas, otherwise they would pay a penalty.\textsuperscript{190} In January 1310, Symon de Rappallo received 100 white besants to invest in Laiazzo or elsewhere, except Egypt, and return back to Cyprus.\textsuperscript{191} However, imposing Papal sanctions and preventing aristocrat families conducting business in

\textsuperscript{184} Ashtor, E. ‘‘Levant Trade’’, p. 21.


\textsuperscript{186} Ibid, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{187} Ibid, pp. 122-123.

\textsuperscript{188} Edbury, P. ‘‘Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades’’, pp. 103 and 133; de Mas Latrise, Histoire, II, pp. 119-22, 156-7 and 172-3.

\textsuperscript{189} \textit{LS [Desimoni]}, no. 148.

\textsuperscript{190} \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 32, no. 9.

\textsuperscript{191} \textit{LS [Balard]} 43, no. 45 (part III). See also no. 56.
Mamluk territories remained a major problem for the Cypriot authorities. For example, on 5 September 1300, Filippo de Nigro appointed Baldus Spinola as his procurator to deal with merchandise which he had in Syria and three days later Tondellus and Guidetus Spinola appointed Lanfrancus de Mari to sell their 7 Jewish slaves to Raphael de Palerme for (the price of) 700 white besants (ca. 175 Venetian ducats).\textsuperscript{192} These families also had contacts with the individuals who migrated from the Muslim East to Famagusta probably after 1291. For instance, in March 1300, Iacobus Safsaf de Beyrouth, inhabitant of Famagusta, received 150 white besants (ca. 37.5 Venetian ducats) from Pellegrinus de Castello and 100 besants (ca. 25 Venetian ducats) from Nicolaus de Mari to invest in Syria.\textsuperscript{193}

Even more interesting information comes from an act concluded in November 1300. Ambrogio Salvaigus and Lanfranco de Port, procurators of Baldus Spinola and Filippo de Nigro, leased an armed galley called ‘‘Gata’’ to Oberto Campanarius and Giovanni Passara for a trip to Genoa for 4 months. An armed galley belonging to Baldus Spinola and Filippo de Nigro and the said galley were in Syria while the aforementioned act was concluded.\textsuperscript{194} The next year, on the 17\textsuperscript{th} of September, Guideto Spinola leased one of his ships called ‘‘San Antonio’’ to Lanfranco in order to transport a number of slaves to Egypt (Alexandria and Damietta).\textsuperscript{195} Another contract drawn up on 29 July 1301 reveals how serious the Genoese investment in Egypt and Syria was. According to the contract, Nicolino Signago received 2,766 white besants (ca. 691.5 Venetian ducats) from Domezus to invest in Syria.\textsuperscript{196}

Indeed, the content of the contracts drawn up by aristocrat families such as Spinola, Doria, Clavaro, de Mari and de Nigro and their journeys to Syria and Egypt which were recorded with great openness and without any attempt to conceal the purpose indicates that

\textsuperscript{192} LS [Desimoni], nos. 255 and 257.
\textsuperscript{193} LS [Desimoni], no. 83.
\textsuperscript{194} LS [Polonio] 31, no. 130. For more evidence of de Nigro, Doria and di Savona members conducting business in Syria, see LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 78, 163 and 174.
\textsuperscript{195} LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 148.
\textsuperscript{196} LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 25. Conradus de Clavaro was present as a witness.
official regulations were not strict enough to stop them conducting business in the Muslim lands. Moreover, in general terms some of the contracts suggest that sanctions and penalties were not deterrent to stop even individual merchants who did not belong to prominent Genoese and Venetian companies. For example, on 18 June 1301, Giacomo of Accon, priest of a Famagustan church, absolved Florentine merchant Viviano de Ginnembaldo who was excommunicated before because of conducting trade in Egypt.197

Besides transgressing boundaries of official regulations and trade sanctions, aforementioned aristocrat families were also involved in piracy. In September 1298, while a Venetian merchant called Marco Michel the Tartar was in Famagusta waiting for a gamella198 to arrive from Ayas where he had loaded eighteen sacks of Aleppo cotton and six “sporte” of ginger, he had been informed that an armed Genoese galley belonged to Franceschino Grimaldi199 was about to sail toward Famagusta. Although Marco the Tartar has been given guarantee by the castellan of Famagusta that his merchandise will be unloaded in Famagusta safely, the gamella that was carrying his stuff was robbed by Grimaldi. After this incident Marco complained to the king and Grimaldi was captured by the admiral of Cyprus soon afterwards. The said merchandise was put in the storehouse of the government in Famagusta. Moreover, it is interesting to note that despite the fact that Grimaldi was captured and found guilty, he was released soon afterward and all the goods that he had plundered returned to him.200 In another incident, in 1301, a Pisan called Luparellus complained that his gamella was sacked by the galley of the Genoese podestà (of Famagusta) and merchandise worth 400 white besants (100 white besants) were taken from his ship.201

It is more likely that Genoese pirates organized attacks of the particular galley lines. For instance, in 1303, the Venetian Baily made several complaints to the Genoese Consul in Famagusta about two Genoese pirates, namely Percivale della Turcha and Giacomo Bianco, who attacked Venetian ships operating between Ayas and Famagusta.\textsuperscript{202} Another Genoese aristocrat who operated both as a merchant and pirate was Francesco \textit{Squarciafico}. At least on two occasions, notarial records reveal that Francesco made payments to two different \textit{Narbonnais} for the compensation of their losses. First, Bernardus de Quibeno from \textit{Narbonne}, procurator of Leonardus de Rivarolo, received 1,382 Armenian dirhems (ca. 98.71 Venetian ducats) from Francesco \textit{Squarciafico} as compensation for losses caused by Francesco during his capture of the galley belonging to Leonardus. In September 1300, another two \textit{Narbonnais} claimed to recover 30 sacks of cotton which were lost when their ship was attacked by Francesco on its way from Ayas to Cyprus.\textsuperscript{203}

Furthermore, Catalans also constituted an important part of the piracy in the Mediterranean, and generally operated along the Syrian coast. On 29 March 1361, Venetian merchants complained that they were robbed by an armed Catalan galley around Beirut and Catalan pirates took their 27 sacks of sugar worth 3,456 besants (ca. 864 Venetian ducats). In April 1362, another Venetian stated that the aforementioned Catalan galley attacked their ship on the Syrian coast. According to the Venetian merchants, those Catalan pirates were supported by the king of Aragon.\textsuperscript{204} This allegation somehow finds confirmation in the chronicles and \textit{Aragonese} documents as well. As it will be shown, according to the notarial evidence, Catalan merchants continued to trade with the Muslim East despite the papal prohibitions. On the other hand, illegal trade with the prohibited areas was encouraged by the Kings of Aragon themselves. In this sense, Nicholas Coureas pointed out that “the Catalan

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{203} Ibid, p. 210; \textit{LS [Desimoni]}, no. 232 and 314.
\textsuperscript{204} \textit{de Boateris}, nos. 59 and 155.
\end{flushright}
violations of the papal embargo on trade with Muslim lands were tacitly encouraged by the acquiescence of the Kings of Aragon, who even turned such breaches of the law to their own economic advantage’. Although, the Kings of Aragon and the papacy supposedly agreed on enforcing an embargo on trade with the Muslim lands, in 1326 King James II of Aragon granted a privilege to a Catalan merchant called James Dolvan for all his civil and criminal actions. The said merchant was conducting business in Muslim lands and also according to de Mas Latrie he visited Cyprus often and from there he sailed to the Mamluk territories.

Most probably, he transported ‘luxury’ merchandise from Muslim East to Famagusta and vice versa. On another occasion, in 1335, G. Olivella and his associate B. Simonis sailed to Cyprus with their ships and that belonging to Olivella unloaded its cargo in Famagusta. And from Famagusta, the ship of Simonis had been granted a papal dispensation to sail to Syria.

Of course, merchants like J. Dolvan, G. Olivella and B. Simonis were not the exceptions. According to the registers of Lambert Sambuceto, on 22 April 1300, Roberto Ginetus of Catalonia chartered his galley ‘‘San Salvator’’ to the Florentine Bardi company to load at least 2,400 salmea of Apulian wheat either in Barletta or Manfredonia and return back to Cyprus in eight days after unloading that wheat either in Armenia, Syria or Famagusta.

In 1301, Raimondo Stephanus of Barcelona informed Pietro of Barcelona that he loaded 433.5 moggi of wheat and 79 moggi of barley along with Pietro’s own consignments of wheat and barley which were about to be shipped to Laiazzo.

---

207 Coureas, N. “Profits and Piracy”, pp. 31-2. Also in 1301, Vivian de Gennibaldi from Acre was granted absolution by authorities of Cyprus to sail to Mamluk lands and it is also known that Vivian exported weapons to Egypt before he granted licence to trade with Syria and Egypt (proven by notarial evidence). For the case of Vivian de Gennibaldi, see; Ashtor (1983), p. 42 and fn. 245.
209 LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 56.
Considering the illicit trade with the Mamluk lands, the activities of the merchants from other nations is equally important in this period. As it is discussed, the dominant Genoese broke trade sanctions explicitly and maintained the control of the grain trade in the region. However, other merchant groups such as Syrians, Tuscans and Venetians were also co-operated in transporting grain to/from the East, albeit less intensely. For instance, on 8 October 1300, Giovanni Leonus of Tortosa received 300 ‘gold Saracens’\(^\text{210}\) from the Pisan merchant called Enrico de Spina to invest in Armenia.\(^\text{211}\) In 6 November, Castellus de Porta, Pisan, received 999 white besants (ca. 249.75 Venetian ducats) from Manuele Syro and Vernazolus Pexarius and promised to pay them 1,600 dirhems (ca. 114.28 Venetian ducats) of Armenia after his arrival from Laiazzo at Famagusta.\(^\text{212}\) In financial terms, one of the main functions that Florentine and Pisan banking houses could offer was money lending. In this respect, collaboration of Genoese aristocrat families and Tuscan banking houses is attested by the notarial documents. In the act of 22 October 1300, Bernardo Runci, from the Bardi society, publicly ratified that Filippode Nigro and Baldus Spinola cleared the debt of 9,650 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 689.28 Venetian ducats) which they owed him before. In 28 October, Giacomino Pinellus, probably member of a Pisan banking house, received 5,546 dirhems of Armenia (ca. 396.14 Venetian ducats) from Filippo de Nigro and Baldus Spinola for the same reason.\(^\text{213}\) The large quantities of money borrowed by de Nigro and Spinola also indicate how large their investments were in the Muslim East. In some cases, Florentine

\(^{210}\) The Saracen besant was equivalent to 3 ½ white besants or 14 soldi of Cyprus around 1320’s and 1380s. According to Spufford, the Saracen besant was 40 Venetian soldi (sou or shilling) in Cyprus. However, according to Pegolotti’s manual it was 36 soldi 4 denari to 45 soldi 6 denari. Also in 1320, the Genoese florin was 4 besants and 4 carats and in 1382 it was 4 besants and 18 carats. In the middle of the fifteenth century, it was estimated as 5 besants. Moreover, the Florentine florin was 4 besants and 1 carat (24 carats=1 besant) and the Venetian ducat was equivalent to the 4-5 white besants of Cyprus in 1320 (7 besants in 1464); Spufford (1986), p. 298-9. Also 12 Armenian besants were equivalent to the 32 white besants or 10 Saracen besants of Cyprus. 1 Armenian besant=23 soldi in Venice. 1 Genoese florins=4besants and 4 carats in Alanya: Spufford, p. 295.

\(^{211}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 39. See also no. 49.

\(^{212}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 101. For other Pisan merchants transporting grain to Armenia See: nos. 207, 214 and 224.

\(^{213}\) LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 60 and 67.
companies also transported large amounts of grain compared to the Genoese investors. For example, on 31 October 1300, Ianucius Bartholi, Peruzzi company agent, and Lipus Bonacurssi (Bardi company), complained to Nicola Zugno, Venetian consul of Famagusta, that their 17,386 measures of wheat on the ship called ‘‘Santa Maria of Nazaret’’ was confiscated in Candia by the local government.214

The prominent Syrian de Lezia family was also involved in grain trade with Armenia. In January 1302, Cele Mele, Pisani, received grain worth 753 white besants (ca. 188.25 Venetian ducats) and soap worth 1050 white besants (ca. 262.5 Venetian ducats) from Dagnanus and Cosmo de Lezia to invest in Armenia. On 27th of March, this time Homodeus de Lezia received 2,250 white besants (ca. 562.5 Venetian ducats) from Damiano de Lezia in order to go to Armenia and invest it in a most lucrative way.215 From 27 March to 29 April, members of the de Lezia consortium presented 12,810 white besants (ca. 3.202 Venetian ducats) in total to be invested either in Cilician Armenia or Laiazzo in particular.216

Moreover, the counterpart of grain was cotton. As is examined by several scholars, Italian merchants were divided into several categories and each group specialised in a different field. Their activities were multifaceted and they operated as traders, transporters, insurers, money-changers, bankers, industrialists and information agents.217 As a result of this, a distinct group of Italian merchants was involved in only transporting cotton from the Middle East to the West. Without any doubt, the Muslim East was a main centre of cotton cultivation and export both before and after the fall of Acre. Syria, Egypt and later Cilician Armenia were the main centres where Genoese and Venetian merchants operated intensely. In terms of providing first-class cotton during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Aleppo,

214 LS [Polonio] 31, no. 76.
Asciam and Hama were the most famous cities. Before the fall of Acre in 1291, the Italian merchants frequented generally northern Syria, particularly Venetians and Pisans were in Aleppo and Genoese in Antioch.\textsuperscript{218} Furthermore, the cotton of Turkey was in demand. Written evidence suggests that cotton was cultivated in Turkey even during the Mongol period. According to the chronicles, the cotton was abundant in Asia Minor and cities like Sivas (Sebaste), Konya (Iconium), Malatya (Melitene) and Ankara (Angora) where visited by the Western merchants. In the thirteenth century Cilician cotton was cultivated in Korykos (Mersin province), Silifke (Seleucia), and Adana and the quality of cotton produced there was ranked in third place after that of Hama and Aleppo by Pegolotti.\textsuperscript{219} Moreover, in fourteenth century principal ports of the Turkish Emirates in Asia Minor, such as Palatia (Balikesir) and Ephesus (Altologo), and Antalya (Sattalia) and Alanya (Candelore) in the southern coast of Asia Minor, became major centres where Genoese and Venetian merchants loaded Turkish cotton.\textsuperscript{220}

The Levant region was not only a stepping-stone for the Latin merchants but it also had a great control on the roads of Asia and remained as a primary supplier to the West until the end of fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{221} In this sense, there can be no doubt that Cyprus played a major role regarding the cotton trade by providing cotton of Cyprus and transit transportation opportunities for the Eastern cotton to the West. In Cyprus, cotton was cultivated mostly in the lands of Episkopi, Paphos, Limassol, Larnaka and Famagusta (especially Mesaria plain), and towards the mid-fourteenth century Venetian Corner family dominated sugar and cotton


\textsuperscript{219} Nam (2007), pp. 136; Mazaoui (1981), p. 39 and fn. 54; Pegolotti, ‘‘La practica’’, p. 58. The importance of Famagusta as a high-class cotton provider is revealed by the lists of Pegolotti, see discussion on the role of Famagusta regarding Levantine cotton trade in the next sub-section.

\textsuperscript{220} Nam (2007), p. 139.

cultivation together with Hospitallers.\textsuperscript{222} The cotton that was harvested in the island and cotton from the Cilician-Armenia, Syria, and Egypt was all gathered in Famagusta before it was transported to the West. According to the state law, cotton must be transported from Famagusta and also written evidence from the period reveals that there was an obligation for masters of cotton to reside in Famagusta.\textsuperscript{223} Indeed, that the superiority of Famagusta port continued until the late fifteenth century is obvious from the state records of Venice and Genoa.

Referring the importance of Famagusta in cotton transportation after the fall of the Crusader states, the transactions concerning cotton transportation from the late thirteenth to mid-fourteenth centuries recorded by Sambuceto are abundant. However, before the examination of notarial evidence regarding the cotton transportation from East, the close link between Cilician Armenia and Famagusta should be explained shortly. After the 1291, the state of Venice decided to allow the Cyprus-Armenia galley line to transport cotton and banned the Beirut-Alexandria galley line until the mid-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{224} On this basis, it is safe to suggest that cotton dealers who operated in Syria and Egypt most probably sent cotton first to Cilician Armenia and from there to Famagusta. This indeed partly explains the regular appearance of Armenian ports in the contracts recorded by Sambuceto. Also, the analysis of Michel Balard regarding the largeness of investments conducted by Genoese merchants in Levant seems to support this idea as well. According to Balard, the cumulative amount of business investments between 1296 and 1310 rose to 600,275 white besants in general. The investment of Genoese merchants in Cilician Armenia (Ayas and Tarsus) in total reached 142,837 white besants and Cyprus (internal trade) follows with 36,144 white

\textsuperscript{222} The historical background of cotton cultivation in Cyprus and its transportation to the West and Aegean are examined well in former sections. Nam, (2007), pp. 173-4.

\textsuperscript{223} The state regulations from mid-fourteenth to late fifteenth century regarding the cotton cultivation and trade will be analysed in the following sections in detail. Nam (2007), pp. 177-253. Mas-Latrie, Histoire de l’île de Chypre, vol. 3, p. 491.

\textsuperscript{224} Nam (2007), p. 249.
In comparison, the lower amount of investments in Syria-Palestine and Mamluk Egypt by Genoese merchants in this short period of time was explained by Balard as the effectiveness of the papal prohibitions. According to him, the economic policy of the Kings of Cyprus was consistent and trade sanctions strictly imposed by the Kings brought Famagusta into a position of mandatory port-of-call for western merchants. However, as the ineffectiveness of the papal prohibitions is proved by the official documents in the previous pages, the main reason for the lower frequency of investments in Syria and Egypt was more related to the changes of galley lines of Venice and Genoa.

In Famagusta, the cotton trade was controlled by the Italian merchants who also had close links with Armenia, Syria and Egypt. For instance, On 16 March 1299, Belcare de Belcare received 514 white besants (ca. 128.5 Venetian ducats) from Viviano de Ginembaldo, procurator of ‘‘Filippo’’, for 7 sacks of cotton which Filippo received in Laiazzo from the Pisan consul appointed by Belcare. On 21 May, Arnaldo Sarraurinus and Guglielmo of Rosrente from Barcelona asked the permission of Guglielmo de Carato of Barcelona, patron of the ship ‘‘San Nicola’’, to load 40 sacks of Aleppo cotton to his ship that is to be shipped to Barcelona. Next day, Simonino Rubeus received Lombardian cloths worth 860 saracen besants from Babilano Salvaigus and promised to pay the money after he sells 4 sacks of Aleppo cotton in Genoa. Moreover, on April 1301 Bellucus de Accon, a Pisan, received cotton and sugar worth 2540 saracen besants from Tomas Grassus in order to sell them either in Venice, Ancona, or Puglia. In another act concluded on 5 April 1307, Guglielmo de Mari and Benedetto Gambonus sold 150 cantar of Syrian cotton (grane cotoni

---

227 LS [Balard] 39, nos. 109, 150.
228 LS [Balard] 39, no. 147. See also no. 150 for the merchants of Barcelona transporting 40 sacks of Aleppo cotton to Barcelona in 1299.
de Syria) to Georgio Vetrario in Famagusta. However, the lack of effort to conceal the origin of merchandise in the acts suggests that these merchants were either in contact with prominent families or working for them.

Beside transactions indicating Famagusta as a main place where cotton consignments loaded, there are also examples of contracts showing that certain agents hired by cotton traders in order to travel from Famagusta to Levantine ports and from there transporting merchandise directly to the West. On 4 November 1300, Marino Sanutus of Venice hired Gherardino de Guarnerio of Acre to transport certain amount of cotton from the port of Pallibus (in the Alexandretta Gulf) to Venice. On 21 February 1301, Palmerius Panzone nominated Leonardo Panzoni as his procurator, who was the patron and owner of the ship called ‘San Antonio’ together with his brother Pietro, in order to transport cotton to Genoa after loading it in Armenia. Palmerius made it clear that if Leonardo loads cotton in Armenia he will be charged 2 Saracen besants by every cantar, however, if the travel is direct from Famagusta he will be charged 6 Saracen besants. The encouragement of trade with the Armenian ports by the merchants explicitly indicates that investors did not have any reason to hide their commercial intentions with the Eastern ports and the reason that they encouraged transporters to load merchandise in Armenia was more likely that Oriental merchandise were also available in Cilician ports due to the change in trade routes. Most probably, this was one of the main reasons for the absence of Egyptian cotton in the Genoese notarial acts. However, another reason for the lack of Egyptian cotton in the notarial records is the lack of development in Egyptian cotton industry until the late medieval period. This fact found confirmation when the dynamics of cotton production in Egypt during the thirteenth and
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230 LS [Balard] 43, no. 133.
231 LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 89.
233 As it is mentioned before the caravan road starting from Ayas (Liaizzo) to Tabriz via Sivas, Erzincan, and Erzurum was the most preferable route for the Venetian and Genoese merchants where they had access to the Oriental merchandise.
fourteenth centuries were examined. According to Heyd, the cotton industry was not well developed in Egypt thus it never played an important role in relation to the trade between Latins and Muslims. Mazzaoui also follows Heyd’s hypothesis and adds that the lack of Egyptian cotton in the manual of Pegolotti indicates a sharp decline in commercial relations between Mamluks and the West during the fourteenth century. However, Ashtor interprets the situation in a different way. According to him, the production of cotton in Egypt had already been neglected by Abbasid Caliphs and generally cultivation started during the Fatimid reign and reached its peak during the Mamluk domination in fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Jong-Kuk Nam also offers a more analytic interpretation showing that cotton was not a common agricultural product in Egypt until the late Middle Ages, and, comparing to flax and sugar cane, its production remained relatively low.234

Although, it can be said that grain and cotton were among of the most important commercial items that Italian traders were involved with, they also transported other commodities such as sugar and oriental spices.235 As notarial evidence suggest, Oriental goods were either loaded in Famagusta before transportation to the West, or Lesser Armenia started as their loading point on their way from Famagusta to Genoa and Venice.236 Relying on the Genoese notarial records, it is quite obvious that prominent Genoese families held the

235 It is necessary to state that due to the word limitations there is no space to discuss other products in detail in this section. However, it must be mentioned that items such as silver, cloth and slaves were widely traded by the Italian merchants (particularly Genoese) and Famagusta played an important role as an international slave market and distributor of European cloth to the Latin East. The role of Famagusta in the slave trade and its evolution is discussed comprehensively in the next sections. For the notarial evidence of Famagusta based merchant companies transporting large amounts of cloth and silver to the Cilician Armenia and Muslim lands see; LS [Balard], nos. 46, 113, 184, 300; LS [Balard] 39, nos. 2, 20, 23; LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 125, 404; LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 50, 121; LS [Pavoni] 49, nos. 134, 147, 208, 276, 277; LS [Balard] 43, no. 2 (in part II-1307) and nos. 5 and 12 (in part III-1308-1310). For the activities of prominent Genoese merchant families (such as Savona, Bestagni, Tartaro, Rubeus) in Cyprus, Egypt, Syria and Laiazzo from 1274 to 1279 and transportation of silver and cloth from Cyprus the Latin East see; Notai genovesi in oltremare. Atti rogati a Laiazzo da Federico di Piazzalunga (1274) e Pietro di Bargone (1277, 1279), e. L. Balletto, CSFS 53, (Genoa, 1989). CSFS 53 [1] refers to the year 1274 and CSFS 53 [2] refers to the years 1277, 1279. CSFS 53 [1], nos. 31, 51-5455, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, 73, 90, 91, 92, 109, 110; CSFS 53 [2], nos. 12, 16, 17, 20, 26, 34, 43, 46, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 72, 80, 115, 133, 134. There is also evidence that despite the Papal prohibitions Latin merchants continued to transport war materials from Ayas to Egypt. On this see; Jacoby, D. “The Supply of War Materials to Egypt in the Crusader Period” in Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 25 (2001), pp. 102-132.
control of Oriental merchandise transportation to Genoa besides grain. For instance, in 1300 Baldus Spinola and Filippo de Nigro hired out their galley, which was anchored in Syria and loaded with 97 sacks of sugar (c. 240-250 cantars of Genoa) ready to be transported to Genoa to Oberto and Giovanni.\(^{237}\) On 25 August 1300, Franciscus Squarciafico, Philiponus de Nigro and Baldus Spinola received an unspecified amount of Armenian dirhems from Franchis Tavano in exchange for what they had promised him to transport for him. In addition to this, they loaded 132 sacks of pepper in total and Franciscus received 1,500 salmes of grain worth 55,180 dirhems (ca. 3941.4 Venetian ducats) from the Bardi society on behalf of Iohannes Tavano which were all to be transported to Genoa.\(^{238}\) On 30 August, the same aristocratic consortium loaded another 84 sacks of pepper also to be shipped to Genoa.\(^{239}\) On another occasion, Baldus Spinola and Philippo de Nigro received a certain amount of galingale, Brazil-wood, frankincense and sugar from Egypt for a trading venture to Genoa.\(^{240}\) Next year, in October, Leonarduzius de Dominico, loaded cotton, sugar, incense and buckram worth 1,988 saracen besants to the ship of Barone Pellegrini in order to be transported to Ancona. At the same day, Lipus de Ancona loaded cotton, sugar, incense and buckram worth 1,871 saracen besants to the same ship of Barone Pellegrini.\(^{241}\) Although acts are silent about from whom Leonarduzius and Lipus bought the merchandise, money currency clearly indicates their origin. In a wider context, merchants of Genoa were not the only ones dominating the spice trade but Venetians as well. A Venetian judicial act from the early fourteenth century also refers to the purchase of spice in Famagusta which was probably imported from Mamluk lands to Famagusta and from there to Venice.\(^{242}\) It seems, however, as if the Oriental spices from Syria were still imported to Famagusta by Italian traders towards the mid-fourteenth

\(^{237}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 130.  
\(^{238}\) LS [Desimoni], nos. 218, 219.  
\(^{239}\) LS [Desimoni], nos. 228, 229, 235, 239.  
\(^{240}\) LS [Desimoni], no. 256.  
\(^{241}\) LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 220 and 221.  
century. The manual of Pegolotti includes a price list for spices which shows how much spices cost in Syria and in Famagusta after they were imported to Cyprus. According to Pegolotti, spices from Syria and Egypt were packed in Famagusta and every parcel was 40 local rotuli which was equal to 50 *ratls* of Damascus. In this respect, Ashtor rightly pointed out that “the custom prevailing in Famagusta to pack the spices in such parcels is an obvious indication that most of them came from Damascus”.

In fact, the act concluded during 1360 in Famagusta, mentions a purchase of pepper in Alexandria which substantiates the analysis of Ashtor.

The acts drawn up by Sambuceto and Rocha covering the period from 1304 to 1310 are revealing less regarding the activities of Famagusta based Latin merchants in the East. At first glance, it appears that the merchants of Famagusta still maintained close contacts with Cilician Armenia. For example, on 2 August 1304 (?), Bonifacio de Rappalo received wheat worth 200 white besants (*ca. 50 Venetian ducats*) to sell in Laiazzo. In February 1307, Pietro Ceba received 14,000 white besants to invest either in Laiazzo or Provence. At the same month, Oberto de Gavio undertook a voyage to sell camlets worth 700 white besants (*ca. 175 Venetian ducats*) in Armenia and return back to Cyprus. Similarly, in April, Manuele de Turri received 10,300 white besants (*ca. 2.575 Venetian ducats*) from Bonifacio de Grimaldis to invest either in Armenia or the West. Surprisingly, there is not mention of the activities of Genoese merchants in the Muslim East except one receipt of payment that refers to Damascus and Beirut without stating the purpose of journey or type of merchandise. Unlike the notarial acts from 1296 to 1301 there is an observable peculiarity in the records from 1304 to 1307. The documents reveal very limited information which prevents the reader from exposing the actual purpose of the investment. Most of the documents reveal only the name

---

243 Ibid, pp. 74-5 and fn. 53; Pegolotti, p. 85.
244 *de Boateriis*, no 42.
245 *LS* [Balard] 43, no. 22 (in part I) and nos. 55, 70 and 135 (in part II).
246 *LS* [Balard] 43, no. 66 (in part II).
of the investor, the recipient and the amount of money. Also most of the acts are defined as ‘receipt of payment’ and short acts only stating that recipients of the money can invest money anywhere appropriate. This, however, obviously indicates the intention of concealing the main purpose of the trip. However, the records from 1308 to 1310 are even more undelightful. There are less than ten acts referring to the transportation of cloth, wheat and cotton to Armenia, Pera and Anatolia (Romania).

The unusual nature of the contracts recorded in the early fourteenth century can be attributed to a variety of factors. One important factor was the relatively strict papal embargoes promulgated in the early fourteenth century. In 1295, Pope Boniface VIII (1294-1303) promulgated an extensive bull prohibiting all trade with non-Christians and asked religious authorities of the maritime cities to ban all trade with Egypt. In 1304, his successor Pope Benedict XI (1303-1304) sent a letter to Genoa and Pisa stating that ‘‘[...] nobody could or ought to go to or carry anything to the lands of the Muslims, or to Muslims where ever they are [...]’’. The requirements of Pope Benedict seem to have been taken seriously by Genoa and Pisa. But shortly after the arrival of the letter Genoa and Pisa asked the Pope to revise the papal bull and permit them to carry on trade in the Muslim East. In March, Pope Benedict declared that Genoese and Pisan merchants were free to travel to Muslim lands, except, the lands of the Sultan of Babylon (Mamluk Egypt) and they were not allowed to trade war materials. Moreover, in 1308 Pope Clement V proclaimed another total embargo against Muslims, this time targeting especially the merchants of Venice, Genoa, Ancona and

247 For some of them see: LS [Balard] 43, nos. 41, 46, 47, 69, 106, 128, 147, 151, 159, 175.
248 There are 302 acts recorded by the Sambuceto and de Rocha between 1304-1310. Generally they consisted of manumission of slaves, receipt of payment, and agreements that gives merchants full right to invest money wherever appropriate without stating any specific place.
249 LS [Balard] 43, nos. 2, 4, 5, 6, 29, 75, 81, 82 (in part III).
251 Ibid, p. 195 and fn. 74. ‘‘...possitis ad alias preter quam Babilonie soldano subjectas Sarracenorum terras accedere cum mercibus et rebus non vetitis et habere commercium cum Sarracenis terrarium ipsarum’’.
Pisa.\textsuperscript{252} The total embargo on trade with the Muslims and Popes’ efforts against contraband trade seem to be the main reason for the less informative acts drawn up by the Latin merchants.\textsuperscript{253} However, another possible explanation for the lack of Genoese activities in the Muslim East can be attributed to the political confrontations in Cyprus. During the reign of Henry II the diplomatic relations between Cyprus and Genoa started to deteriorate due to a variety of reasons. As is known, Lusignans took the side of Venetians during the War of St Sabas and in 1288 the Genoese authorities refused to ratify a new commercial agreement suggested by King Henry. Thereupon, in 1291 Henry II rescinded the agreement of 1288 and several incidents occurred in Cyprus indicating that the authorities in Cyprus supported Venice during the Curzola War (1293-1298).\textsuperscript{254} Seemingly, the diplomatic relations between Henry II and Genoa were relatively normalised from 1298 to 1304. However, in 1305 Henry II ordered all Genoese nationals to leave the island claiming that Genoa was planning to attack his kingdom.\textsuperscript{255} Indeed, only a year later the political situation in Cyprus worsened. On 26 April 1306, Amalric of Tyre, the king’s brother, ascended the throne with the title of ‘governor and rector’ and declared that Henry was too ill to rule the kingdom. In 1308, Amalric of Tyre made a peace agreement with Genoa but evidently they were not granted any trade privileges by Amalric.\textsuperscript{256} Also, according to the Chronicle of Amadi the economy of Cyprus was hit by a great failure of harvests in 1308. This, indeed, explains the scarcity of notarial records referring to the exportation of wheat, sugar and cotton from Famagusta to the West or Latin East from 1308 to 1310.\textsuperscript{257} On the other hand, when Henry regained power in

\textsuperscript{252} Ibid, p. 195-6.
\textsuperscript{253} LS [Balard] 43, nos. 45 and 56.
\textsuperscript{254} Edbury (1991), pp. 110.
\textsuperscript{255} Ibid, p. 111. In 1329, relations between Cyprus and Genoa normalised again when King Hugh of Cyprus granted commercial privileges to Genoa and agreed to compensate all debts owed to Genoa by King Amalric (Aimery) of Tyre. On this see; Epstein, S. Genoa and the Genoese: 958-1528 (The University of North Carolina, 1996), pp. 198-99.
\textsuperscript{256} Ibid, pp. 113 and 117. According to the Edbury first Amalric’s first diplomatic move was to grant trade privileges to the republic of Venice.
\textsuperscript{257} Ibid, p. 123. There are only 6 acts referring to the wheat transportation or sale of wheat between 1308-1310. see; LS [Balard] 43, nos. 24, 41, 69, 80, 81, 82.
1310 the relations between Genoa and Kingdom of Cyprus become again progressively worse. Regarding the political relations between the Kingdom of Cyprus and Genoa in 1310, Peter Edbury has pointed out that ‘the Cypriot authorities were taking a tough line with any Genoese they believed to be breaking the embargo’.  

To conclude, as illustrated earlier, the economic relations between Famagusta and the Cilician Armenia and Muslim East were intense. Yet, rather than oversimplifying the socio-economic aspects of the period by merely analysing the commodities that were imported and exported, the aim is to provide a detailed analysis of Famagusta-based Italian merchant groups and their role in Levantine trade. In the light of the primary evidence, it has been shown how these families controlled the Levantine trade and also the constant cooperation between several merchant societies indicates that trade between 1270 and 1310 was not under the monopoly of any single nation. Furthermore, an analysis shows that merchant communities were interested in specific products (e.g. cotton, grain, cloth, sugar, Oriental spices) which also reveal what is in demand both in the Muslim world and the West. Unfortunately, the period from 1310 to 1350 remains a mystery. The lack of notarial and fiscal evidence regarding the economic dynamics of Famagusta makes it impossible to analyse the agricultural potential of Famagusta and its commercial relations with the Muslim East. However, ecclesiastical registers from this period allow us to catch a glimpse of the merchant activities. For instance, in 1315 the armed galleys commissioned for monitoring the Eastern Mediterranean against illicit trade were warned specially about the merchants of Cyprus. Moreover, in 1320 Pope John XXII declared a bull of excommunication against merchants of Cyprus who were caught transporting forbidden merchandise to Mamluk Egypt.  

What is more striking is the permission granted by Pope Clement VI to King Hugh

---

259 Coureas, N. “Controlled Contacts: The Papacy, The Latin Church of Cyprus and Mamluk Egypt, 1250-1350” in Vermeulen, U. and Steenbergen, V. J. (eds.) *Egypt and Syria in the Fatimid, Ayyubid and Mamluk*
IV of Cyprus allowing him to establish a galley line (two galleys) to the port of Alexandria and other parts of the Mamluk territory for a five-year period.\(^{260}\) But, although the papal bulls are good pieces of evidence for the existence of long-distance trade they do not provide any hints about the volume of the trade. In this sense, for more detailed analysis of the economic dynamics of Famagusta and the volume of Levant trade from 1310 to 1350 notarial evidence is crucial.

---


\(^{260}\) Coureas, N. “Controlled Contacts”, p. 407.
2.2.2 The Role of Famagusta as a Distribution Centre of Oriental and Local Merchandise to the West (1300-1340)

The commercial and agricultural potential of Famagusta and its importance to the West as an important supplier has been largely neglected in the existing literature. As discussed earlier, there is a common tendency in the modern scholarship to describe the city as a ‘boom town’ and correlate its so-called ‘rise’ with the fall of Acre in 1291. The role of Famagusta in the long-distance Levant trade is often explained by the political and strategic factors. Yet, the agricultural potential of Famagusta region (and Cyprus in general) and the role of Latin merchants in transporting local and Oriental merchandise from Famagusta to the West are somehow neglected in the modern scholarship. However, Famagusta was not important only because of its proximity to the Muslim East and the activities of its prominent merchant companies in the East but also as a main supplier of local agricultural products (such as wheat, cotton, sugar, salt and vegetables) to the West. As will be seen, the notarial evidence clearly shows that the international market of Famagusta was one of the most visited markets in the Levant by Latin merchants, offering them local and Oriental goods at the same time. It was also the most important slave market in the Eastern Mediterranean which offered a wide range of slaves from different ethnicities.

Particularly, Venice and Genoa paid special attention to Cyprus in the thirteenth century. Cyprus was an important transit point for Oriental merchandise and at the same time agriculturally suitable for exploitation. Meanwhile, from 1266 onwards, Sicily and Naples became problematic places for the Genoese merchants due to the political problems between Charles of Anjou and Genoa. On the other hand, political instability between Genoa and Pisa in Sardinia around 1297 meant no easy exploitation of its local products for the Genoese either. Although both Sardinia and Corsica contributed to the economy of Genoa at some
level they lost their importance towards the mid fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{261} In this regard, Famagusta was a gold mine for Genoa that gave its merchants access to the local products and provided them with a secure environment for the marketing of Oriental merchandise transported from the East. It seems that Genoa had already discovered the importance of Cyprus around 1260s. Pope Urban IV, in 1261, warned the King of Cyprus that Genoa, in cooperation with the Byzantines, was planning an attack on the island.\textsuperscript{262} The Venetians were established in Cyprus long before the Genoese. They were active in the island even during the Byzantine period and throughout the thirteenth century Limassol became their port-of-call on their way to Byzantium and Latin East. The intensified diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Cyprus and Venice from mid-thirteenth century onwards and the exploitation of salt reserves on the island by Venice is attested by the Maggior Consiglio registers.\textsuperscript{263} More importantly, the Venetian Cornaro family possessed a large number of sugar plantations around Limassol, Famagusta, Kyrenia, Paphos, Morphou and Lefka and considerable amounts of the wheat and cotton produced in the hinterland of Famagusta.\textsuperscript{264} As David Jacoby observed, Famagusta was integrated to the Venetian galley line to Laiazzo in 1294 and from 1301 a Venetian-Laiazzo galley line via Famagusta consisted of 6 to 8 galleys.\textsuperscript{265}

The importance of Famagusta was illustrated by Pegolotti’s extensive section showing the commercial contact between Famagusta, Syria, Armenia, and Turkey, the Greek islands, Constantinople, Crete, Italy, southern France, Catalonia, Spain, Tunis, and further with Paris, London, Bruges and Antwerp.\textsuperscript{266} For instance, Pegolotti’s commercial manual provides a list of ports which served as the main high-grade cotton suppliers. This includes Hama, Aleppo,

\textsuperscript{261} Epstein, ‘Genoa and the Genoese’, pp. 143-4 and 232.
\textsuperscript{262} Edbury (1991), p. 11.
\textsuperscript{264} See Chapter 2-Section1.
\textsuperscript{265} Jacoby (2009b), p. 67.
\textsuperscript{266} Pegolotti, F. B. La pratica della mercatura, (ed.) A. Evans (Cambridge, 1936), pp. 89-102.
Sciame (central Syria), Acre and Latakia on the Syria coast, Cilician Armenia, Cyprus (Famagusta), Puglia and Malta. Indeed, the map of Mediterranean port cities provided by an unknown Arab author finds some confirmation in the commercial manual of Pegolotti dating back to the fourteenth century. In the list of Pegolotti, important port cities such as Korykos, Silifke and Adana together with Cilician Armenia and Cyprus are mentioned as high-quality cotton providers. The commercial importance of cotton for Venice and Genoa, and its production and transportation from the Levant and Eastern Mediterranean is well examined by prominent scholars. Eliyahu Ashtor pointed out that Oriental spices and cotton were some of the most demanded items by the Venetians and they somehow succeed to control cotton monopoly in the Muslim Levant in the thirteenth century. However, as it will be seen, the Genoese merchants would soon join the cotton monopoly as a shareholder together with Venice, and due to the inadequacy of cotton produced by Syria, cotton of Egypt and Turkey was in demand from the mid-fourteenth century onwards. The cotton industry together with sugar, grain and Oriental spice constituted the main body of the commercial monopolies controlled by Latins not only in the Mediterranean Sea but also the Black Sea and Levant. As Maureen Mazzaoui has argued, “cotton manufacture stands out as the only

268 See Appendix.
269 Heyd (1936), vol.2, p. 612; Mazzaoui (1981), p. 39. Considering the fact that this Arabic manuscript is a copy of late twelfth or early thirteenth century and originally compiled during the eleventh century, the similarities between this manuscript and the fourteenth century manual clearly reveals that the maps and information about the cities provided by the Arab author was prepared for the commercial purposes. That both works refer to the same port cities also might suggest that Cyprus was involved in cotton trade (at some degree) during the eleventh century as well.
271 Ashtor, “The Venetian Cotton Trade”, p. 689. However, the cotton of Turkey was not high in quality. That the best quality of cotton was provided by Syria, Egypt, and Cyprus is also attested by the several records. (For example, see; manual of Pegolotti).
major export industry geared to the output of low-priced goods for popular consumption with profits heavily dependent upon volume of turnover.”\textsuperscript{272}

Moreover, as discussed previously, official contracts reveal that the Venetians and Pisans settled in Limassol established close links with their compatriots conducting cotton business on the Southern coasts of Anatolia and Little Armenia. Venetians largely dominated the cotton trade in the eastern Mediterranean together with the Genoese and Pisan merchants. Despite the predominance of the Genoese merchants in the Famagusta harbour, the Venetian merchants nevertheless gained numerous commercial and fiscal privileges as attested by Amalric de Lusignan in 1306.\textsuperscript{273} Shortly afterwards, the Venetian Senate decided that the vessels carrying cotton to Venice should sail from either Cyprus or Cilician Armenia. Furthermore, in the second half of the fourteenth century they obtained a concession from the King of Cyprus who rewarded them with the district of Episcopi where the Corner family cultivated large amounts of sugar cane and cotton until the Ottoman conquest.\textsuperscript{274} The dominance of the Venetians and Genoese (in particular), considering the international trade especially from the fourteenth century onwards, is also reflected by the manual of Pegolotti. According to Pegolotti’s manual, the Venetian and Genoese citizens were exempted from commercium in Cyprus whereas all the others were supposed to pay two per cent.\textsuperscript{275}

One of the most important merchandise that was exported to the West from Famagusta was cotton. Cotton was produced in Cyprus and largely exported to Italy and other parts of the West. Pegolotti provides the list of cotton types produced in Cyprus, consisting of cotone, cotone mapputo, cotone granato, cotone filato and bucherame

\textsuperscript{272} Mazzaoui (1981), p. 60.
\textsuperscript{273} Mazzaoui (1981), p. 41.
\textsuperscript{274} Ibid, 41; Jacoby (2009b), p. 68.
\textsuperscript{275} Pegolotti, “La practica”, p. 84; Abulafia, D. “The Merchants of Messina: Levant Trade and Domestic Economy” in (ed.) David Abulafia, Commerce and Conquest in the Mediterranean, 1100-1500 (Ashgate, 1993), pp. 199 and 210. Although, Pegolotti’s manual was compiled around 1340s it is certain that it includes considerable amount of material dateable from 1310 to1340. On this see; Pegolotti, “‘La practica’”, p.xiv.
The movement of cotton was diverse. Not only Genoese and Venetians but also merchants from ‘‘minor trading cities’’ and Orientals were involved in the cotton trade. Although, it is not known when exactly cotton was introduced to the island, nor its development, available evidence tells us that cotton cultivation in Cyprus reached its peak during the early fourteenth century. Particularly, it was cultivated in Paphos, Episkopi, Limassol, Larnaka and Famagusta. Especially, it is well known that after the Venetian Corner family obtained the property of the District of Episkopi in 1360 they started to cultivate sugar and cotton in large amounts. Beside Venetians, merchants of Messina, Pisa and Genoa were involved in cotton transportation from Famagusta to the West.

The notarial registers of Lamberto Sambuceto, who worked in Famagusta from 1294 to 1307, shed light on the cotton trade between Famagusta and the West. In 1291, the merchant called Viviano Milleo, from Messina, acted on behalf of Ruggero Lorea, admiral of the king of Sicily, and chartered the ship called ‘‘Santa Maria de Scara’’. He intended to transport 50 cantar of cotton and 8 cantar of alum from Cyprus to Venice by the 15th of March. On 18 September 1301, a Pisan called Bachemeus Aflicante received cotton in Famagusta worth 6,591 white besants (ca. 1647 Venetian ducats) from Guido de Bando promising to sell it in Venice and return to Famagusta. In October 1301, a spice dealer and burgess of Famagusta called Giacomo, a Syrian Christian, received cotton from Damiano Pegolotti, ‘‘La practica’’, pp. 77, 79, 85-7, 93-4 and 158; Mazzaoui (1981), p. 181, fn. 65. As MacKenzie stated in his thesis ‘‘according to Pegolotti, cotton yarn was priced in white besants, while ginned cotton wool was priced in saracen besants so the contracts recorded in saracen besants may concern wool rather than yarn’’. MacKenzie (1994), p. 212 fn. 63; Pegolotti (1936), p. 77. So in this sense, it is not always possible to calculate exact quantities of merchandise involved due to the variations in price and sometimes uncertainty of the type of merchandise.

Edbury, P. ‘‘Famagusta in 1300’’, p. 337.
LS [Balard] 39, no. 34. [According to Pegolotti; 1 cantar (kantar) of Cyprus is equivalent to the 720 Genoese lire (libbra or pound). 1 cantar of Cyprus is equivalent to the 740 Genoese lire of cotton. 5 silver lire of Genoa= 7 marks of Cyprus or 5 sterlhi. Cotton fabric (cotton-mappato) was 1 besant per cantar, yarn cotton was 1 besant per sack, seeded cotton (cotton granato) was 12 carats per sacks, cotton was 1 besant and 12 carats per bale and linen 1 besant per sack. Pegolotti, pp. 85,86 and 409. For silver and exchange rates in relation to Venice and the import of coins and silver, see: pp. 81-3 and 97-8.]
LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 128.
Lezia worth 2,662 Saracen besants and according to the agreement each Saracen besant is equal to 3.5 white besants therefore 9,317 white besants (ca. 2,329 Venetian besants). On the same day, Giacomo again received cotton this time from Cosmo, brother of Damiano de Lezia, worth 3,568 white besants (ca. 892 Venetian ducats) in order to carry them to Venice on the ship of Marino and Nicola.\(^{281}\) Indeed, Cosmas and Damian de Lezia often chartered the ships of Nicola Sten and Marino de Aragusia (Ragusa?) to carry cotton to Venice.\(^{282}\) Also, the said Giacomo, as notarial evidence suggests, was working for the Lezia brothers transporting cotton from Famagusta to Venice. The sums involved on 7\(^{th}\) October 1301 were impressive. Giacomo appears in 5 different acts on that very day and he received cotton worth 16,098 white besants (ca. 4,024 Venetian ducats) in commenda\(^{283}\) from the Lezia brothers, for a trade venture in Venice.\(^{284}\) Moreover, other members of the de Lezia family were also involved in the cotton trade as well. Michelino Lezia admitted receipt of cotton worth 8,600 white besants (ca. 2,150 Venetian ducats) from members of the Lezia and Antiochia families, on 7 October 1301, that were to be shipped to Venice.\(^{285}\) Refugees from Acre were also involved in cotton transportation to the West. A clear indication of merchants from Acre is illustrated by two acts dated 10 and 15 January 1302, where Giovanni de Castello, olim burgessis de Accon, received 1,600 white besants (ca. 400 Venetian ducats) in total for trade in Venice.\(^{286}\) The following day, that is, 16\(^{th}\) January 1302, Teodoro de Tripeler of Acre admitted receipt of 409 ½ besants received in cotton from a Genoese called

\(^{281}\) *LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 203 and 204.*


\(^{283}\) “Like the sea loan, the commenda contract is drafted only for the duration of a sea voyage; it is ended when the borrower returns the capital plus the profits or minus the losses.” Lopez, R. *Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World,* (New York, 2001), pp. 174-5.

\(^{284}\) *LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 203, 204, 205, 206 and 207.* (3,568 white besants and 3,580 Saracen besants. According to the agreements each Saracen besant is equal to the 3.5 white besants.)

\(^{285}\) *LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 210, 211, 212, 213, 214 and 215.*

\(^{286}\) *LS [Pavoni] 49, nos. 8 and 15.*
Corrado de Clavaro, who was acting on behalf of Corrado de Alexandrio, for commerce in Venice.\footnote{LS [Pavoni] 49, no. 20. For the commercial activities of immigrants from Acre see; Jacoby, D. "Refugees from Acre in Famagusta around 1300" in (ed.) Walsh, M. Kiss, T. and Coureas N. The Harbour of all this Sea and Realm: Crusader to Venetian Famagusta (Budapest, 2014), pp. 53-67. However, it must be noted that activities and appearance of the refugees from Acre in the notarial acts are not even comparable to the power and commercial activities of prominent Genoese families, such as; Spinola, Doria, de Mari, de Nigro and Squarciafico.}

The merchants of Genoa were also largely involved in the cotton trade on their own account. The prominent Genoese families, such as \textit{de Mari}, \textit{Spinola}, \textit{Squarciafico}, \textit{de Nigro} and \textit{Doria} exported various merchandise from Famagusta to Genoa. In April 1299, Percivale de Mari and Babilano de Negrono who were acting on behalf of Simonino Rubeus and Ottolino Rubeus promised that they will pay 650 Genoese lire (libbre, pounds or \textit{libra Ianuensis}),\footnote{It should be noted here that the term ‘Genoese pound’ sometimes refers to the Genoese weight measurement. In this sense, \textit{Miliarum Librarum Ianuense} = 1,000 Genoese pounds in weight and \textit{Centarium} = 100 Genoese pounds in weight. However, in this case it is clear that lire or ‘pound’ refers to money. Yet, in Levantine trade money was generally paid in besants. But, on some occasions \textit{miliarium biscanciorum argenti} (silver bars) were used. Verlinden, C. The Beginnings of Modern Colonization: Eleven Essays with an introduction (Cornell Uni., 1970), p.148. Also, according to Bryne ‘ship-owners reckoned their profits chiefly on the freight paid for cargoes fetched back to Genoa from ports overseas, and not on the cargoes exported from Genoa’}. 8 soldi and 4 dinar in two and a half months in Genoa. On another occasion, at the same month, Ottolino Rubeus received 1600 white besants (\textit{ca. 400 Venetian ducats}) from Percivale payable in Genoa.\footnote{LS [Balard] 39, nos. 131 and 132.} Again, on 30 April 1299, Percivale concluded two acts where Raimondino de Rappalo and Lanzalotus had each been given 1000 (\textit{ca. 250 Venetian ducats}) and 400 white besants (\textit{ca. 100 Venetian ducats}) separately by Percivale de Mari in order to invest it in Genoa and return back to Cyprus.\footnote{LS [Balard] 39, nos. 136 and 141.} Indeed, Percivale and other members of the Mari family concluded a considerable amount of deeds and paid impressive amounts of money to invest either in Genoa or other Italian cities. They also acted as middleman and witnessed several of the agreements of their compatriots.\footnote{LS [Balard] 39, nos. 35, 39, 40, 71, 72, 85, 94, 105, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 141, 143 and 147.} The \textit{de Mari} family was one of...
the most important Genoese families in Cyprus, they belonged to the Ghibelline clan in Genoa, and they held important positions in Cyprus. For instance, Pasquele de Mari served as a Podestà in 1297 (in Nicosia) and Rector of the Genoese community during the Curzola war negotiating the compensation of damage caused by the Venetians.  

Genoa was also a shareholder in the cotton industry together with Venice. However, the Genoese merchants of Levant were more active in this industry in the Eastern ports. Genoa already exported raw cotton chiefly from the North African ports of Ceuta, Bougie and Tunis during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Genoese dominance in the Levantine trade, as will be seen in the next section, continued through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as well. Indeed, Genoa was an important exporter of cotton to other western port cities. Genoese customs receipts from these periods reveal that a considerable amount of cotton was exported to Provence from Genoa in 1376. In addition, in the same period some cotton was conveyed to Barcelona and Seville via Genoa. In spite of the relatively small number of contracts that were concluded in Famagusta concerning the cotton exported to Genoa, the quantities carried by the Genoese traders were significant. For instance, on 15 April 1300, Enrico bought 31 sacks of cotton on the ship called ‘‘Dalmacia’’ from the Scozzi company and the cotton was to be taken to Genoa. Three days later, another Genoese merchant called Manuel Tartaro acting on behalf of Iohannes de Vignali received 45 sacks of cotton from Iohannes Zaccaria that was to be shipped to Genoa on a ship belonging to Branca de Castro. Also in September 1301, another Genoese called Giacomo de Gropo received 10 sacks of cotton worth 1,453 white besants (ca. 362. 25 Venetian ducats) from Viviano de

---

292 Mackenzie ‘‘Consuls and Communities’’, pp. 210-211; LS [Desimoni], no. 42.
293 Mazzaoui, p. 172 and fn.24.
296 LS [Desimoni], nos. 99 and 101.
Ginnembaldo to be traded in Genoa.\textsuperscript{297} Moreover, despite the rarity of Genoese merchants sending Cypriot cotton to Genoa from Famagusta in Sambuceto’s notarial work, the considerable amounts of Cypriot cotton that were carried to the Genoa are illustrated by the Genoese customs receipts.\textsuperscript{298}

Apart from Venice and Genoa, the cotton was largely exported from Famagusta to the cities like Ancona and the Puglia (region of Apulia). During the first half of the thirteenth century the Latin East (Jerusalem-Antioch-Edessa-Tripoli) was an important commercial centre for the Anconitan merchants and after the restrictions on Levantine trade, Famagusta became their main centre of commerce which allowed them to export cotton to the West. As Abulafia mentioned, despite the lack of evidence concerning the commercial contracts from Ancona, it is known that they had a colony in Acre and were therefore regarded as a potential candidate of ‘‘\textit{Repubblica marinara italiana}’’ in the later period of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{299}

The work of Lamberto di Sambuceto reveals how active Anconitans were in the Levant trade after the fall of Acre. They often collaborated with Genoese, south Italian, Pisan, and Greek investors (or partners) as well as the aforementioned Syrian family de Lezia (originating from Lattakieh) and transported impressive amounts of cotton from both Levantine ports and Famagusta to Ancona.\textsuperscript{300}

The brothers Cosmas and Damiano, members of the \textit{de Lezia family}, were important investors in cotton. It seems as if Leone de Lezia was appointed by them to deal with the transportation of the cotton to the ports of Italy. On 7 October 1300, Leone admitted receipt of ginned cotton worth 7,060 white besants (\textit{ca. 1765 Venetian ducats}) in total to be sold in

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[]\textsuperscript{297} \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 32, no. 97. See also \textit{LS [Polonia]} 31, no. 237.
\item[]\textsuperscript{299} Abulafia, D. \textit{‘‘The Anconitan Privileges’’}, p. 525.
\item[]\textsuperscript{300} Ibid, pp. 546-47.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Ancona and Puglia (Apulia). 301 The de Lezia family was the only non-Italian originated family in Famagusta that was able to compete with Venetian and Genoese trading companies. As notarial acts indicate, most of the time they collaborated with members of their own family but they had some associates from Ancona as well. The prominent ones were Tomaso de Rogerio and Simone de Nicola of Ancona, with whom Cosma and Damian sent consignments of cotton worth 3, 119 white besants (ca. 779 Venetian besants) to Ancona and Puglia in October 1300. 302 Both Anconitans appear often in the acts of 1301 carrying cotton to Ancona on behalf of Cosma and Damian and acting as procurators of de Lezia in order to collect debts in Ancona. 303 Furthermore, there was a significant increase in the amount of cotton carried to Ancona by de Lezia members in 1301. On 7 October 1301, different members of the de Lezia family sent and carried cotton to Ancona worth 28, 044 white besants (ca. 7.011 Venetian ducats). 304 Additionally, Ancona also had a council and official representative in Famagusta 305 and merchants from Ancona often were involved in the cotton trade and transported various merchandise from Famagusta to Ancona. One such merchant, Lupus de Egidio, together with other investors loaded goods worth 1,871 saracen besants onto a ship owned by Pellegrini de Galante to be shipped to Ancona in October 1301. The goods included cotton, sugar, pepper, incense, buckram and gold. On the same day, another such merchant Leonarduccio de Dominico of Ancona also loaded 9 sacks of cotton, 6 cases of sugar, half a quintar of pepper, half a quintar of incense, 47 pieces of buckram, and gold.

301 LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 31, 32, 33 and 34. There are several types of cotton circulating in the Famagusta market. Pegolotti mentions some of them in his work as ‘‘cotone granato’’ (with seeds) and ‘‘cotone mapputo’’ or ginned cotton, Pegolotti, ‘‘Pratica della Mercatura’’ pp. 85-6 and 366-7. See also Mazzaoui (1981) p. 176, fn. 9.
302 LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 48 and 54.
303 LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 197, 199 and 200. See also another Anconitan called ‘‘de magistro Nicolao de Ancona’’ acting as a debt collector in Ancona on behalf of Cosmas. LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 197.
304 LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 192,193, 194, 195, 196, 198, 199, 200, 202 and 208. It is highly possible that the members of de Lezia family and their associates were sending cotton to Ancona and Puglia during the late 13th century as well as they appears in the acts of 1296 either as a party that lent the money or witness. The acts are clearly stating that the received money will be invested in Puglia and Ancona without specifying the merchandise. See LS [Balard] 39, nos. 7 and 8.
305 LS [Desimoni], no. 169.
to the same ship on its way to Ancona worth 1,988 saracen besants. In another act, Leonardo Salembene of Ancona placed 45 sacks of cotton, 22 cases of sugar, 125 pieces of buckram, and some gold, on a ship.  

Grain was also highly demanded by merchants especially during the late middle ages. Beside the exportation of grain to Famagusta by Westerners, the island itself was an important wheat supplier. Especially, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the island played a crucial role in supplying wheat to the West, Aegean (Rhodes) and the East. The reduction of the labour force especially in Egypt and Syria due to the Black Death and ‘frequent plague recurrences’ caused depopulation, therefore the production decreased. In the fourteenth century, the export of wheat to Cyprus, Syria, Crete and Dalmatia from Egypt has already been examined by Ashtor. At the same time, official records reveal that Italian merchants transported impressive amounts of wheat from Apulia, Sicily and Cyprus to Egypt and Syria during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Wheat, as a most important and commonly used cereal in daily life, was now under the hegemony of Latin merchants. In fact, during the late thirteenth century ecclesiastical authorities requested that Latin merchants not supply wheat to the Muslim Levant. In response, Pere Marci, the Catalan treasurer, ‘‘reported to the king that Alexandria’s population would have been reduced to naught without the supply of wheat by Catalan merchants’’. In the early fourteenth century Egypt and the Muslim Levant in general were suffering from famine, and Syria was invaded by Tatars. Several notarial contracts drawn up in Famagusta also show that Apulian wheat

---

was transported first to Famagusta and from there to Syria during the years of famine.\textsuperscript{311} Although, wheat production in Egypt does not seem to vanish, the wheat industry witnessed serious decline in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{312}

Italian traders were not the only ones exporting and importing wheat in the Levant. The Templars and Hospitaliers were also involved in long-distance trade and interested in transporting grain. They appear in the commercial transactions with other merchants carrying merchandise to central Italy and exporting grain from Apulia. In 1295, Charles II, the Angevin king of Naples, granted them exemption that allowed the Templars to export grain from their local estates to Cyprus without paying tax. According to the agreement the Templars were obliged to export grain through the Apulian (Puglia) ports of Barletta, Manfredonia and Brindisi. The merchandise that was exported to Cyprus by the Templars was about 5,000 \textit{salmae} of grain (2,000 \textit{salmae} of wheat and 3,000 \textit{salmae} of barley) and 500 \textit{salmae} of vegetables.\textsuperscript{313} In 1293, considering that they had 8 galleys both for trade and guarding of the island, the Templars imported and exported impressive amounts of merchandise during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{314} On some occasions, they also collaborated with members of Florentine banking companies. For instance, on 5\textsuperscript{th} May 1299, the Templars were carrying 500 \textit{salmae} of Apulian wheat for themselves and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{311} Ibid, p. 284-5.
\item \textsuperscript{312} Ashtor, E. \textit{A Social and Economic History}, p. 319. The importance of Cyprus as a production centre and grain supplier to Rhodes during the fifteenth century is examined in the last section of chapter 2.
\item \textsuperscript{313} Coureas, N. “The role of the Templars and the Hospitaliers in the movement of commodities involving Cyprus, 1291-1312” in Edbury, P. and Phillips, J. (eds.) \textit{The Experience of Crusading, vol. 2} (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 257. For original source see L. de Mas Latrie “\textit{Histoire de l’île de Chypre}”, II, pp. 98-99. See also Pegolotti, p. 122, 113 and 166. ‘100 salmea of Manfredonian wheat was equivalent to 760 moggia in Famagusta and 180 moggia in Laiazzo (Cilician Armenia). Also, 100 salmea of Sicily was equivalent to 825 (285?) moggia of Cyprus, 200 moggia of Armenia, 165 ribebe of Alexandria and 161 moggia of Syria’; Also Pegolotti, p. 409 ‘ounce (or occha), 1/12 or 1/15 rotl in Ayas, Rhodes, Cyprus (therefore not the oqqah, ‘oke’, which is 1/36 or 1/44 cantar in the Levant’, ‘1 salma was equal to 25 pounds (about 11.3 kilograms) or 1 salma was around 160 litres and itself divided into 16 staia. In Venice: 1 staio = 83,3 litres, 1 moggio = 4 staia. 1 salme of Sicily = 2,5 or 2,6 hectolitres.’ Aymard, Maurice. \textit{Venise Raguse et le commerce du blé pendant la seconde moitié du XVIe siècle}, (Paris, 1966), p. 172. According to the Carmel Cassal: (1 salma=2.74 hl.). Cassal, C. State intervention in the Grain trade of Malta (16\textsuperscript{th} – 20\textsuperscript{th} Century) in \textit{Mediterranean Review, vol.6 no.2} (December, 2013), p. 69.
\item \textsuperscript{314} Ibid, p. 258.
\end{itemize}
another 1070 salmae of wheat belonging to the Florentine banking house of Bardi on their ship called ‘‘Potta Johis’’ which was to be unloaded in Cyprus within six months.\textsuperscript{315}

The Florentine merchants that visited Cyprus during the fourteenth century were numerous as well. They were active in Famagusta, Limassol and Nicosia, where some of them worked as agents of the Florentine banking houses while others conducted their own business individually. A famous Florentine, Francisco Balducci Pegolotti, author of the *La Pratica della Mercatura*, worked for the house of Bardi during the fourteenth century. The Florentines were made to pay a 4% duty on goods entering or leaving Cyprus. However, the members of Bardi and Peruzzi companies paid only a 2% duty. Florentine companies were powerful enough in Cyprus to demand to pay less. In 1324, as a result of the efforts of Pegolotti himself, Hugh IV granted the Florentine merchants a privilege that enabled them to pay 2% duty just like the Pisans, Provençals, Narbonnese, Anconitans and Catalans.\textsuperscript{316} The Peruzzi, Bardi and Mozzi were the most prominent Florentine banking houses that were active in Famagusta.\textsuperscript{317} In many transactions, Florentine banking houses were involved in a large scale of money lending, and export or import of various merchandise. Together with the Templars, the Bardi and Peruzzi companies were the largest grain exporters from Apulia to Cyprus.\textsuperscript{318} For instance, in April 1300, Robertus Ginetus leased his ship to Bochinus of Claro, agent of the Bardi banking house, preparing to sail to the Apulian ports of Manfredonia and Barletta with 5 female slaves on board. They agreed that Bochinus would load 2,400 salmae of Apulian wheat when he arrived at the mentioned ports and then return to Cyprus.\textsuperscript{319} In another notarial deed dated 31 October 1300, Ianucius Bartholi of Peruzzi’s society and Lipus Bonacaresi of Bardi’s society, complained to the Venetian consul

\textsuperscript{315} Ibid, p. 258.
\textsuperscript{316} Pegolotti, ‘‘Pratica della Mercatura’’, pp. xx. and 84; Coureas, N. ‘‘Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century’’ in *EKEE XXV* (Nicosia, 1999), p. 62.
\textsuperscript{317} For detailed information about the commercial relations between Famagusta and Florence, See Coureas, N. ‘‘Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence’’, (Nicosia, 1999).
\textsuperscript{318} Coureas, N. ‘‘Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence’’, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{319} *LS [Desimoni]*, no. 109.
Nicola Zugni that 17,386 salmae of their wheat loaded to the ship called “Santa Maria di Nazaret” belonging to Lorenzo di Gozi was seized and discharged in the port of Candia by the local government.\(^{320}\) While this transaction provides important hints about the involvement of the Florentine banking houses in grain transportation, it also reveals their cooperative relationships when necessary.

Also, in October 1300, the Anconitan merchant called Dominic received 2,200 modii of salt from another Anconitan Polus of Bartholomew worth 200 saracen besants. After Dominic received the salt he sold it to Berthold from the Peruzzi banking house and promised to transport it to Italy with his own ship shared with Polus.\(^{321}\) On 4 March 1301, Iohanes, a camlet weaver, received 4,642 white besants (\textit{ca. 1.160 Venetian ducats}) from the representative of the Peruzzi company called Richus Manfredi.\(^{322}\) The reason for the payment is not stated, however, it is more likely that Iohanes lent a certain amount of the camlets to the Peruzzi agent and received his money after the company delivered them.\(^{323}\) On the same day, Giovanni de Porta, citizen of Nicosia, received 6,385 white besants (\textit{ca. 1.596 Venetian ducats}) from the representative of Peruzzi. Again, the nature of the contract is not specified.\(^{324}\)

Unlike the banking houses of Bardi and Peruzzi, the Florentine banking house of Mozzi was more interested in money-lending in Cyprus. On 15 April 1301, a certain Andreas Fortis, a member of the banking house of Mozzi, received 70,000 white besants (\textit{ca. 17.500 Venetian ducats}) from Perocius Grassus. The said Perocius Grassus was acting on behalf of Battizinus Battizen and Tingus Berti Farolfi, both members of the house of Bardi. In 1310,

\(^{320}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 76.
\(^{321}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 64; Coureas, N. “Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence”, p. 54.
\(^{322}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 262.
\(^{324}\) LS [Polonio] 31, no. 263.
Giacomo of Valenza borrowed money from agents of the Peruzzi called Nicholas and Peter and he promised to repay them 1,100 Genoese lire (libra or pound) within three months.\textsuperscript{325} The agents of the Peruzzi banking house often appear in the acts undertaking intermediary roles. In a deed of 1302, the same Richus Manfredi, from whom Iohanes received money for his camlets, was acting on behalf of the Peruzzi banking house and paid 92 white bezants and 2 carats (of gold probably) to Manuele de Vinderico for an unstated amount of cotton.\textsuperscript{326}

Unfortunately, the existence of Florentine banking houses in Famagusta did not last long. In 1343, Pope Clement VI organized a naval league formed by Venice, the Hospitallers, the Sanudo family of Naxos, and Cyprus against Turks in order to prevent more devastation caused by the piratical raids in the Aegean islands and Cyprus. In 1344, the Commune of Florence was assisting this league financially and they defeated the Turks off Chalkidike and captured the port of Smyrna in late October. However, in 1345, the Pope requested that the Commune of Florence continue their financial support for the league, but they refused to oblige, discontinuing support of the league both financially and militarily. It was alleged that, after the formation of the naval league the trading relations between Famagusta and Florence began to be shattered. In fact, one of the reasons for their disappearance was the relaxation of the papal embargo on trade from 1344 onwards which enabled Latin merchants to sail directly to the Muslim territories, but this was not the main reason for the disappearance of the Florentine banking houses in Famagusta.\textsuperscript{327} As Nicholas Coureas pointed out, the Florentine banking houses of the Bardi and the Peruzzi were the ones who financed the King Edward III of England’s wars against France. In 1345, both banking houses collapsed due to

\textsuperscript{325} Coureas, N. ‘‘Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence’’, pp. 55, 56 and 60; \textit{LS [Polonio]} 31, no. 343 and \textit{LS [Balard]} 43, no. 80. See also the \textit{Scozzi} company from Piacenza represented in Famagusta, \textit{LS [Polonio]} 31, no. 116 and \textit{LS [Desimoni]}, no. 99.

\textsuperscript{326} \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 49, no. 238. For more evidence to the activities of Peruzzi company in Famagusta see Jacoby, (2012b); Hunt, E. \textit{The Medieval Super Companies: A Study of the Peruzzi Company of Florence} (Cambridge, 1994); Goldthwaite, R. \textit{The Economy of Renaissance Florence} (Baltimore, 2009).

\textsuperscript{327} Coureas, N. ‘‘Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Florence’’, p. 64.
the economic reasons that the King refused to pay the debt he owed them. After that the Bardi and Peruzzi houses were not active in Cyprus.  

Alongside the Italian banking houses there were also independent merchants working in cooperation with prominent merchant consortiums. Lamberto Sambuceto lists a number of such merchants from Genoa, Venice, Marseille and Barcelona involved in trade in Famagusta. They dealt with diverse merchandise. One of the groups that dealt with the sugar trade was the Genoese Rubeus family. Both Simonino and his father James Rubeus are mentioned in several notarial acts of Lamberto di Sambuceto. Simonino often appears as ‘the freed son of James Rubeus’ which suggest that James was a slave before he gained his freedom. The said Simonino, first appears in the act of 1299 where Baliano de Negoro bought cotton from him worth 800 white besants (ca. 200 Venetian ducats) and Simonino guaranteed that he will have it sent to Genoa on the ship of Andrea Spinola. A year later, he was acting on behalf of Ottolino Rubeus and sent 80 cantar of sugar to Genoa loaded on the galleys of Spinola and Cataneo. On 3 February 1300, Rabella de Grimaldis, acting on behalf of Andriolus and Symon, received a payment from Andolus Salvaigus worth 80 cantars of sugar (zuchari de Cipro) promising to transport them to Genoa before June on a ship boarding for Provence. On the same day, Rabella de Grimaldis concluded another act, this time acting on behalf of Andrea and Symon Dentutus, making payment to Manfredus de Marino to have 80
cantars of sugar (zuchari de Cipro) transported to the Provence. On 25 October 1300, Domenico Mathei de Broxina of Ancona was carrying 2,200 moggia of salt to Venice and Ancona in cooperation with the Peruzzi banking house. On some occasions, the scale of the investment of individual merchants and the amount of money invested by them even surpassed the investments of the prominent banking houses. A deed of April 1301 provides a most appropriate example of this. A Pisan called Bellucus received sugar and cotton worth 2,540 saracen besants (worth 8,890 white besants or 2,222 Venetian ducats) from Oberto Rizardus who was acting on behalf of Tomasso Grassus to be shipped to Venice, Ancona, Adriatic and Puglia (Apulia?). Apparently, some of them had to deal with powerful Genoese consortiums as the Oriental market was controlled by the Genoese in Famagusta. For instance, on 30 August 1300, Franciscus Squarciafico, Baldus Spinola and Philiponus de Nigro received 1,406 Genoese lire from Gabriel de Albaro and in return promised him to transport 40 cantars and 20 rotuli of pepper to Genoa until 1st of January. On the same day, the same consortium received 1.400 Genoese lire from Iohannes Passara for the transportation of 21 sacks of pepper and 4 sporte of incense to Genoa.

In agricultural terms, cotton, grain, sugar, wine and salt were the most profitable exports that were produced on the island of Cyprus from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. As previously mentioned, the Mesaria plain was the main centre for grain production together with Paphos and Limassol, where considerable amounts of cereals were cultivated. Salt was also important for Venice and they exported large amounts of the salt produced in the salt lakes of Larnaca and Limassol. Together with the salt and grain, the

331 LS [Desimoni], nos. 41 and 60.
332 LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 64 and 323. In the acts, it is not clarified whether every Saracen besant is equal to 3.5 white besants. However, if we consider that 1 Saracen besant is equal to 3.5 white besants, 2,540 Saracen besants is equal to 8,890 white besants.
333 LS [Desimoni], nos. 228 and 229. For pepper transported from Famagusta to the West see; LS [Desimoni], nos. 218, 219, 228, 229, 235, 239, 240, 304; LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 220, 221, 222; LS [Pavoni] 49, no. 21; LS [Balard] 43, no. 61 (part III).
cultivation of sugar and production of wine were encouraged by the royal authorities as well. The exportation of sugar and wine was important income for the crown and royal estates from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries and the crown controlled the main sugar production centres such as the casalia of Lefke, Morphou and Potamia. Documents of the mid-fourteenth century reveal that the Lusignan crown possessed large amounts of sugar plantations in Kouklia (south-east of Paphos), the Hospitallers at Kolossi, and the Venetian Cornaro family at Episkopi. The feudal lords and the crown were also involved in trade, selling wine, sugar, wheat, and barley during the first half of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. For instance, in 1300, John of Ibelin, the titular lord of Arsur, received 600 white besants \( (ca. 150 \text{ Venetian ducats}) \) from a Genoese merchant for 130 jars of wine. Also the Augustinian nunnery of St Mary and All Saints at Acre owned an estate in Paphos producing corn, pulses, rice, oil, wine, sugar, soap, and also other items. And their annual revenues were not less than 1,092 white besants \( (ca. 273 \text{ Venetian ducats}) \). It is worth mentioning that the important sugar plantations possessed by the Venetian Corner family, in the vicinities of Kyrenia, Morphou (Omorfo) and Lefka (Lefke), also Kouklia, Paleokytro (Balikesir) and Kanakaria in the northern plain, were close to Famagusta. It is more likely that the grain from Mesaria plain and sugar from the estates belonged to the Cornaro family directly found its way to the Famagusta port. Additionally, Ludolf von Suchen during his visit to Cyprus between 1336 and 1341 reported that he saw 100 Muslim slaves working in the vineyard at Engaddi near Limassol. This impressive amount of labour work at Engaddi clearly indicates that Cyprus was a great centre of production and at the same time great market for Saracen (Arab) slaves who were in demand both in the Mediterranean and the West.

335 Ibid, pp. 111.
337 Ibid, p. 115.
Slaves were traded amongst other merchandise and they were in high demand in Famagusta. The slave trade in the Mediterranean and Black Sea was under the hegemony of Genoa and they were the principal supplier to the Mamluks. Around the 1270s Genoa established their colony in Kaffa (Caffa) in the Crimea, in condominium with the Jochid Mongols, and they established strong commercial network connecting Kaffa with Egypt via the Bosphorus and Famagusta was integrated within this commercial network. Black Sea ports, namely Kaffa and Tana, were important grain and slave suppliers for both Venice and Genoa.339 The slave trade was a large share of the Mediterranean’s and Black Sea’s overall economic activity. The Black Sea was a source of Eastern European and Turkish slaves who they were transported to Egypt and Famagusta together with the Muslim slaves by Genoese merchants.340 As already noted by Amitai, the Turkish and Mongol slaves from the Golden Horde were transported by Genoese merchants to Egypt and Syria and ‘‘they represented raw material for the strengthening and maintenance of the Mamluk army’’.341 Kaffa, Cyprus and Crete were important centres for slave trade and transportation.342 In Cyprus, the slave

---


markets existed both in Famagusta and Nicosia, as is attested by the notarial evidence. The importance of slave labour in Cyprus is also revealed in administrative documents concerning rural estates. The island was one of the great agricultural production centres in the Eastern Mediterranean and slaves were in great demand as they provided the necessary manpower needed for agricultural industry. Mostly they were used for the cultivation of the lands, as household servants, and sometimes given as a dowry.

In Famagusta, slaves were as important as other major commodities such as, cotton, sugar, and grain. Among them Turkish, Saracen, Tatar and Mongol slaves were highly in demand and prominent Genoese merchants operating in Famagusta were the main distributors of slaves originated from Black Sea region and Middle East. For example, on 14 March 1299, Isabella, daughter of Giacomo Gazayre (Ghazaria-Crimea) sold her 12 year-old female slave (Negro) called Sayda to Giovanni for 150 white besants (ca. 37.5 Venetian ducats). On March 1300, Anthonius de Noli sold a 9 year-old Saracen slave called Heiosefe for 6 gold florins and 1 besant to Genoese Galiano Savona. In July, Baldoynus Savona, Genoese inhabitant of Famagusta, sold his female slave Dobla from Cervia (Serbia?) with her son to Alegro Fateinanti. The price is not stated but Baldoynus makes it clear that if Alegro decides to sell her in the future the price would not be less than 300 white besants (ca. 75 Venetian ducats). The records of Lamberto Sambuceto clearly reveal that the members of ‘Savona’ family were involved in the slave business and were often buying and selling slaves in Famagusta. On 4 July 1302, Gregorello Formica of Savona paid 100 white besants (ca. 25 Venetian ducats) for a 17 years-old female Cuman slave called Cologo to Tomasso de Fossato. Moreover, in 1307, Ansaldo Ioria of Savona sold his Greek slave called Maria from...

343 LS [Desimoni], no.86. ‘‘Publico rudagio Famaguste’’ ‘‘a public bazaar’’; Nicola de Boateriis. Notaio in Famagosta e Venezia (1355-1365), ed. A. Lombardo (Venice, 1973) (hereafter cited as de Boateriis), no.2.
346 LS [Desimoni], no. 91.
347 LS [Desimoni], no. 161.
Rhodes to the spice dealer called Berthozio. The action took place ‘in loggia Ianuensium’. However, on the same day the said Berthozio gave Maria to the Dama Gena as a dowry. This time the action took place ‘in apotheca dicti Berthocii’. A few days later, Thomasso di Savona, another member of the family who dealt with the slave trade, sold his slave Giorgino, from Rhodes, to the Venetian Guido de Cenaro for 55 white besants (ca. 13.75 Venetian ducats). Another Genoese family that often appears in the notarial records involved in the slave trade is de Voltri. In 1301, different members of the family appear in the records buying and selling slaves. For instance, on 1st of March, Giovanni Rex de Voltri bought a Turkish slave from another Genoese called Guglielmo and six days later same Giovanni paid 150 white besants (ca. 37.5 Venetian ducats) to the Antonio de Noli for 1 male and 3 female slaves. On 31st of March, this time Lanfranco di Voltri sold a 12 year-old Greek slave to Nicolo di Chiavari.

In general, Turkish, Saracen, Mongol, Cuman and Circassian slaves constitutes the majority in the acts drawn from 1296 to 1310. In fact, this was due to the aforementioned trade network established by Genoa connecting Kaffa, Alexandria and Famagusta with Genoa. There is a significant number of notarial records mentioning sale of slaves originating from Anatolia, the Black Sea and Middle East. In total, 10 Saracen, 14 Mongol and 11 Turkish slaves are referred in the ‘straightforward bill of sale’ type of acts which contains no detailed information about the buyer and seller or any reason behind the sale. The age and sex of slaves sold by the Genoese merchants in Famagusta were varied. For instance, on 27 July 1301, Gandulfus de Staeria, Genoese, sold a 10 year-old Turkish (male) slave called Ali

349 LS [Balard] 43, no. 74.
351 LS [Polonio] 31, no. 332. see also no. 399.
from Cassaria (Kayseri?) for 60 white besants (ca. 15 Venetian ducats). At the same day, another Genoese Facinus de Ceva sold a 14 year-old Turkish slave (male) called Hosuffo (Yusuf) to Guirardo de Placencia (Piacenza) for 100 white besants (ca. 25 Venetian ducats). Nevertheless, in 1302, a Genoese called Giovanni barrilarius sold a Hungarian female slave for 78 white besants (ca. 19.5 Venetian ducats) to Peyre de Barcellona and on 3 July 1302, Ottobono and Giacomo, both Genoese, paid 350 white besants (ca. 87.5 Venetian ducats) to Paschalis de Paschale for the transportation of 11 Mongol slaves (6 male and 5 female) on the ship called ‘Saint Antonio’ which was about to set sail from Laiazzo port. The slaves were also shipped to the West by Genoese merchants as certain notarial acts indicate. A deed of February 1300 records the various kinds of merchandise such as rings, amber, cloths, tunics, a mantle, and slaves that Ugolino was going to transport to Genoa in order to compensate his father’s debts. The price of the slaves, however, was diverse. Thus, while the price of aforementioned Turkish slaves Ali and Hosuffo was 160 white besants (ca. 40 Venetian ducats) in total, a male slave from Africa, aged 50, was sold for 130 white besants (ca. 32.5 Venetian ducats) in September 1301. Variance of the slaves’ prices was also revealed by the agreements concluded at the same year. In August 1301, a Saracen slave, aged 14, was sold for 64 white besants (ca. 16 Venetian ducats) and on the same day a brownish slave called Comanum (the Cuman), aged between 10-12, was sold for 100 white besants (ca. 25 Venetian ducats). Taken together it is apparent from the acts that prices were not dependent on age or nationality.

Lastly, despite the lack of notarial evidence from 1310 to 1350 the Venetian state records suggest that Famagusta still maintained its role as a distributor of Oriental

---

355 LS [Desimoni], no. 42.
merchandise to the West. In 1314, the Venetian Senate declared that cotton should be exclusively transported to Venice from Cyprus or Cilician Armenia.\footnote{Jacoby (2009b), p.68.} Indeed, the convoys of the Venetian State galley that visited Cyprus and Cilician Armenia annually consisted of 6 to 10 galleys from 1328 to 1340. Their number was even 11 in the year of 1344.\footnote{Ashtor, ‘Levant Trade’, p. 54-55 and Table II.} Also, later in 1338 Famagusta became the ultimate destination of Venetian galley line is attested by the state documents.\footnote{Jacoby (2009b), p. 67.} This was mainly due to the weakened position of Cilician Armenia against Muslims in the East. After the conversion of the Mongols in Persia to Islam in 1306 Cilician Armenia had to defend itself on three fronts against Mongols, Mamluks and Seljuk Turks.\footnote{Coureas, N. “‘Lusignan Cyprus and Lesser Armenia: 1195-1375’” in EKEE, XXI (Nicosia, 1995), p. 37.} In 1315, the kingdom of Cilician Armenia had to pay an annual tribute of one million dirhems to the Mamluks to prevent further Muslim incursions. However, the efforts of the Papal-Armenian coalition were not enough to stop Muslim attacks on Cilician Armenia. In fact, Mamluk attacks in 1320, 1322, 1335 and 1337 disrupted by the Western trade in the Levant and the Cilician Kingdom was no longer a secure place for the Latin merchants. In 1332, the major commercial port of the kingdom, Laiazzo, was occupied and in 1337 the Armenian capital of Sis was conquered by the Muslims.\footnote{Ibid, p. 50; Irwin (1986), pp. 120-1.} Undoubtedly, Muslim raids on Armenia caused great disruption to the trade routes connecting the Black Sea with the Mediterranean via Alexandria. The effects of the political instability between Cilician Armenia and the Mamluk Sultanate on the Genoese slave trade are apparent when the notarial records of 1307-10 are scrutinized. There are only eight acts referring to the sale of slaves and only two of them refer to Saracen slaves.\footnote{LS [Balard] 43, (Part II) nos. 63, 67, 74, 92, 134, 156. (Part III) nos. 34, 72.}

Taken together, the evidence presented in this and the previous sub-section reveal that Famagusta functioned not only as a ‘bridge’ between East and West after the fall of Acre but
also as an important distributor of local and Oriental merchandise throughout the fourteenth century. The crucial role of Famagusta in the Levant trade was not only due to its strategic position and the prominent merchant companies that had strong ties with the Muslim East. What made Famagusta incomparable with other port cities in the Levant was its international market that offered high-quality local merchandise and a large variety of Oriental articles that were transported both to the West and Muslim East. Cyprus was an important producer and distributor of high-quality merchandise such as; sugar, cotton, salt, grain and camlet that were highly in demand during the fourteenth century. Also the local and international trade networks established by the Italian merchant companies based in Famagusta intensified the commercial traffic between Cyprus and the Muslim East. Without doubt, the crucial role of Famagusta and the volume of the Levant trade during the fourteenth century is surely greater than what is apparent. In fact, Genoese notarial records do not allow us to reach certain conclusions about the volume of trade and it is also not possible to examine to what degree Venetian merchants contributed to the economy of Famagusta in the early fourteenth century. For the period from 1300 to 1350 more archival evidence regarding the role of Venetian merchants is crucial for the comparative analysis. On the other hand, it seems more likely to me that the role of Famagusta in the Levant trade gained new momentum from 1310 to 1350. The political instability in the Cilician Armenia and the disruption of trade routes increased the importance of Famagusta regarding the long-distance Levant trade. The scarcity of evidence and less informative nature of Genoese notarial acts drawn up from 1306 to 1310 might lead historians to conclude that the economy of Famagusta started to decline around the mid-fourteenth century. However, as shown above, existing evidence reveals that the Venetian State galleys visiting Cyprus from 1328 to 1340 were increased, and when the insecure environment in Cilician Armenia is considered, it would not be wrong to suggest that the export of local products from Cyprus increased. One last point must be made before
moving to the next section. The suspension of the galley lines of Syria and Alexandria from
time to time is not to mean that Italian merchants stopped operating in the Muslim East. As
shown earlier, merchants of Famagusta continued to operate in Cilician Armenia and the
Mamluk lands and a considerable amount of them were also involved in contraband trade.
The international market of Famagusta was offering a wide range of Oriental merchandise
and this was probably the main reason for the increase of Venetian galleys towards the mid-
fourteenth century.
2.3 Continuity or Discontinuity? The Economy of Famagusta from 1350 to 1400:

Undoubtedly, the Levantine long-distance trade between the 1340s and 1370s represents a new phase regarding the commercial relations between East and West. The political chaos after the death of the Ilkhanid ruler Abu Sa’id in 1335 hampered the commercial activities of the Italians in Persia. Tabriz, an important supplier of Oriental merchandise to the West, was ruled by Hasan ‘the Little’ while his brother Hasan ‘the Tall’ ruled over Iraq and Azerbaijan. The struggle between the inheritors, Hasan ‘the Little’ and Hasan ‘the Tall’, over the control of Tabriz disrupted Italian maritime trade with Persia, and so did the general prohibition on trade in Tabriz issued by Venice (1338) and Genoa (1340-1) for a short period of time. On the other hand, conflict between the Venetians of Tana and the Tatars in 1343 caused diplomatic chaos between East and West. The commercial activities of Venice in the Black Sea were hindered by the Tatar threat and Venice declared a general ban on trade with the Crimea too. The tension between Venice and the Tatar Kingdom continued throughout the 1350s and Venetian galley lines visiting Tana and Alexandria were suspended due to the political instability and security issues. However, Venice was not the only one that had to consider establishing preventive trade measures. The continuous Mongol expansion along the Silk Road and the siege of Caffa in 1345 jeopardized Genoese business in Crimea and the Byzantine emperor John VI Cantaczenus declared war with Genoa in 1348 after a Genoese attack on Byzantine ships and warehouses. Although Cantaczenus was defeated the following year, another war broke out between Venice and Genoa in 1350 and did not end until 1355. The loss of control in the Black Sea and the conquest of Laiazzo in 1347 by the Mamluks was another heavy blow for Italian Republics. Apparently, the two main routes

363 Ashtor, ‘Levant Trade’, p. 64.
364 Ibid, pp. 65-70.
(namely Tabriz and Tana/Caffa) were not safe anymore and seaborne traffic slowed down due to the Black Death in 1348.\textsuperscript{366}

However, no such thing as an ‘‘Italian merchantman-free’’ market can be found in the Muslim East. Without any doubt, whatever the political situation was between Muslims and Christians, Latin merchants were still the only group who dominated the Levantine trade. As was discussed previously, the papal bans were ineffective and on many occasions merchants were able to get licenses to sail to Muslim lands. There was no difference during the late fourteenth century. As Stantchev pointed out, it is the pontificate of Benedict XII (1334-1342) that can be described as a period of ‘strict embargo’ and both Clement VI (1342-1352) and Innocent VI (1352-1362) issued licences to Venice to trade legally with Mamluk Egypt.\textsuperscript{367} Indeed, Pope Clement VI granted a trade licence to Venice (4 cogs-6 galleys) to visit Mamluk Egypt for 5 years. Allegedly, this was due to the disintegration of the Ilkhanid Empire and Mongol occupation of major ports of the Crimea that virtually brought trade to a halt in the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{368} However, in 1359 Pope Innocent VI again granted Venice a trading licence for 10 cogs and 30 galleys to visit Mamluk Egypt. Nevertheless, the records reveal that Urban V (1362-1370) was the most active pope, who granted licences to at least 68 round ships and 73 galleys to sail to Mamluk Egypt. In fact, the licences issued to Venice, Genoa, Kingdom of Cyprus, Montpellier, Barcelona and Genoese Pera during the pontificate of Pope Urban V are well known. Stantchev’s examination of Papal records reveals that between 1344 and 1378 Venice was granted licences for at least 41 cogs and 99 galleys and Genoa for 24 cogs and 13 galleys to visit Muslim lands.\textsuperscript{369}

\textsuperscript{366} Epstein (1996), pp. 212-7 and Table. 10; Ashtor ‘Levant Trade’, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{367} Stantchev (2009), pp. 242-3. According to the E. Ashtor ‘strict embargo’ period starts from 1323 and ends in 1344. However, Stantchev, relying on papal evidence, proves that ‘strict embargo’ period applies to Benedict’s pontificate (1334-1342). See; Ashtor, ‘Levant Trade’, pp. 44-63.
\textsuperscript{368} Stantchev (2009), p. 243.
\textsuperscript{369} Ibid, pp. 244-6. Apparently, one of the reasons of the increase in licences granted by popes during the late 14\textsuperscript{th} century can be interpreted as the increase of commerce between East and West. To be more precise, the
Also, state records analysed by scholars like E. Ashtor reveal that the number of Italian galleys operating in the Muslim Levant grew after the mid-fourteenth century compared to previous years. For instance, from 1345 to 1350 the number of Venetian galleys that visited Cyprus varied from 5 to 9. However, in the period mentioned, the Alexandria line consisted of 2 to 3 galleys. From 1355 to 1369, the Venetian galleys operating the Cyprus line were between 3 and 5 in number whereas the Alexandria line varied between 2 to 6. Although the Romania line declined during the mentioned period due to several reasons, this cannot be said of the convoys of Cyprus and Little Armenia. The sudden but moderate rise of the Venetian galleys in the Alexandria line clearly indicates the decreasing control of the Avignon papacy over Levantine trade. Indeed, the re-establishment of the Alexandria galley line even increased the amount of Oriental articles exported to Famagusta and enabled the city to maintain its role as a distributor between East and West.

Unfortunately, regarding the notarial records of Famagusta from 1350 to 1370 there is not so much left to examine. The only surviving notarial records belong to the Venetian notaries, namely Nicola de Boateriis (1355-65) and Simeone (1362-71), and consist of 532 acts in total. The Venetian notarial records available to us mostly consist of ‘straightforward bills of sale’, testaments, manumission of slaves, receipts and procuration (power of attorney) which reveal almost no information about the merchandise bought or sold by the merchants. However, Venetian notarial records still help us to see the importance of Famagusta in the Levant trade from 1350 onwards, albeit incompletely. One crucial aspect of the notarial records drawn up from 1355 to 1371 is the existence of commercial ties between Famagusta and the Muslim East. Apparently, Famagusta still maintained its significance as an important

---

Avignon Papacy granted licence to 18 cogs and 24 galleys between 1291 and 1344; however, from 1344 to 1378 popes roughly granted licences to 119 cogs and 162 galleys.

370 Ashtor ‘Levant Trade’, p. 79 and Table III.
371 Ibid, pp. 78-81.
372 It should be noted that Nicola de Boateriis was active in Famagusta between August 1360 and October 1362. Then he moved back to Venice and continued his activities there. Yet, the acts drawn up after October 1362 to 1365 are not related with Famagusta.
supplier of cotton to the West during the mid-fourteenth century. For instance, on 7 October 1360, Menegellus Moco, a Venetian, paid 400 white besants to Nicola Diaco for 2 kantars and 17 rotuls of cotton. In April 1363, Andreas de Molino, a Venetian, bought 35 sacks of cotton of Damas from Gregorius de Negro worth 1.001 ducats. In 1370, Nicholeto states in his will that he conducted trade in Syria with his trading partner Marcho Dachale worth 9.000 dirhems for a certain amount of alum and cotton. Moreover, Nicholeto states that he owned a ship in partnership with two other Venetians, to whom he left the responsibility of deciding whether to sell the ship or send it to Venice. Indeed, due to the lack of evidence, it is not possible to examine the volume of cotton trade and the exact role of Genoese merchants transporting cotton from Famagusta to the West from 1350 onwards. However, the importance of the island as a cotton market is attested by the Venetian state records. In May 1364, the Grand Council of Venice declared that they had granted special permission to Venetian ships and extended the period of cotton loading in Cyprus until 12th of April. Again in July 1366, this time the Venetian State authorized its merchants to import slaves from Tana to Famagusta. Despite the scarcity of available data, it can be safely argued that Famagusta was integrated to the Alexandria galley line and that Venetian galleys were regularly visiting Cyprus. For instance, on 7 November 1367, the Venetian State declared that despite their order directing the captains of the galleys of Cyprus and Alexandria to sail together until Crete, the captain of Alexandria galley was detached from the convoy. However, due to the condition of the ship, namely that it was not harmed, the Venetian Senate decided to absolve the captain from any fine.

373 de Boateris, no. 16; Otten-Froux, C. Un notaire vénitien à Famagouste au XIVe siècle. Les actes de Simeone, prêtre de San Giacomou dell'orio (1362-1371), Thesaurismata, 33 (Venezia, 2003), nos. 37 and 199. Hereafter cited as [Simeone].
375 Ibid, no. 801.
As shown earlier, Genoese merchants played an important role in transporting significant amounts of cotton from the Muslim East to Genoa in the fourteenth century. Several studies have revealed that Genoese merchants transported a large amount of cotton from the Mamluk dominions to the West. Indeed, the volume of cotton exported from Alexandria to Genoa was impressive. In this respect, Jong-Kuk Nam has already examined the archival documents of Francesco Datini of Prato and counted significant numbers of Genoese merchants involved in cotton transportation from the Mamluk dominions to the West. In 1367, three Genoese ships transported 247 sacks of raw cotton from Alexandria to Genoa. However, during the following year the number of ships noticeably increased. In 1368, Genoa received 600 sacks of raw cotton transported from Alexandria by 8 galleys. Famagusta was involved too. On 4 April 1395, Paul Lercario loaded 544 sacks of cotton in Famagusta that were to be shipped to Genoa. Given the incompleteness of the data, it is unfortunately impossible to reflect upon the whole picture of the cotton trade during the later periods. However, although the information provided illustrates more of the general statistics of the period, existing evidence is still enough to prove the Latin monopoly over the long-distance trade in Levant. For instance, the Genoese convoy to Famagusta, Alexandria and Beyrouth consisted of 6 ships and 1 galley during the late fourteenth century. In 1367, from November to December, Genoese merchants loaded 11, 115 kg of cotton in Alexandria and transported it to Genoa. In 1368 the amount transported from Alexandria to Genoa from January to March was not less than 27,000 kg. From 1367 to 1369, members of the Spinola, Doria, Squarciafico and
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379 For general characteristics of the commercial relations between Latins and Muslims, see; Arbel, B. “The Last Decades of Venice’s Trade with the Mamluks: Importations into Egypt and Syria” in *Mamluk Studies Review VIII*, no. 2 (2004).
380 Famagusta-Genoa: 3 ships and 1 galley; Alexandria-Genoa: 2 ships; Beyrouth-Genoa: 1 ship. See Nam (2007), p. 282, Table, 12.
381 247 sacks of cotton = 45 kg each (3-7 kantars). In 1367 (November to December) 247 kg and in 1368 (January to March) 601 sacks of raw cotton transported to Genoa. Ashtar, E. “The Venetian Cotton Trade in...
Lercario crews transported at least 7,083 kantars (c. 332, 901 kilos) of cotton from Alexandria to Genoa. Moreover, from 1380 to 1397 the aforementioned consortium including other families carried a minimum 1,483 sacks of cotton both from Syria and Egypt.\textsuperscript{382} Likewise, Venice had two different convoys of Syria operating in March and September in the late fourteenth and fifteenth century. According to the data, from 1373 to 1410 no less than 114,729 sacks and 53,070 bales of cotton were purchased in Syria and transported to Venice.\textsuperscript{383}

This sudden tendency of Genoa to organize a galley line in order to transport cotton from Syria and Egypt is interesting. From an economic point of view, it is hard to explain the sudden interest of Genoese merchants when one considers that they controlled primarily the grain and Oriental spice trade. In this regard Jong-Kuk Nam has investigated how the merchants of Genoa monopolized the traffic of Turkish cotton which was already the same quality as that of southern Italy while showing no particular interest in Italian cotton.\textsuperscript{384} This, however, could be the consequence of an extension of political control by Venice over the northern Italian mainland during the 1400’s. Venice, in order to secure her leading role as a main cotton distributor to Italy promptly forced hinterland cities to buy cotton only from Venice.\textsuperscript{385} This partly explains the Genoese interest in Turkish cotton. Furthermore, another reason could be the changing economic dynamics of the later periods. The cotton from the Middle East was profitable and highly in demand in the West. The cotton from Syria, Egypt

\textsuperscript{382} Nam (2007), p. 288-90, Table 13 and 14. See also p. 321, fn. 193 for later periods. See Pegolotti (1936), p. 69 and Fleet (1999), pp. 176-7. 1 cantar of Alexandria=100 rotols and 1 Genoese cantar=100 rotols. If 1 Genoese cantar = c.47 kg therefore 7,083xc.47= c. 332,901 kg.

\textsuperscript{383} E. Ashtor described this period as a ‘‘new period of growth’’ and pointed out that: ‘‘the data in the letters to the firm Datini show that at the end of the fourteenth century the Syria cogs carried every year about 8,000 sacks of raw cotton in Venice’’. This amount even increased to 10,000 sacks in 1386 and in 1400 it was 12,000 sacks: Ashtor, E. ‘‘Levant Trade’’, p. 188. Referring to the same source, Ashtor also revealed that impressive amounts of sugar, spice and alkali were purchased by Venetians in Egypt, Syria and Cyprus. Ibid, pp. 180-189 and fn. 506. For a detailed table of cotton purchased in Syria from 1370-1400, see; Nam, (2007), p. 234 and Ashtor, ‘‘Levant Trade’’, pp. 185-186; Table 14.

\textsuperscript{384} Nam, (2007), p. 201.

\textsuperscript{385} Mazzaoui (1981), p. 46.
and Cyprus was relatively high in quality and easy to sell comparing to the Western cotton. However, the development of the cotton industry, especially in Egypt and Cyprus, started at the end of fourteenth and early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{386} The Genoese involvement in the cotton monopoly coincides with these dates. In light of the evidence provided above, the analysis of J. Heers that ‘‘Genoa never established galley lines connecting it with the ports of Egypt and Syria’’\textsuperscript{387} needs to be reconsidered. Moreover, Heers suggests that ‘‘the decline of Genoese Levantine trade in the first half of the fifteenth century is obvious’’.\textsuperscript{388} It is quite obvious that Heers fails to take into account the Genoese official records\textsuperscript{389} which Ashtor had already scrutinized and which partly revealed the importance of Genoese merchants in the Levant. Apparently, these records often mention the term ‘‘officium Cipri and Alexandrie’’ in relation with the Genoese authorities and the organisation of convoys of galleys to Cyprus and Alexandria.\textsuperscript{390}

The relevance of all this is that cotton and sugar and other Oriental merchandise also found its way to Famagusta. In January 1361, the Venetian Franceschinus Griti employed Nicoletto Bembo and Nicoletto Maurocen, both Venetian merchants in Alexandria, to transport a certain amount of pepper from Alexandria to Famagusta.\textsuperscript{391} In March, Nicolao de Maffeis, acting on behalf of Bailardinus Artini, a Venetian and an inhabitant of Famagusta, complained to the doge of Venice that Ugo Lancono of Barcelona, patron of an armed Catalan galley, attacked a Venetian ship, in June 1360, off Beirut (scalam Baruti) and confiscated 27 sacks of sugar (worth 3,456 besants or ca. 691.2 Venetian ducats)\textsuperscript{392} that

\textsuperscript{386} Nam (2007), pp. 153-159.
\textsuperscript{389} ASG = Archivio di Stato Genoa.
\textsuperscript{390} Ashtor, E. ‘‘The Venetian Supremacy in Levantine Trade: Monopoly or Pre-Colonialism?’’ in Studies on the Levantine Trade in the Middle Ages (London, 1978), pp. 8-9.
\textsuperscript{391} de Boateris, no. 45.
\textsuperscript{392} 1 Venetian Ducat was equal to the 5 white besants in 1372.
belonged to the said Bailardinus Artini. It seems that the authorities in Cyprus were not successful in monitoring the Cypriot waters against piracy. On 20 April 1362, two different cases appear in the notarial records, namely Anthonio Bartholomei and Petrus Siromba, both Venetians and merchants in Famagusta, seeking compensation for their merchandise worth 1878 white besants *(ca. 375.6 Venetian ducats)* robbed by the same Ugo Lancono off Syrian waters.  

 Apart from cotton, sugar and pepper other merchandise like cheese, carobs, copper and fur were also exported from Alexandria to Famagusta by Venetian merchants. The Venetian merchants of Famagusta also operated in Cicilian Armenia as attested by the records of Simeone. On 19 April 1363, Vitus Avonal, citizen of Venice and inhabitant of Famagusta, gave 1.000 white besants *(ca. 200 Venetian ducats)* to Franciscus Bon, a Venetian and patron of a griparea, in order to go to Beyrouth and load wine there. According to the contract the said Franciscus should sail to Satalia, except in the case of danger, and sell the wine there. On 23 April, Nicoletus de Arduino, appointed Andreas as his procurator to collect the sum of a certain amount of pork, 520 sides of bacon and certain amount of caviar that he had in Satalia.

Despite the considerable amount of notarial evidence indicating the continuous links between Famagusta and Muslim East from 1355 to 1371, a comparative analysis between Genoese and Venetian records is necessary in order to provide definite answers. Compared with the Genoese records of the years 1296-1310, the Venetian records are much less in quantity, shorter and less informative. Interestingly, the Venetian acts concerning the sale of cotton, sugar and Oriental merchandise constitute only a tiny part of the records whereas they are abundant in the records of Sambuceto and de Rocha. Most of the acts drawn up by de Boateriis and Simeone are either related to testaments, rental agreements, maritime loans, 
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393 *de Boateriis*, nos. 155 and 159.  
394 *de Boateriis*, nos. 128, 125, 143.  
395 *Simeone*, no. 14, 46.
general power of attorney (procuration), apprenticeship contracts, receipts or the manumission and sale of slaves. The absence of Venetian acts referring to grain exports to the East and a relatively lesser amount of acts referring to the cotton, sugar and spice sales need a closer examination. Firstly, it must be noted that it is not possible to extrapolate from Boateriis’ and Simeones’ records reliable statistical data about the economic potential of Famagusta. As shown before, although Venetian and Genoese state records clearly reveal that Famagusta was an important trade centre integrated to the Alexandria galley line, the records of the available Venetian notaries do not offer enough information for the type and value of merchandise imported and exported to/from the East. In addition, the lack of Genoese notarial evidence from the 1340s to 1374 and the absence of Genoese merchants in the Venetian records is another problem that needs to be questioned. The sudden decrease in grain, sugar and cotton transportation from/to the Muslim East from 1360 to 1365 was probably due to the political conflict between Genoa, Venice and the Kingdom of Cyprus. As was shown earlier, Genoese merchants dominated the sugar, grain and spice trade in Famagusta and recently published Genoese records indicate that they were still involved in the sugar and slave trades in Famagusta and were actively trading in the Muslim East from the 1320s to the 1370s. However, relations between the Kingdom of Cyprus and Genoa were relatively poor during the mid-fourteenth century. Peter I, the king of Cyprus, maintained peaceful relations with Venice and in 1360 new privileges were granted to the Venetian nationals in Cyprus. During his reign, Peter I, often visited Venice for diplomatic purposes and collaborated with Venice at the time of the Cretan revolt (1363-4) and in return

396 For some of them see: de Boateriis, nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 17, 26, 27, 33, 34, 38, 60, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 203, 212, 227, 308, 309.
397 For Genoese state records see; Day, J. ‘Les douanes de Genes: 1376-1377’.
398 Balard, M., Balletto, L. and Schabel, C. (ed.) Gênes et L’Outre-mer: actes notariés de Famagouste et d’autres localités du Proche-Orient (XIVe-XVe s.), Centre de Recherche Scientifique: Sources et Etudes de L’Histoire de Chypre, LXXII, (Nicosia, 2013), Part I, Section I, no. 1; Part I, Section II, nos. 5 and 7; Part I, Section, III, no. 1; Part I, Section IV, nos. 20 and 26.
received logistical support from Venice in transporting his forces to the East.\textsuperscript{399} On the other hand, there were serious conflicts between the Genoese and Venetians in Famagusta in 1344 and 1368. Indeed, the period from the 1340s to the 1360s saw an escalation of tensions between the Genoese authorities and the Cypriot government as Genoa was preparing for war with Cyprus both in 1343-4 and 1364-5.\textsuperscript{400} However, at the same time Genoa was at war with Venice from 1350 to 1355 and both sides were economically exhausted. To prevent any possibility of war with Genoa, on the eve of the crusade against Alexandria, the Cypriot authorities conceded to Genoese demands in April 1365.\textsuperscript{401} Although the common interests and crusading plans of Peter I had facilitated the peace with Genoa, the aforementioned political disputes in Cyprus and ongoing war between Genoa and Venice surely distracted the Genoese from their activities in Famagusta. However, without relevant Genoese notarial evidence it is not possible to evaluate whether the political conflicts between the Kingdom of Cyprus and Genoa was a long-term negative factor.

Besides the diplomatic crisis between Genoa and the Kingdom of Cyprus on the one hand and long conflicts between Venice and Genoa on the other, there were other factors that had an economically significant impact on the Levantine trade in general. First of all, the reigns of King Hugh IV (1324-1358) and King Peter I (1359-69) represent one of the most politically hectic times throughout the Lusignan period. During the reign of Hugh IV, the Kingdom of Cyprus participated in naval leagues together with Venice and Rhodes in order to defend Smyrna and monitoring the southern coasts of Asia Minor against Turkish raids. Hugh’s participation in the naval leagues together with Venice and Rhodes definitely brought Cyprus into a dangerous position. The island became the target of the Turkish Emirates and Hugh had to monitor Cypriot waters against Turkish piracy that posed serious threats to the

\textsuperscript{400} Ibid, pp. 155 and 167.
\textsuperscript{401} Ibid, pp. 160 and 166-7; Epstein (1996), pp. 219-21.
international galley lines. Like Hugh, Peter also supported the naval leagues and adopted an even more aggressive foreign policy towards the Muslim world. In 1360, Peter I occupied Corycus (Gorigos) in Cilician Armenia and Satalia (Antalya) was captured in 1361. Peter captured Satalia without opposition and cities like Myra, Anamur, Sis and Candelor (Alanya) were raided by the Cypriot forces. Allegedly, after the capture of important harbour cities on the southern coasts of Anatolia and the imposing of tributes on the local emirates which aimed to provide security for the Cyprus-Armenia galley line, this prevented further piratical attacks on Cyprus. However, the relatively secure environment was soon to be changed. The main goal of Peter I was to recover the Holy Land and convince Avignon to join a crusade against Mamluks. Despite Peter’s ambition leading the crusades, John II of France was appointed as leader in 1363 and the papacy proclaimed that the main goal of the crusades was rather recovering Jerusalem than attacking Egypt. However, when King John II died in 1364 Peter I became leader of the crusade. Having achieved one of his major goals, Peter I organized a military expedition, on 9 October 1365, to Alexandria and sacked the city for nearly 1 week. The success of Peter I in capturing Alexandria was, however, short. Understanding that it was not possible to defend Alexandria against the Muslims the allies, namely the Hospitallers, convinced Peter to withdraw and on 16 October the troops set sail back to Cyprus. Although the success of Peter in destroying Alexandria was appreciated in the West the consequences of this expedition were heavy. According to the Arab chronicle, the troops of Peter I carried with them nearly 5,000 captives to Cyprus in order to sell as slaves. Yet, in addition to Smyrna and the southern coasts of Anatolia Peter I now had to defend Cyprus as well against Mamluks. The disruption of trade with the Mamluks also

402 Edbury (1991), pp. 158-161. For the Venetians in Famagusta donating money for the defence of Smyrna see: [Simeone], nos. 19 and 175.
caused serious economic problems both in Europe and Cyprus. The European market suffered from a lack of spices and cotton and the Mamluk Sultan negotiated with the Turkish emirs to join him and form a Muslim union to impose a strict commercial embargo against Cyprus and Rhodes. The Levant trade was severely damaged and the mercantile republics, namely Venice and Genoa, together with the Hospitallers were seeking a way to make peace between the Mamluks and Peter I. After long negotiations, mediated primarily by Venice, peace was made between Peter I and the Mamluks in 1370. However, one wonders why Peter I would undertake such a risk while East-West trade was of the utmost importance to Venice, Genoa and Cyprus, especially after the Black Death. According to Peter Edbury, the main goal of Peter I was ‘to get the sultan to concede preferential commercial facilities, tariff reductions, and legal franchises and guarantees for Cypriot merchants trading in his lands.’ However, whatever Peter’s motivation was for this ‘partly’ successful expedition, the sack of Alexandria did not only cause long-term diplomatic crisis between East and West but also short-term disruption in the Levant trade in general.

Another factor that contributed to the disruption of the Levant trade was the outbreak of the Black Death. The plague first ravaged the Black Sea in 1346-7 and then spread by maritime traffic to Alexandria, Cyprus and southern Europe in 1348. The Black Death, one of the most catastrophic pandemics in history, caused great economic depression both in Europe and Middle East. It has been argued that, between 1346 and 1353 nearly half of the population in Europe died and the volume of trade and production significantly decreased. In 1348, the plague allegedly swept away one-third of Italy’s population and both Venice and Genoa suffered from high mortality. John Days’ estimation suggests that imports and food
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consumption in Genoa declined between 30-50 percent by 1350. The economic and demographic consequences of the plague were even worse in the Mamluk lands. Egypt and Syria lost one-third of its population during the first strike in 1347 and Egypt was hit by twenty major epidemics from 1347 to 1517. In this respect, Irwin rightly pointed out that the main reasons for the high fatalities in the Mamluk lands were famine and drought and reportedly ‘peasant mortality led to long-term labour shortage’ in the East. Mamluks’ reliance on exported grain and the decrease in labour and production in Europe caused a significant rise in the cost of wheat in Egypt. Similarly, there was a considerable rise in the price of spices, bread and sugar in Mamluk lands. In 1347, a quintal of sugar was 23-27 dinars while it was 6.4 dinars before the plague which suggests a minimum 72 percent rise in sugar prices. Although existing evidence reveals that the trade continued, albeit slowed down, ‘the caravanserais had to close because of the scarcity of clients’ in Alexandria. Cyprus, was of course, by no means an exception. The island was ravaged by the Black Death in 1348 and its population reduced by between one-third and one-fifth. Although no demographic evidence survives and there are only a few snippets of information, it is highly likely that population of Famagusta, the international port of the island, perished. Thereafter, another two major epidemics broke out in the island in 1362 and 1363 as well. Allegedly, after the first struck, when a merchant ship from Rhodes was travelling to Cyprus, and the captain of the ship found no merchants in the port, he decided to set sail somewhere else. The possible economic consequences from 1348 onwards are unknown. However, there is a substantial amount of information about the plague that hit the island in the summer of 1362.

Philippe de Mézières, in his hagiographical Vita about St. Peter Thomas, provides a relatively detailed portrayal of the plague and its effects both in Nicosia and Famagusta. According to him, when the plague arrived in 1362 Peter Thomas organized a procession in Nicosia and gathered all the people in Saint Sophia cathedral to beg God’s forgiveness. Although the people of Nicosia survived without any harm, the same could not be said for Famagusta. Peter Thomas, after his visit to Famagusta to organize another procession, describes the city as ‘a furnace of pestilence and death’. The pestilence ravaged Famagusta and it was taking 30 to 40 people each day. Mézières noted that due to the high mortality Peter Thomas feared ‘‘the danger that the Catholic faith would be lost in Cyprus’’.

Without doubt, the Black Death in 1348 and 1362 and the military expedition to Alexandria in 1365 caused serious economic depression both in Famagusta and more generally in the Levant. Therefore, the aforementioned factors need to be taken into consideration when one tries to draw certain conclusions from Venetian notarial documents. Considering that we do not know how many other notaries were active in Famagusta around the 1350s, drawing certain conclusions from the existing Venetian notarial documents could mislead historians. In comparison with the Genoese records (1296-1310) that are scrutinized in the previous sections, the Venetian records (1355-1371) are less diversified and quantitatively smaller. However, despite the political turmoil and natural disasters both Boateriis’s and Simeone’s records contain a considerable amount of deeds concerning the sale of slaves. The deeds concerning slaves represent %25.4 (47 acts out of 185) of Boateriis’s and %28.6 (57 acts out of 199) of Simeone’s records. Although, it is difficult to explain the rare appearance of common articles, such as cotton, sugar, grain and spices,
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Venetian notarial records reveal that the slave trade continued unabated during the mid-fourteenth century.

Compared with earlier records, the Venetian inhabitants of Famagusta were more active in the slave trade from 1360 onwards. The slaves came from various backgrounds, such as Tatar, Circassian, Saracen, Turkish, Bulgarian, Vlach, "Romanian" and Greek, and were bought and sold by Venetians in Famagusta. For instance, on 6 February 1361, Antonius Babin, a Venetian and an inhabitant of Famagusta, sold his female slave called Anna de Romania to Marco de Venetian for 120 white besants (ca. 24 Venetian ducats).418 In March 1361, Abraim de la Liça sold his slave called Cali del Vixo to Çanino Barbadico, a Venetian noble and inhabitant of Famagusta, for 152 white besants (ca. 30.4 Venetian ducats).419 In October, Diamente de Peyra (Pera), inhabitant of Famagusta, sold Luciam de Caffa for 115 white besants (ca. 23 Venetian ducats) to a Venetian called Leonardus de Buy.420 Seemingly, Greek slaves were also in a higher demand among Venetian inhabitants of Famagusta compared to earlier periods. In 18 February, Mussoit sold 12 years-old Andreas de Salonich (Thessaloniki) to Bartholomeo Cassellerio, a Venetian inhabitant of Famagusta, for 95 white besants (ca. 19 Venetian ducats) and in June another Greek slave called Anna de Sallonich sold to the Venetian noble Albanus for 160 white besants (ca. 32 Venetian ducats).421 On 26 July 1362, Iohannes Lambardus sold Xoi and her son Nicola from Lemnos to the Venetian Iacobus Grimani for 130 white besants (ca. 26 Venetian ducats).422 In 1364, Froxini (Frozini-Euphrosyne?), wife of Theodorus Fuscerano, citizen of Venice and an inhabitant of Famagusta, sold a Greek slave called Chaliça to Galeacius Delphyno for 170

418 de Boateriis, no. 47.
419 de Boateriis, no. 56.
420 de Boateriis, no. 133.
421 de Boateriis, nos. 50 and 76.
422 de Boateriis, no. 172.
white besants \(\text{(ca. 34 Venetian ducats)}\). The prices of the Greek slaves varied depending on their outlook, age and gender. For example, in 1362, Marcus Fino sold a male slave called Dimitrius to the Venetian Marcus Mauroceno for 90 white besants \(\text{(ca. 18 Venetian ducats)}\). However, in October, a Greek slave called Iani was bought by Iohannes Taiapetra for 119 white besants \(\text{(ca. 23.8 Venetian ducats)}\). Compared to the male slaves, females were obviously more expensive in the slave market. On 29 September 1362, Rini sold for 180 white besants \(\text{(ca. 36 Venetian ducats)}\) and in 1364, the 25 year old Anna was worth 200 white besants \(\text{(ca. 40 Venetian ducats)}\), whereas the Greek Iorgi de Foia, who was 30 years old at that time and mentally disabled \(\text{(fatuus)}\), sold for only 65 white besants \(\text{(ca. 13 Venetian ducats)}\). However, this should not be interpreted as meaning ‘male’ slaves were not in demand. It is more likely that ‘female’ slaves were more expensive because they were regarded as a ‘luxury’ commodity. They served the domestic sector and their price varied depending on their outlook and age. Yet the same can be said for the male slaves as their outlook, capability and strength affected their price.
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423 [Simeone], no. 88.
424 Boateris, no. 176 and [Simeone], no. 159.
425 [Simeone], nos. 101,102, 156.
Apart from the Greek slaves, Venetian merchants also dealt with Tatar, Circassian, Bulgarian and Turkish slaves. One of them was Marcus Maurocenus who appears at least in 5 different acts and was probably a professional slave dealer. He first appears in the act of May 1361 making a payment to the Bernardus Georgio for female slave called Maria Vlacha (from Wallachia). In the following year, he made a payment of 142 white besants (ca. 28.4 Venetian ducats) to Simon de Leone for the 15 year old Tatar slave called Aspertus. Marcus Maurocenus also appears in the deeds of Simeone. On 7 November 1363, Nasibene, a spice dealer, sold Marcus a slave called Çorci for 120 white besants (ca. 24 Venetian ducats). Moreover, in October 1364, Marcus sold a slave called Georgius de Romanie to the same Nasibene for 200 white besants (ca. 40 Venetian ducats). Marcus Maurocenus often appears buying slaves and he was probably an agent operating both in Famagusta and Venice. The deed concluded in Venice seems to be supporting this fact. In July 1364, Deya
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426 de Boateriis, nos. 73 and 129.
427 [Simeone], nos. 73 and 133. The same spice dealer called Nasibene also appears in the records of Nicola de Boateriis. see: de Boateriis, nos. 153 and 161.
Mauroceno, wife of Marcus Mauroceno, sold a Tatar slave called Margarita to Donatello Donato for 28.5 Venetian ducats. Another Venetian merchant that was intensely involved in slave trade was Matheus Venerio. He appears in 8 different acts buying and selling Tatar, Greek and Saracen slaves. For instance, On 30 September 1363(?), Matheus made a payment of 207 white besants (ca. 41.4 Venetian ducats) for 2 Tatar slaves, called Bona and Phylipa, to Sandrus Padavin. Next day, he sold a Tatar slave called Expertus to Victor Muse for 90 white besants (ca. 18 Venetian ducats). In December, Matheus bought a Saracen slave called Katarinio from Guielmus, an inhabitant of Famagusta, for 120 white besants (ca. 24 Venetian ducats). Matheus Venerio also appears twice in the records of 1364 selling and buying Greek and Tatar slaves. There were also considerable amounts of Venetian individuals buying, selling and manumitting slaves from diverse nations.

While at a glance the main actors in Boateriis’s and Simeone’s records appear to have been the Venetians, there are considerable amounts of deeds indicating that prominent Genoese merchants still played an important role in the distribution and sale of the slaves from Black Sea. In many cases, prominent Genoese merchants appear in the Venetian notarial records selling especially Tatar slaves to the Venetians. On 10 September 1361, Marcus Gallamanno de Campofregoso, Genoese, sold a Tatar slave called Maria to Simeon Giustianus, a Venetian, for 120 white besants (ca. 24 Venetian ducats). In 14 September, Helionus Spinola received 160 white besants (ca. 32 Venetian ducats) from a Venetian called Benedictus for the sale of another female slave called Lucia. In April, Assaldus Spinola, an inhabitant of Famagusta, sold a male Greek slave from Corinth to a Venetian spice dealer

428 de Boateriis, no. 214. For more evidence to the sale of Tatar slaves in Venice see; nos. 243, 274, 300, 319.
429 [Simeone], nos. 57 and 58.
430 [Simeone], nos. 63, 85, 116 and 127.
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called Bartholomeo de Garopellis for 150 white besants (*ca. 30 Venetian ducats*).\(^{432}\) A year later, the aforementioned Marcus Gallamano sold a Tatar slave called Maria to Simoni Guistiniano, a citizen of Venice, for unspecified price.\(^{433}\) On 11 January 1363, Adalanus de Negro, sold a Circassian slave called Katerina for 160 white besants (*ca. 32 Venetian ducats*) to Venetian called Iohannes and in October another Tatar slave called Christina was sold by Benedictus de Savona for 150 white besants (*ca. 30 Venetian ducats*).\(^{434}\) The prominent Genoese Zacharia family members were also actively involved in the slave trade. In 1364, Angelus Zacharia sold the 20 year old Tatar slave called Chisne to Marcus Trunzane for 150 white besants (*ca. 30 Venetian ducats*).\(^{435}\)

As well as the predominant figures additional individual Genoese merchants, either inhabitants or short-term visitors, operated in the slave market. One of them was Nicola Dondi, an inhabitant of Rhodes and merchant of Famagusta, who sold a female Bulgarian slave to Nicholas Barbadico, the Venetian Bailli of Famagusta, in November 1360. In 1361, Conradus Pravesinus, merchant of Famagusta, received 145 white besants (*ca. 29 Venetian ducats*) from the Venetian noble Andrea Dona for the sale of a female slave from ‘‘Romania’’.\(^{436}\) Similarly, in May another Venetian noble bought the Bulgarian slave Mariam from the Genoese Egidius de Auria.\(^{437}\) On March 1363, Iocobus de Sestre, Genoese, sold a Greek slave called George to Iohannes de Milano for 150 white besants (*ca. 30 Venetian ducats*).\(^{438}\) From March to September 1363, Simeone recorded the sale of 7 Tatar slaves (5 female, 2 male) worth 1,042 white besants (*ca. 208.4 Venetian ducats*) who were all sold to the Venetians by Genoese merchants.\(^{439}\) Nevertheless, it should also be noted that generally

\(^{432}\) *de Boateriis*, nos. 66, 90 and 93.
\(^{433}\) *de Boateriis*, no. 182.
\(^{434}\) *[Simeone]*, nos. 65 and 170.
\(^{435}\) *[Simeone]*, no. 91.
\(^{436}\) *de Boateriis*, nos.39 and 68.
\(^{437}\) *Boateriis*, no. 74.
\(^{438}\) *Boateriis*, no. 23.
\(^{439}\) *[Simeone]*, nos. 36, 61, 65, 91, 107, 112, 121.
the price of female slaves was higher compared to the price of males. The average price for the female slaves (for 17 cases), in the records of Nicola de Boateriis, is 141.65 white besants (ca. 28.33 Venetian ducats) and for the male slaves (for 8 cases) is 108.37 white besants (ca. 21.6 Venetian ducats). However, when the records of Simeone are analysed there is a moderate rise in the prices. In Simeone’s records, the average price for the female slaves (for 23 cases) is 148.43 white besants (ca. 29.6 Venetian ducats) and the price of male slaves (for 15 cases) follows at 119.26 white besants (ca. 23.8 Venetian ducats).

In fact, there is a significant rise in slave prices during the mid-fourteenth century when the Genoese (1296-1310) and Venetian (1355-1371) records are compared. In this respect, Benjamin Arbel suggested the estimation of 82.5 white besants for the average price of the slaves (both female and male) in the Genoese records and attributes the relative rise in the average price to the demographic crisis. Moreover, according to him, the reason behind the relative rise in the number of Greek slaves from 1350 onwards can be explained by the Catalan activities in Greece and Genoese piracy in the Aegean. Similarly, Nicholas Coureas argues that the frequent appearance of Greek slaves in the slave market was due to the fact that Turkish piracy in the Aegean increased from the early fourteenth century onwards and resulted in the displacement of Muslim slaves by Greeks in the slave markets of Famagusta and Nicosia. However, both Arbel’s and Coureas’s arguments, while strong, are far from being convincing since evidence coming from the Venetian notary Simeone suggest the opposite. As it is shown above, the acts drawn by Simeone suggest that Tatar slaves were in a higher demand rather than Greek slaves. The estimation of Arbel about the Greek slaves includes all acts (testaments, manumissions and sale) concerning slaves. However, when only ‘direct bill of sale’ acts are considered the available data suggests a totally different picture.

440 The average price estimation given above only includes ‘direct bill of sale’ contracts and slaves mentioned in the testaments or manumission acts are not included.
For example, the records of Boateriis mention the sale of 8 Tatar and 8 Greek slaves. However, Simeone recorded the sale of 23 Tatar, 1 Saracen and 9 Greek slaves. In this sense, it is likely that slave profiles are changeable from notary to notary and this is probably due to the scarcity of notarial records concerning Famagusta. Thus, it is not a supportable hypothesis to suggest that Muslim and African slaves were replaced by Greek and Tatar slaves due to the aforementioned reasons. Moreover, when it is considered that African and Saracen slaves were durable, accustomed to the hot weather conditions and suitable for the manual labour, the report of Ludolf von Suchen regarding the existence of Muslim slaves working in the estates around mid-fourteenth century should be taken into account more seriously. In addition, it is worth mentioning that a considerable amount of the acts of Boateriis concerning Greek slaves refer to their manumission rather than sale.\textsuperscript{442}

The Black Death, that ravaged the Famagusta in 1348 and 1362-3, surely played an important role regarding the relative rise in slave prices and the changing ethnic composition in general. It is also important to note that one obvious difference between the Genoese and Venetian acts concerning slaves is the merchant profiles. Unlike in the Genoese records, a considerable amount of Venetian merchants that bought or sold slaves are mentioned with the title of ‘noble’ in the records of Nicola de Boateriis.\textsuperscript{443} This, when the economic depression caused by the Black Death is considered, suggests that slaves were regarded as even more ‘luxurious’ than ever and were affordable only by rich citizens. Also, another point that needs to be taken into consideration about the rise of slave prices is the possible currency devaluation. The available numismatic evidence, albeit limited, indicates that compared to earlier periods mint output declined during the reign of Peter I and unlike Hugh IV’s reign

\textsuperscript{442} Boateriis, nos. 2, 48, 52, 53, 54, 60, 75, 77, 78, 100, 123, 124, 152, 164, 165, 167. On manumission of Greek slaves from Euboea, see Coureas, “Commercial Relations between Cyprus and Euboea”.

\textsuperscript{443} For some of them see: Boateriis, nos. 68, 73, 76.
‘the demand for re-minting disappeared during the whole of Peter I’s reign.’\footnote{Metcalf, D. M. \textit{The Silver Coinage of Cyprus, 1285-1382} (Nicosia, 1996), p. 97; Metcalf, D. M. ‘A Decline in the Stock of Currency in Fourteenth-Century Cyprus?’ in P. Edbury (ed.) \textit{Crusade and Settlement} (Cardiff, 1985), pp. 264-7; Edbury (1991), p. 153.} However, despite the aforementioned dynamics the appearance of the Tatar, Bulgarian, Turkish, Circassian and Romanian slaves that were sold in Famagusta clearly indicates the slave network between Black Sea and Mediterranean. Indeed, the trade in Caffa, an important Genoese colony, reached its peak in 1365 and Italian merchants transported a large amount of slaves from the Black Sea and Asia Minor to Famagusta, as is attested by the primary evidence. In fact, as mentioned before, the Black Sea and Mamluk Egypt was the crucial nexus for Venetian and Genoese merchants where slaves were bought and sold.\footnote{Balard, M. “‘Giacomo Badoer et le Commerce des Esclaves’” in E. Mornet and F. Morenzoni (ed.), \textit{Milieux naturels, espaces sociaux: études offertes à Robert Delort}, (Paris, 1997), pp. 555-64; Ashtor, ‘Levant Trade’, p. 104.} During the late-fourteenth century, Genoa was seeking a way to control a slave monopoly over the Black Sea, thus they attempted to prohibit subjects of Venice from buying or selling any Tatar slaves in Turkey.\footnote{Ibid, p. 13.} The Genoese investments concerning slave sales were huge. From 1381 to 1382, the total income tax revenue in Caffa was 156,445 aspers which mean more than 3,800 slaves were sold by Genoese merchants.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 179 and 209-10; Jacoby (2009b), pp. 76-7; Balard, M. “‘Les Génois dans le royaume médiéval de Chypre’” in id., \textit{Les marchands italiens à Chypre} (Cyprus Research Centre, Collected Studies, II), (Nicosia, 2007). Bănescu, N. \textit{Le déclin de Famagouste: fin du royaume de Chypre: notes and documents} (Bucarest, 1946).}

Unfortunately, there is not much available data to analyse for the period from 1370 to 1400. There is a common belief among scholars that the Genoese occupation of Famagusta in 1373-4 marked the so-called economic ‘decline’ of the city.\footnote{Edbury (1991), pp. 179 and 209-10; Jacoby (2009b), pp. 76-7; Balard, M. “‘Les Génois dans le royaume médiéval de Chypre’” in id., \textit{Les marchands italiens à Chypre} (Cyprus Research Centre, Collected Studies, II), (Nicosia, 2007). Bănescu, N. \textit{Le déclin de Famagouste: fin du royaume de Chypre: notes and documents} (Bucarest, 1946).} Allegedly, at the coronation of Peter II in Famagusta (in 1372) a quarrel broke out between Venetian and Genoese leaders about precedence and later it turned out to be a massive riot which resulted in the arrest of Genoese citizens in Famagusta. Shortly after, the Genoese authorities decided to organize an
expedition to Cyprus under Pietro Campofregoso, brother of the Doge of Genoa, and Genoese forces captured Famagusta by 10 October 1373. In 1374, peace was agreed between The Kingdom of Cyprus and Genoa. The conditions of the agreement were heavy. Peter II agreed to pay 40,000 florins a year to Genoa, 2,012,400 florins to the members of Maona for 12 years and 90,000 florins for galley crews and mercenaries. In addition, Famagusta was handed over to the Genoese as surety until the payments were complete. On this issue, Peter Edbury rightly states that the main reason behind the Genoese occupation of Famagusta in 1373-4 should not only be attributed to the ‘quarrel’ that broke out between the Genoese and Venetians at the coronation of King Peter II in 1372. However, it was more of a long-planned strategy and when political instability in Genoa and the economic effects of Black Death are considered, the island of Cyprus, where the cotton, sugar and grain largely produced, was a gold mine for them.

The war between Genoa and the Kingdom of Cyprus and the occupation of Famagusta (1374-1464) surely caused some of the changes in the Levant trade. In 1372, the regular galley services of Venice and Cyprus were suspended and it took Venice sixteen years to re-establish a regular galley service again. In fact, the Genoese authorities transferred the seat of the Venetian Bailo from Famagusta to Nicosia and imposed new regulations which compelled all ships that loaded local merchandise in Cyprus to pass through the port of Famagusta. Allegedly, the main goal of Genoa’s policy in transforming the status of Famagusta ‘to being the only harbour of the island accessible for the import and export trade’ was to prevent Venice from using Famagusta as a port regularly. Although, it is difficult to
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say how much Venetian long-distance trade was affected by the Genoese takeover of Famagusta, it is certain that the exportation of local products from Cyprus to Venice was hampered. On the other hand, Laiazzo in Cilician Armenia was conquered by the Mamluks in 1375. The loss of Laiazzo, a major emporium that connected the Mediterranean with the Persian Gulf, was a heavy blow to Venice and Genoa. In fact, the change of trade routes and the fall of the Ilkhans in Persia caused serious disruption in the Levant trade and the Italian maritime republics had to rely on their colonies in the Black Sea, namely Caffa and Tana, for the Indian spice trade. This was probably the main reason for the re-establishment of the Beirut galley line by Venice that linked Cyprus from 1388 to 1424.

Recently published Genoese notarial records provide important hints about the economic dynamics of Famagusta after the Genoese occupation, even if they are limited. Compared to earlier notarial records the Genoese records drawn up around 1380s are more official in nature. Nevertheless, besides Famagusta notarial records include acts drawn up in Syria, Rhodes, Chios, Gorighos, Paphos, Nicosia, but they do not offer much about merchant activities in Famagusta. However, to a certain extent, it appears that Genoese merchants were still actively operating in Famagusta. For example, on 7 August 1383, Johannes de Bargagli, ordered Adalonus Pallavicino, Massaria of the galleys to return three boxes of powdered sugar to their owner which he had received on board. In the same month, Salvus Sosomena, burgess of Famagusta, reported having been expelled from the city. According to the report, the said Salvus travelled to Beyrouth from Kyrenia on a Catalan ship and stayed three years in Beyrouth and Latakia, one year in Alexandria, six months in Rhodes and eight
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Arbel, B. ‘‘Maritime Trade in Famagusta during the Venetian Period (1474-1571)’’ in M. Walsh, T. Kiss and N. Courèges (ed.) The Harbour of all this Sea and Realm: Crusader to Venetian Famagusta (Budapest, 2014), p. 95.


Jacoby, ‘The Venetians in Byzantine and Lusignan Cyprus’, p. 76.


[Gênes et l’Outre-mer], no. 41 and p. 269.
months in Finike (Phoenicus) in Turkey. On 8 September 1383, Gotifredus Spinola, a Genoese citizen and patron of an armed galley, demanded the restitution of 3 boxes of powdered sugar that were taken by Nicolaus de Illionibus and sequestered by the treasury (massaria) of Famagusta. Two days later, the said Spinola complained that Nicolaus de Illionibus had stolen various merchandise, such as camlet, cloth and candle holders from Damascus and bocasine. The nature of the merchandise clearly shows that Gotifredus Spinola was operating both in Famagusta and the Muslim East. Indeed, it seems that Famagusta was still integrated to the Genoese galley line of Egypt and Syria during the late fourteenth century. For instance, on 25 September 1383, twelve galleys left Cyprus for Egypt. However weather conditions forced them to return to Cyprus. Then the captain of the galleys decided to visit Syria. Genoese galleys transporting Oriental spices and cotton from Alexandria to Rhodes in 1383 are also attested by notarial evidence. Also, six additional documents from state archives of Genoa published by Bliznyuk, recorded between 1391 and 1396, mentions Famagusta as a port of call for the Genoese ships. Seen through such records, Genoese merchants were still exported significant amounts of sugar, camlet and cotton from Famagusta to Genoa during the last decade of fourteenth century.

Understandably, the Venetian merchants that operated in Cyprus do not appear in the Genoese records. Yet, it is known that the Venetian merchants of Famagusta were also enjoying the same royal tax rate as the Genoese around the 1390s. However, the available

459 [Gênes et l'Outre-mer], nos. 45, 46, 47 and pp. 276, 278.
460 [Gênes et l'Outre-mer], nos. 76, 89 and pp. 303, 313.
461 [Gênes et l'Outre-mer], no. 101 and p. 332.
evidence is not adequate to examine their commercial activities in Famagusta from 1374 to 1400. Similarly, the acts concerning Genoese merchants reveal a very limited amount of information about the commercial activities in the city. Considering the surviving notarial evidence it is not possible to estimate the scale of Genoese and Venetian trade in Famagusta. However, this should not be interpreted as an economic ‘decline’ as Famagusta and Chios served as a base for Genoese trade with Levantine and Black Sea ports during the late fourteenth century. As Nicholas Coureas pointed out, there is a substantial amount of evidence showing that ‘Famagusta served as a first port of call for ships sailing from Genoa to Syria and Genoese ships bound for Syria stopped off at Famagusta on their outward and return journeys’ during the last decades of fourteenth century. In this respect, further archival evidence is necessary for more profound analysis of merchant activities and the role of Famagusta in Levant trade from 1374 to 1400.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ship owner or patron</th>
<th>Loading Site</th>
<th>Port of arrival</th>
<th>Value or quantity</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04.11.1367</td>
<td>Luciano Squarciafico</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>10381  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.11.1367</td>
<td>Alberto Lercario</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>2782  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.12.1367</td>
<td>Ottobono Doria</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>5372  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.01.1368</td>
<td>Matteo Maruffo</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>5692  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.01.1369</td>
<td>Pietro Scotto</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>1730  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.01.1369</td>
<td>Guglielmo Ermirano</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>720  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.01.1369</td>
<td>Bernabo Cattaneo</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>48245  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.01.1369</td>
<td>Oberto Squarciafico</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>1119  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.03.1369</td>
<td>Ottobono Doria</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>13893  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05.1369</td>
<td>Lucchetto Lercario</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>10579  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03.1371</td>
<td>Lodisio Belaveo</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>11623  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03.1371</td>
<td>Lanzarotto Cattaneo</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>515  &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.03.1391</td>
<td>Oberto Squarciafico</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>75 kantars of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1395.??</td>
<td>Ottaviano Lercario</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>4 sacks (216 ducats)</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1396.??</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>237 sacks of sugar powder (8721 ducats)</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Genoese ships loading sugar in Alexandria from mid-fourteenth to late fourteenth century. Information given in this table does not include every transaction. Yet it is prepared to set examples of the sale of sugar transportation. The data provided in this and following tables is gathered from archival sources used by Ouerfelli.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of ship or patron</th>
<th>Loading site</th>
<th>Port of arrival</th>
<th>Value or quantity</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.10.1385</td>
<td>galley of Beirut</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1300 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Duerfelli, Le Sucre, pp. 688-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.05.1386</td>
<td>convoy of cogs (spring)</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>150 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.05.1387</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>360 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.05.1389</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (spring)</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>380 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11.1392</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (fall)</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>400 sacks of sugar and 500 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.04.1393</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; (spring)</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>170 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.11.1393</td>
<td>4 galleys</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>100 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.04.1394</td>
<td>2 cogs</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>250-300 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.11.1394</td>
<td>convoy of galleys of Beirut</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>500 sacks of powdered sugar from Cyprus and 300 sacks from Syria</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.11.1394</td>
<td>4 galleys of Beirut</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>224 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.10.1395</td>
<td>convoy of cotton (muda de cotton)</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>800 sacks of sugar powder</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.11.1395</td>
<td>galleys of Beirut</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1000 sacks of sugar and 900 sacks of sugar powder</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.11.1396</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1000 sacks of sugar powder and 300 sacks of sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.11.1399</td>
<td>convoy of cogs (fall)</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>1800 sacks of sugar powder</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.10.1400</td>
<td>convoy of Beirut</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>2000 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?03.1408</td>
<td>4 cogs (muda de cotton)</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>cotton, alum and sugar (uncertain quantity)</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.05.1408</td>
<td>navi di Suria</td>
<td>Syria and Cyprus</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>34 sacks of sugar powder</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Venetian ships loading sugar in Beirut, Syria and Cyprus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Ship owner or patron</th>
<th>Loading Site</th>
<th>Port of arrival</th>
<th>Value or quantity</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.11.1368</td>
<td>Ambrogio de Negro</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>6224 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3. 1369</td>
<td>‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>6000 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.04. 1369</td>
<td>Domenico Campofregoso</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>150 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.05.1369</td>
<td>Jacopo Salvago</td>
<td>Beirut</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>894 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.03.1367</td>
<td>Paolo Bechignano</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>414 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.11. 1376</td>
<td>Sancho Barono</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>380 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?. 10. 1377</td>
<td>Marco Bechignano</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>3205 ‗‗ ‗‗</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.4. 1383</td>
<td>Francholino Luciano</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>113 sacks of sugar and 12 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.04.1395</td>
<td>Paolo Lercario</td>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>29 sacks of sugar and 30 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>??. 1396</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Beirut-Famagusta</td>
<td>Genoa</td>
<td>96 sacks of sugar and 170 sacks of powdered sugar</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Transportation of sugar from/to Famagusta by Genoese ships.
2.4 Famagusta in the Fifteenth Century: Economic Dynamics and Commercial Potential

Due to space limitations this section is intentionally limited to the most in demand products of cotton, sugar and grain, although there were many other goods that were transported from the Levant to the West. The main aim of this section is to examine the commercial potential of Cyprus’ agriculture and more particularly the role of Famagusta in the Levant trade during the late medieval period. The economic dynamics and agricultural potential of the hinterland of Famagusta in the fifteenth century is a little known subject. Indeed, it is not easy to portray the economic importance of Famagusta throughout the fifteenth century. Although there is a considerable amount of recently published archival material referring to Famagusta, it is still not possible to estimate the overall economic role that Famagusta played in the Levantine trade. The difficulty stems primarily from two facts: firstly, the gradual economic and political changes in the Levant and secondly, the disproportionate (relative to its abundance) amount of archival material concerning Famagusta.

From an economic point of view, the Levant trade suffered from severe economic depression during the early fifteenth century. The Oriental industries in the Middle East declined as a consequence of the Black Death and long civil wars caused economic instability in the Mamluk Sultanate. Additionally, the decline in the textile and sugar industries in Egypt and Syria at the beginning of the fifteenth century resulted in a rise of the prices in the Levant.\textsuperscript{467} Also, the political reasons for the short-term depression in the Levant trade can hardly be ignored. As access to the Oriental merchandise became more onerous the competition between the Genoese, Venetian and Catalans became fiercer. The Venetian

victory against the Genoese at the battle off Modon (1403) and an unsuccessful expedition against the Syrian ports weakened Genoa’s position in the Levant trade.\textsuperscript{468} The efforts of the Genoese authorities in Famagusta to maintain good relations with the Mamluks came to nothing and the conflicts continued unabated from 1405 to 1420.\textsuperscript{469} Yet, despite the diplomatic chaos, the Genoese were still operating in Syria and they had a colony in Damascus. Famagusta played an important role in Genoa’s Levantine trade policy and there was an office called ‘‘\textit{Officium Syriae et Cypri}’’ that supervised the Genoese commercial activities in the Levant. In 1403, Genoese ships were still visiting Alexandria and the Cyprus-Alexandria galley line consisted of 3 galleys.\textsuperscript{470} In addition, Venetian cotton cogs were also visiting Cyprus in 1414. It is not known, though, how much Famagusta benefited from the more advantageous position of Venice in the Levant trade during the early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{471}

The Mamluk invasion of Cyprus in 1426 marked a new era in the Levant region. Cyprus was reduced to tributary status and control over the Kingdom of Cyprus by the Mamluk Sultanate continued until the year 1516-1517. But contrary to the traditional belief, commercial links between Cyprus and Middle East intensified after the Mamluk invasion. In this respect, Nicholas Coureas has pointed out that ‘‘in terms of commercial interchange, however, it was the Cypriots, not the Mamluks, who were the real winners. Cypriot products were exported to Egypt, and in the case of sugar even displaced Egyptian and Syrian sugar production, which went into decline.’’\textsuperscript{472} Parallel to the general decline in the Middle East sugar industry, sugar production in Cyprus witnessed its heyday and large amounts were exported to the Mamluk lands and the West. The Venetian convoy of Syria first visited the

\textsuperscript{468} Ashtor ‘\textit{Levant Trade}’, pp. 216-9; Epstein (1996), p. 259.
\textsuperscript{469} Ibid, pp.216-21.
\textsuperscript{470} Ibid, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{471} Ibid, pp. 255 and 267. Table 24.
ports of Famagusta and Limassol and loaded sugar before departing for Syria. The island was also a main supplier of wheat and barley to Syria and Egypt, and cotton from Syria was transported to Cyprus by Venetian merchants after 1426.

Letters of Venetian merchants provide invaluable information about cotton exportation from the Middle East and Cyprus during the fifteenth century. Letters suggest that cotton was imported from Cyprus and Syria to Venice by Latin merchants throughout the fifteenth century. A letter of January 1407, written by Constantino di Priuli, a Venetian Patrician, informed Donado Soranzo who was just about to sail to Hama (Syria) that he had loaded 7 bags to the ship containing 3,400 ducats and 4 canvas rolls, which was to be invested in Syria. Moreover, Constantino instructed Soranzo that 3,400 ducats should be invested in cotton of Hama. Constantino di Piruli was also complaining that in the loading period of that time over 3,000 sacks of cotton exported to Venice, which is quite low compared to the earlier periods, and he instructed Soranzo that if he could not find high quality cotton or in the case of any shortage then he was to buy boccasini (light cotton) or pepper from Damascus, products which were in great demand and profitable as well. Also, Constantino asked Soranzo to transport the said cotton either at the present loading period (Muda) or the following one, whichever Soranzo thought more profitable. As is already known from the official records from the fifteenth century, the Soranzo family member’s mission was to import cotton from Syria to Venice. In 1486, Piero Malipiero sent a letter from Nicosia to Venice in order to inform Piero Morosini that he had loaded six sacks of cotton in Hama and
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475 Arbel, B. Venetian Letters (1354-1512): from the Archives of the Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation and other Cypriot Collections (Nicosia, 2007), no. 2. “Canvas was mainly used for the sacks of cotton exported from Syria”. see; p. 59 and fn. 3.
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477 Ibid, pp. 28-9. See also the letter of nobleman addressed to the Soranzo instructing him how to invest money in Damascus, Ibid, no. 3. The Soranzo family was a well-known Venetian firm established especially at Hama: Mazzaoui (1981), p. 38.
loaded them to the ships of Michele da Mosto who was about to sail for Venice. On 4 August 1495, Geronimo and Giorgio sent a letter to Giovanni in Damascus informing him of the market prices of various articles in Venice such as bavelle (waste-silk fiber), ginger, nutmeg, brazil-wood, cloves and cotton. According to the letter, cotton of Hama was worth 4-4 ¼ ducats and cotton from Sarmin (south-west of Aleppo) and Cyprus 3 ¼ - 2 ½. However, what is more interesting is another letter that was written in 1486. The letter was written in Famagusta by Odon Spinola to the Venetian Ambrogio Malipiero in Syria. As Odon Spinola wrote this letter in response to Ambrogio’s, the scale of the business is uncertain. However, Ambrogio apparently advised Odon in the previous letter to use a certain amount of soap in exchange for unspecified merchandise in Famagusta. Odon thereupon informs him that soap was not in demand in Famagusta and suggested they should sell it in Ancona and the profit should be spent on Anconitan wheat which is easier to sell.

Further evidence can be also found in the records concerning Cyprus’s cotton. It was cultivated mostly around the cities such as Paphos, Episkopi, Limassol, Larnaka, Nicosia and Famagusta. There is a common belief that cotton was introduced to Cyprus from Syria. However, as it was already mentioned before, due to the lack of evidence regarding earlier periods there is little known about the development of the cotton industry in Cyprus before the fourteenth century. After the mid-fourteenth century the cotton and sugar monopolies were generally controlled by the noble Venetian family of Corner. Especially, the district of Episkopi appears to be one of the most important cotton suppliers for Venetian galleys. Similar to the cotton convoy of Syria, the cotton of Cyprus was loaded only in March and September. The transportation of cotton from Cyprus to Venice was carried according to the
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state regulations called "muda gothonorum".\textsuperscript{484} Especially, after the fall of Acre in 1291, Venice immediately banned the Beirut-Alexandria galley line which was replaced by the Cyprus-Armenia galley line in order to transport cotton from the Levant. This suspension lasted until 1366, when the Venetian Senate decided to establish an official convoy of galleys for Cyprus, Syria and Alexandria. However, due to the regenerated trade relations between Venice and the Mamluks, and the Genoese occupation of Famagusta in 1373-4 the galley line of Cyprus was suspended again from 1375 to 1444.\textsuperscript{485}

The political situation, however, neither brought an end to the Venetian hegemony regarding cotton trade nor the importance of Famagusta. Allegedly, at least 500 master-craftsmen of cotton resided in Famagusta at the end of the fifteenth century (see below). Also, according to Emmanuel Piloti, a Venetian merchant and traveller (fl. 1420), merchants of Beirut and Tripoli visited Famagusta with their ships to sell cotton, spices and other products of their country.\textsuperscript{486} From 1373 to 1474 cotton was transported to Venice by private galleys, and only after the Genoese were driven out of Famagusta in 1474, an official galley line for Cyprus was re-established. At the end of the fifteenth century, roughly 7000 sacks of raw cotton and 150 sacks of spun cotton were transported from Cyprus to Venice.\textsuperscript{487} In 1491, the merchant community of Famagusta requested that the government of Venice restore the rights, customs and privileges that they had enjoyed during the Genoese period. Their
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\item \textsuperscript{485} Nam (2007), pp. 249-51.
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requests were as follows: ‘all cotton that [is] harvested in the island must be gathered and transported from Famagusta and [the] 500 cotton masters that are living in the island should reside in Famagusta and other inhabitants of the island should only be allowed to work in the cotton fields for their own use and should not be allowed to sell their cotton.’

Without doubt, we can say that Famagusta was still an important emporium and at the same time an important supplier for Italian merchants. The importance of Limassol, Pafos, Nicosia and Famagusta (especially Mesaria plain) as grain producers during the later periods is already highlighted. Considering the statistical data provided earlier, regarding the large amount of cotton cultivation and exportation, one may conclude that Famagusta still maintained its role as a distributor of Levantine merchandise. Although there is no extensive research on the Levantine cotton trade, the data provided above is enough to prove how large the cotton trade was in scale. In this sense, the argument of Heyd that: ‘Genoese merchants were mainly transporting oriental spices, silk sheets and gold from Famagusta... Yet, cotton had to be accepted of the least importance’’ neglects the notarial and official documentary evidence.

The economic dynamics that are suggested by the aforementioned data are also supported by the evidence concerning sugar transportation. In the first place, sugar itself was found in the regional markets (for example Damascus) and secondly because it requires intensive labour, capital and comprehensive organization of the use of land, development of the sugar industry started quite late comparing to cotton and grain. Cyprus was the third most important sugar production centre in the Levant after Syria and Egypt during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. From the mid-fourteenth century onwards the sugar
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industry in Cyprus was controlled by the Lusignan dynasty, the Venetian Corner family and the Military Orders.\textsuperscript{491} After the invasions of Tamerlane, sugar production in the Mamluk domains, particularly in Syria witnessed considerable decrease in production. This caused a sudden rise in the production of sugar in the royal domains of Cyprus.\textsuperscript{492} From the late thirteenth to mid-fourteenth century sugar was loaded with other merchandise on a much smaller scale. However, it was both consumed and transported in impressive amounts around the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{493}

M. Ouerfelli, however, has stressed that the sugar trades of Damascus and Cyprus are the only ones identifiable from the state records of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century. The evidence suggests that the second half of the fourteenth century witnessed a significant increase in sugar consumption. According to the Datini archives, large amounts of sugar cargoes were loaded in Egypt, Syria and Cyprus by Italian merchants. However, Ouerfelli argues that before the year 1420, Syria and Egypt lost their respective roles as major sugar markets in favour of Cyprus and Sicily.\textsuperscript{494} Also, according to the licences granted by the captain of Famagusta in mid-fifteenth century, 60\% of sugar merchants operating in the island were Venetians. Genoese and local sugar merchants consisted of 38\% whereas Catalans were only 2\%. As sugar became more profitable around the Levant, the Venetian Martini family also joined the Corner family to strengthen their control over the resources of the island where they were already in a favourable position since sugar production had deteriorated due to the crisis in the Egyptian sugar industry and the Mongol occupation of Syria.\textsuperscript{495} Another reason for the decline of the sugar industry in Egypt and Syria could be the

\textsuperscript{491} Ibid, pp. 102, 106 and 109.
\textsuperscript{492} Ibid, p. 109. It is also argued by Jacoby that: “when the Mongol conqueror Tamerlane (Timur) advanced in Syria in 1400-1401, most Venetian merchants and officials staying in the region fled to Famagusta”. Jacoby (2009b), p. 77.
\textsuperscript{493} The evidence to this analysis can be also seen in the notarial acts of earlier periods. see also Ouerfelli, pp. 363 and 407-437. For increasing importance of the sugar industry around late fourteenth century see: Ashtor, ‘Levant Trade’, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{494} Ouerfelli, ‘Le Sucre’, pp, 323, 332 and 357; Ashtor ‘Levant Trade’, p. 208.
\textsuperscript{495} Ouerfelli, ‘Le Sucre’, pp. 441 and 447, Graphic 36.
decline in sugar factories in early fifteenth century. According to an Arabic chronicle and various travellers, there were approximately 25 sugar factories in Cairo in the early fifteenth century whereas there were 66 around 1325. However, it is not the decline of sugar factories in Egypt which requires examination in this case but the scale of sugar exportation from the late fourteenth to fifteenth century.

The licences granted by the Genoese government of Cyprus from 1438 to 1450 to the sugar merchants indicate how large the sugar trade was in scale. Between 1438 and 1450, at least 4,500 sacks of powdered sugar were loaded by Venetian merchants in Famagusta, Paphos, Kyrenia and Limassol. According to the data, 1,854 sacks of sugar out of 4,500 were loaded by members of the Corner family. Moreover, the Genoese merchants also loaded roughly 400 cantars of sugar (c. 18,800 kilos) probably transporting it to Venice and from there to Genoa and sometimes directly to Alexandria. For instance, on 17 March 1435, Georgius Rubeus chartered the ship of Thomasinus Manuel, anchored in the port of Famagusta, and agreed to load an unspecified amount of sugar molasses to be transported directly to Alexandria. What is interesting about their case is the continuous co-operation between the Venetian and Genoese merchants. For example, on 25 February 1440, Benedetto Larcario from Genoa purchased 100 cantars of sugar molasses in Limassol and loaded it on the ship of Giovanni Corner. In April, Desiderio Cattaneo loaded 100 sacks of sugar on the ship ‘navi pulverum venetorum’ that he bought in Paphos. Desiderio was not co-operating only with Venetians but with his compatriots as well. In October, 70 cantars of sugar molasses where loaded onto the ship of Niccolo Spinola by Desiderio whereas the direction of the ship is unspecified. Evidently sugar of Cyprus was not destined only for the Western ports but Egypt as well. On 27 March 1439, Benedetto Larcario loaded 80 cantars of sugar in
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Paphos and Limassol and in 1441 Benedetto loaded 40 cantars of sugar in Paphos, both to be transported to Damietta in Egypt. However, although the cities are often specified in the transactions regarding the consignments transported to the Mamluk dominions, in some cases the destination has been specified simply as ‘Egypt’ without mentioning the specific city. A licence of October 1441 is a good example of it. Tomassino Mansol loaded 35 cantars of sugar molasses on the ship of Giuliano Carlavario to be carried ‘in partibus Egipti’. The importation of Cypriot sugar into Egypt also suggests a decline in the connections between Muslim and western markets. More precisely, the sufficiency of Cyprus and Sicily as sugar and grain suppliers would somehow have contributed to the decline of Syrian and Egyptian markets. However, considering their proximity to the Persian Gulf, they still played a vital role regarding the transportation of Oriental spices to the West.

The decline in the Levantine sugar industry can be seen from the records of Datini as well. While, Venetian convoys touched both Syria and Egypt from 1383 to 1394 loading large quantities of sugar, after April 1394 the whole situation was changed. As Venetian sugar embarkation records suggest, the Beirut galley line of Venice was still active and large amounts of sugar were loaded in Alexandria, Beirut and Syria and transported to Venice around the late fourteenth century. The amount of galleys operating is uncertain but sugar was transported according to the ‘muda gothonorum’ regulation. However from 1394 onwards the convoy of Beirut loaded sugar both in Syria and Cyprus. In some cases, the convoy of cotton also loaded sugar both in Syria and Cyprus in order to be shipped to Venice. On 27 October 1395, ‘la muda de coton’ loaded 800 sacks of sugar powder and in October

502 The licences granted by the Genoese government regarding sugar, cotton and grain transportation clearly suggest continuous trade between Genoa and Levant. As it will be seen, the Beirut galley line was not suspended by Genoa even during the late fourteenth century, and galleys of Beirut transported sugar to Famagusta is known by official records. The Genoese presence in Egypt, Syria and Famagusta transporting large quantities of sugar consignments shows that Heyd was wrong reaching the conclusion that ‘Genoese were not operating in the ports of Syria’. Heyd, II, p. 461. See also J. Heers (1961), p. 175. Moreover, the Genoese records concerning sugar suggest that Venetian hegemony over Levantine sugar trade needs to be revisited. For the idea of Venetian hegemony in Levant See: Ashtor, ‘Observations on Venetian Trade’, pp. 533-86; Ibid, ‘Levant Trade’; Ibid ‘Venetian Supremacy in Levantine Trade’, pp. 5-53.
1,500 sacks of sugar powder together with 500 sacks of unrefined sugar of Cyprus and Damascus were loaded to be conveyed to Venice by the convoy of Beirut. Another convoy called ‘navi di Suria’ which appears in the records of the fifteenth century was also loaded both in Cyprus and Syria. Also, when one examines the few reports that mention Syria as an only loading site one will notice that sugar was loaded along with alum and cotton and transported to Venice by the ‘convoy of cotton’.

Another point that needs to be mentioned here is the activity of the Genoese merchants. As was mentioned earlier, Genoese aristocrat families such as Squarciafico, Spinola, Doria, de Negro and de Mari were all involved in the sugar trade. Large amounts of sugar were conveyed via Alexandria, Beirut, Syria, Cyprus and Rhodes to Genoa. From September to December in 1367, the ships belonging to the Squarciafico, Doria and Lercario consortium carried sugar from Alexandria to Genoa worth 22,456 Genoese pounds. In 1368, Priano Spinola and Ambrogio de Negro transported sugar worth 35,408 Genoese pounds from Syria and Beirut to Famagusta. It is noteworthy that, despite the decline of the sugar industry in Egypt, Genoese merchants continued to transport large quantities of sugar from Alexandria and Beirut. State records suggest that merchants of Genoa continued to export sugar from Alexandria, Beirut and Syria until 1403. In addition, the Genoese galley line of Beirut also touched Famagusta just like the Venetian one at the end of fourteenth century. However, Genoese galleys still sailed directly to Beirut without visiting Famagusta in the fifteenth century, whereas the Venetian galleys of Beirut were loaded in Cyprus as well. As was shown in the previous section, Genoese families also co-operated with the Hospitallers in Cyprus who obtained large amounts of estates where they cultivated grain and sugar.

504 Ibid, table 5, p. 690.
505 Ibid, Table 4, p. 681. In 1376, Sancho Borono transported 5 sacks of sugar from Famagusta to Genoa which was worth to 380 Genoese pounds. Moreover, in 1377, 37 sacks of sugar from Cyprus that to be transported from Famagusta to Genoa was estimated as 3,205 pounds. See: Ibid, p. 683.
Particularly the Doria family, who also controlled the soap monopoly in Rhodes, had close contacts with the Hospitallers, transporting soap from Rhodes to Cyprus. Of course, as it has been revealed, their trade was not limited to soap but also included several other goods. Furthermore, one should also take into consideration the impressive amount of sugar cargoes transported from Cyprus mainly to Italy, Syria, Egypt and Rhodes during the fifteenth century by the Hospitallers, the Venetians and the Genoese, all of which reveals the scale of production and exportation at the same time.\footnote{Jacoby ‘The Venetians in Byzantine and Lusignan Cyprus’, pp. 81-83; Ourefelli ‘Le Sucre’, pp. 64-6 and 94-102. According to the Jacoby, Ouerfelli correlates the increased importance of Cyprus as a sugar producer with the political instability in Syria and invasions of Timur. However, “he fails to consider the shipping of Cypriot sugar to Mamluk territories and the technological improvements in its production that furthered that traffic”. Ibid. p. 98 and fn. 170.}

Parallel to the industrial developments in Cyprus more manpower was required for agricultural and domestic purposes. The existence of the slave markets and their use enable us to analyse the scale of agricultural production in fifteenth century Cyprus. Since the information and ethnical composition of slaves mentioned in the deeds of Boateriis is very limited, documents from the archives of Rhodes concerning the Hospitallers and their activities concerning Cyprus between 1409 and 1459 must be examined as they complement the information revealed by the Venetian letters.\footnote{Borchardt, K., Luttrell, A., Schoffler, E. (eds.) Documents Concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives: 1409-1459, Cyprus Research Centre: Text and Studies in the History of Cyprus LXVI (Nicosia, 2011). Hereafter cited as: ‘Rhodian Archives’.} As mentioned previously, the absence of Muslim and African slaves in the deeds of Boateriis has often been correlated to the Catalan, Genoese and Turkish piracy in the Aegean by prominent scholars.\footnote{See previous sub-section.} However the available evidence suggests that they continued to exist both in Cyprus and Aegean. On 14 September 1438, Abraham of Cyprus and his wife Elia, who were not allowed (it is not stated whether by law or not) to bear children for domestic service anymore, were licensed to buy a female Saracen slave. Additionally, in 1451, Jean de Lastic freed the Tartar slave Ludovicus who
served the late Seneschal Guillaume de Lastic. Slaves from Cyprus were also sent as a gift to the Hospitallers living in Rhodes. In a document of April 1437, Louis de Lusignan, Preceptor of Phinikas and Anoyira, gave an eight year-old Greek Cypriot slave as a gift to Angelino Muscetulla, Preceptor of the Baiulia of Cyprus and Admiral. On 22 August 1451, the said Jean de Lastic manumitted a Russian slave called Georginus who served the late Guillaume de Lastic. Apparently, Guillaume had more than one slave serving to him before his death. Another interesting deed, dated to March 1453, concerns the marriage between Caterina Querimoti and Philip Michali tis Annas (presumably Greek). Philip was a former slave of Antoni de Fluvia and after his manumission he left Cyprus and married Caterina in Rhodes on 8th of March. However, on 14 March, the Master’s Seneschal Louis de Manhac claimed that the archbishop of Rhodes’ declaration that the couple’s future children would be free was damaging to the Order’s interests.

Without doubt, the evidence narrated above suggests that a slave market still existed in Cyprus during the mid-fifteenth century. This at the same time partly indicates the continuity of rural life and agricultural production where mainly slaves were used. The Mamluk invasion of 1426, generally regarded as signifying an end of commercial prosperity, supposedly led to the downfall of Famagusta. However, the existing evidence suggests otherwise. A letter written in 1480, by a certain Francesco Zilberti who was an agent of Marco Bembo, a Venetian patrician, informed Bembo that he had sailed to Phocaea from Constantinople where he loaded alum and then sailed to Chios wishing to sell caviar there. However, there was no demand for caviar in Chios and Francesco decided to take the whole merchandise, consisting of alum, caviar, and Malmsey wine to Rhodes and Cyprus. From
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there, he departed for Cyprus but due to the unfavourable weather conditions he had to sail to Rhodes (where he wrote the letter) with the intention of reaching Cyprus. During his stay at Rhodes, Francesco reported that the Beirut galleys had been in Rhodes but that the galleys had sailed to Venice 20 days before his arrival.\footnote{515} On 1 December, 1481, Marco Bembo received a letter from another agent called Giovanni (Zuan) Confeto. In this letter, Giovanni informs Marco Bembo that a certain Giovanni Vasalo had brought 8 kegs of caviar and 20 barrels of salted palamida fish which belong to Marco and Lazzaro Tartaro. However, because the Cypriot merchants brought fresh ones on board of the light galleys and the quality of the caviar that Giovanni Confeto received was bad he only managed to sell 3 kegs of it. Apart from the caviar and palamida fish, Marco Bembo also sent 16 pieces of Flanders serge cloth to be sold in Cyprus. Saying that he did not receive the consignments, Giovanni also informs Marco that the cloth was not in demand there and that he should make arrangements to sell them in Syria.\footnote{516}

Although the commercial relations between Cyprus and the West during the fifteenth century are poorly documented, intense trade between Cyprus and the Aegean are well illustrated by the acts from Chios and Rhodes. The surviving evidence, though limited, is enough to illustrate Famagusta’s importance in the Mediterranean trade. The published and unpublished documents concerning Chios, which have been well-examined by N. Coureas, reveal that certain agricultural products were transported to Famagusta from Chios and from there to the Mamluk lands of Syria and Egypt. Moreover, during the late medieval period the Famagusta market served as a distribution centre for the mastic originating from Chios.\footnote{517}

Famagusta maintained strict ties with the Genoese colonies of Pera and Chios and notarial evidence reveals that the Genoese trading companies from such places had representatives in Famagusta handling their affairs there in the late-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{518}

During the late fourteenth and early-fifteenth centuries, Cypriot weights were used for the mastic of Chios that was transported to the eastern Mediterranean lands. Prominent families, such as the \textit{Giustiniani}, who controlled the administration of Chios, were also involved in the mastic trade at the same time. The members of the family were heavily involved in the distribution of large quantities of mastic from Chios to Famagusta.\textsuperscript{519} The Genoese, Jewish, and Greek merchants of Famagusta also appear in the acts as buying and selling merchandise from Chios and Pera during the fifteenth century. In this respect, Coureas notes that, during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries ‘‘both islands were part of the Genoese trading networks of the eastern Mediterranean’’ and ‘‘if Chios played a unique role in the production of mastic, Cyprus played an important role in its distribution throughout the Levant [...]’’.\textsuperscript{520}

In order to understand the continuous role of Famagusta in the Mediterranean during the fifteenth century, the economic relations between Rhodes and Cyprus need to be examined further. From the fourteenth century onwards, one of the most important groups involved in trade was the Hospitallers. After the Mamluk conquest of Acre in 1291, the Hospitallers and Templars withdrew from Syria and established their headquarters at Limassol.\textsuperscript{521} Moreover, the conquest of Rhodes by the Hospitallers in the early-fourteenth century increased the commercial interaction between Cyprus and Rhodes. As will be seen,
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the products such as wine, grain, livestock and sugar that were produced by the Hospitallers in their Cypriot estates, were transported to Rhodes regularly, especially during the fifteenth century. Indeed, the Hospitallers in Cyprus maintained close relations with the crown, unlike the Templars whose properties were confiscated by King Hugh in 1279. After the dissolution of the Order of the Temple in 1312, a high proportion of their properties in Cyprus were given to the Hospitallers. Some of the records suggest that Cypriot estates constituted a ninth of the Hospitaller’s total income (180,000 florins) and they owned more than 60 casali in 1374. The island allegedly provided half of the Levantine income of the order. The estates of the Hospital in Cyprus yielded tremendous amounts of income on a yearly basis. In 1317, the Preceptory of Cyprus owed annually 60,000 besants to the Master and government at Rhodes.

One of most important Hospital estates in Cyprus was ‘‘casale quod dicitur Colos’’ at Kolossi where they produced sugar. The earliest known reference to Hospitaller sugar from Cyprus can be found in the account book of a Catalan merchant, Joan Benet. During his visit to Famagusta in the mid-fourteenth century, Benet bought various merchandise such as pepper, cinnamon, ginger, lac, incense, borax, cotton, and laudanum and he bought ten ounces of sugar from the commander of Hospitallers. The papal schism of 1378 seemed to affect the administration of the Hospitallers in Cyprus, but agricultural production continued despite the papal disruption, albeit at a reduced rate. In 1400, the annual

527 ‘‘As a weight for valuable commodities one livre or pound was subdivided in 12 ounces; in Cyprus one pound was about 336 to 340 grams, one ounce about 28.18 grams.’’ Luttrell, A., Borchardt, K. and Schoffler, E. (eds.) Documents Concerning Cyprus from the Hospitals’s Rhodian Archives: 1409-1459 (Nicosia, 2011), p. xxxix.
responsions sent to Rhodes were reduced to 5,000 florins but from 1405 to 1410 they rose to 7,000 florins.\textsuperscript{529} However, in 1411 the royal tithe owed by the Hospitallers was 210 Cypriot quintals (ca. 4,600 kg) which indicate that their income was far more than the owed tithe.\textsuperscript{530}

In the following years Hospitaller representatives appear often in the transactions making large amounts of investments. On 26 April 1415, Pierre Galoys, a Lieutenant in Cyprus, was ordered by the Hospitaller Treasury to pay 100 ducats and 25 cantars of sugar to Toma Larca. Also, the receipt of May 1441 informs us that 8 boxes of sugar from the estate of the late Angelino Muscetulla were delivered to a Convent by Antonio Belucca.\textsuperscript{531} There was a noticeable variety in the origins of the merchants with whom Hospitallers conducted business. On 9 February 1445 the Master of the Convent Jean de Lastic sold sugar from Kolossi to a Venetian and resident of Rhodes, Giovanni Martini. According to the agreement, Giovanni was required to pay 28 ducats of Rhodes and 16 aspers for every quintal to Bernardo Salviati after the transportation of the sugar from Kolossi to Famagusta. The same Giovanni together with Girolamo Martini made payment of 5,000 florins to the Preceptor of Cyprus for 125 quintals of sugar from Kolossi in March 1449.\textsuperscript{532} Giovanni and Girolamo Martini appear more often in the contracts than other merchants. A quittance of 30 December 1449 shows that the said Venetians bought all the sugar of the Preceptory from Kolossi for five years worth of harvests and the consignments were to be collected from Famagusta. Moreover, the Preceptory of Cyprus guaranteed Giovanni and Girolamo that if they received less than 137 quintals for any reason the purchasers may claim damages. Less than two months later, on 7 February 1450, members of the Martini family requested from the Preceptor that sugar which was in the mould made at Kolossi was to be kept in the mould that
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Giovanni and Girolamo brought from Venice. At this time the Convent also informed them that they could collect sugar either from Kolossi, Famagusta, Episkopi or Limassol, wherever their galley from Venice moored.\textsuperscript{533}

In 1450, the traveller Stephen de Gumpenburg during his visit to Kolossi was informed that the annual income of the Order from sugar was 12,000 florins. Nonetheless, the Cypriot sugar, especially from Kolossi, was in high demand especially in Egypt, and it looked as if the Order occasionally ran out of it.\textsuperscript{534} In the accord of 1452, the Hospitallers’ Treasury and members of the Martini family reached an agreement that the damages accrued from the undelivered thrice-cooked sugar powder for the past and present year would be compensated. According to the agreement if the sugar purchased cost more than 31 Venetian gold ducats per quintal, then Martini would pay the difference. However, if the sugar quality was bad the Treasury would be in charge and pay a price mid-way between the price of the sugar of Lapithos and Kouklia (in Cyprus).\textsuperscript{535} It is by no means clear at what rate sugar was cultivated in Lapithos and Kouklia but obviously the sugar crops cultivated in Kolossi were of better quality and in greater demand than sugar from the other Hospitaller estates.\textsuperscript{536}

Grain, soap, pepper and wine were other major export items that were in demand together with sugar. In particular, prominent members of the Genoese Doria clan continued to conduct business on the island during the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{537} On 3 August 1436, the Convent of Hospitallers in Cyprus declared that they owed 2,500 florins of Rhodes to Bartolomeo Doria of Genoa, who held the soap monopoly on Rhodes, and that the Treasury would pay the sum in Rhodes in the following October. In 1446, Michele Grillo, the Genoese
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merchant, transported 1,000 modii of grain worth 234 ducats and 12 aspers from Cyprus to Rhodes. In general, grain and barley were exported largely to Rhodes by the Hospitallers as well. In March 1442, the Order declared that Jean de Marsenac and Giovanni Martini sold 8,000 modii of grain and 6,000 modii of barley in total to the Order and they received payment within three months. In the act of 1446, Pietro Barozzi was assured by the Order that he would receive 430 ducats for the transportation of 1,500 modii of grain and 551 modii of barley to Rhodes from Cyprus and Kos. The above-mentioned Jean de Marsenac was often involved in the transportation of grain from Cyprus to Rhodes. However, he was working on behalf of the Order and exported a considerable amount of grain from Cyprus. For example, on 9 October 1449, the Master Jean de Lastic nominated him to export 2,000 modii of grain and 1,000 modii of barley from Cyprus to Rhodes.

On another occasion, Niccolo Tron, merchant of Venice, acting on behalf of Angelino Muscetulla, Admiral and Preceptor of Cyprus, exported pepper from Cyprus to Rhodes worth 1,050 ducats of Venice which was sold to the other merchants in Rhodes by the Order. Apart from the pepper, wine also appears to have been in demand in Rhodes where Jean Perrin bought 50 barrels of wine of the Baiulia of Kellaki (in Cyprus) that was to be shipped to Rhodes. Furthermore, the Order instructed Jean de Marsenac in 1449 to inspect the quality of sugar, cotton, wine and grain consignments before they were transported from Cyprus to Rhodes, and to count and weigh the sugars, molasses, wines, and the animals, and to inspect the estates and houses at Nicosia, Kyra, Mora, Khirokitia, Kolossi, Yermasoyia, Logara and Kellaki. The consignments were worth to 56 gold ducats of Venice, 144 ducats (unspecified currency), 150 ducats of Rhodes and 100 barrels of wine (the price is not mentioned).
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the same year, Louis de Rilhac was given an order by the Master of the Convent to collect debts from Felipe d’Hortal in Cyprus who owed a considerable amount of money from the sale of wine, grain, sugar and silk from the estates of the Order.\textsuperscript{543} In both transactions agricultural products were listed, consisting of sugar, cotton, grain, barley, other cereals, wine, honey and vegetables.

The fact that transactions were so elaborate suggests that there was continuous agricultural production and exportation. The quantities mentioned imply a considerable amount of warehouse space for agricultural productions stocked by Hospitallers. This is contrary to the idea that Famagusta lost its importance after the Genoese conquest while the surviving evidence presented here suggests continuity. Also it is necessary to mention that agricultural production continued undisturbed and long-distance trade relations in the Mediterranean were still maintained until the Ottoman conquest in 1571.\textsuperscript{544} As one would imagine, the scale of the trade must be more than is illustrated. It is clear that merchant groups had access to the resources both in Famagusta and Muslim dominions and organized the transportation of goods to the West. This commercial policy of the West based upon the control of regional markets was also applied in Cyprus. As an industrial capacity started to develop in Cyprus, it seems like Famagusta become more important. Above all, the increasing importance of sugar, cotton and grain in the Levantine market also boosted the stocks in Cyprus. It should also be noted here that papal restrictions on trade undermined the competition between Venetian and Genoese merchants, and co-operation between merchant families made both papal and state restriction ineffective. Moreover, as detailed analysis of the most demanded products (such as: cotton, sugar and grain) has revealed how regional and

\textsuperscript{543} Rhodian Archives, no. 255.

international trade control was retained by the Latins, it also shows the agricultural importance of Cyprus as an important cotton, grain, and sugar-producer from the late thirteenth to late fifteenth century. Surely, prominent merchant groups and their contacts with local markets in Mamluk dominions also contributed to Famagusta’s importance. However, the available evidence is not adequate to reveal the full-scale economic dynamics of the Levant during the fifteenth century. Similarly, due to the scarcity of the notarial and archaeological evidence it is not possible to draw a clearer picture of late medieval Famagusta. In this sense, I believe archaeological evidence will yield much more invaluable information in the future about the incontestable role of Famagusta regarding the Levant trade.
Monies and Measures:

Monies: (14th-15th c.)

- 1 white besant of Cyprus was divided into 24 carats like Byzantine hyperpyron.\(^{545}\)
* 1 white besant of Cyprus = 2 grossi and 4 soldi cipresi
* 3 ½ white besants or 14 soldi of Cyprus = 1 Saracen besant
* 1 Venetian ducat = 4 to 5 white besants (in 1320); 5 white besants (in 1372)
* 1 white besants = 3.5 Armenian dirhems (in 1300)
* 1 Saracen besant = 10 Armenian dirhems (in 1300)
* 12 Armenian besants = 32 white besants of Cyprus or 10 Saracen besants in Cyprus (1380)

- 2 white besants of Cyprus = 1 Byzantine hyperpyron\(^{546}\)
* 2 white besants and 3 ½ gros =1 Venetian ducat
* 1 white besant = 2 gros (or gros grand) = 4 half-gros (or gros petit) = 24 carats = 48 deniers (early fourteenth century)
* 1 gros grand = 2 gros petit = 24 deniers
* gros grand (or gros): 4.6 grams of silver, gros petit (or half-gros): 2.3 grams of silver and denier: 0.6 grams of copper

- 36 soldi and 4 denari to 45 soldi and 6 denari = 1 Saracen besant\(^{547}\)
* Genoese florin = 4 besants and 4 carats (in 1320); 4 besants and 18 carats (in 1382);
* Florentine florins = 4 besants and 1 carat (24 carats = 1 besant)

- 1 Rhodian florin was subdivided into 20 aspers and 320 deniers.\(^{548}\)

---


\(^{546}\) Makhairas, L. (1932), pp. 46 and 148; Borchardt, K., Luttrell, A. and Schoffler, E. (eds) *Documents Concerning Cyprus from the Hospital’s Rhodian Archives: 1409-1459* (Nicosia, 2011), p. xxxviii. ‘gros-grand was 4.58 grams under King Peter II (1369-82) and declined to 3.8 grams under Queen Catherine (1473-89)’.

\(^{547}\) Spufford (1986), p. 299.
*1 asper = 16 deniers
*1 ducat = 32 aspers
*1 florin = 0.625 ducats
*1 ducat = 1.6 florins
-1,050 ducats of Venice = 1,000 ducats of Rhodes.\(^{549}\)

**in the mid-fifteenth century**:\(^{550}\)

*282 besants and 36 deniers of Cyprus = 100 florins of Rhodes and 20 aspers
*1 Rhodian florin = 2.8 white besants of Cyprus
*1 ducat of Venice = 6 ½ white besants of Cyprus
*Venetian ducat = 7 white besants (in 1464) and 8 white besants of Cyprus (in 1486)\(^{551}\)
*1 Genoese florin = 5 white besants of Cyprus (in 1450)

**Measures and Modern Equivalents:**

-The Cantar (or quintal) was subdivided in 100 rotols (or ratl) in Cyprus. The rotols were subdivided in 12 occhia (or onquie).

-1 pound was subdivided in 12 ounces in Cyprus.\(^{552}\)

*1 cantar of Cyprus = c. 226.4 kg.
*1 rotol = 2.3 kilogram
*1 occhia = 190 grams
*1 pound = 336 to 340 grams
*1 ounce = c. 28.28 grams

-The Modium (or Modius) (dry measure) was subdivided in 8 cafisso or (qafis). The levelled modium in Cyprus was c. 32.028 litres for grain and 34.232 litres for barley.\(^{553}\)

\(^{549}\) Ibid, p. xxxvi.
\(^{550}\) Ibid, p. xxxviii.
\(^{551}\) Ibid, p. xxxix.
\(^{552}\) Ibid, p. xxxix.
\(^{553}\) Ibid, p. xxxix.
3.1 Cultural and Social Interaction, and Ethnic Diversity in medieval Famagusta

One of the most distinctive features of socio-economically powerful cities is their diverse communities. The economic process of the city collectively triggers the social process within the society as well. In this sense, in order to understand the economic dynamics of medieval Famagusta, its continuous socio-cultural process needs to be understood. So far, limited attempts were made by scholars to understand the Famagustan society and the sub-communities existing within it. The scholarly attention was rather focussed on pure demographic changes, especially those that occurred after the fall of Acre in 1291. It is well-known that, especially during the early fourteenth century, Famagusta witnessed a demographic change due to the large influx of immigrants both from the Latin East and West. The socio-political aspects and demographic dynamics of medieval Famagusta are well examined by the historians, but very briefly. Therefore, this section attempts to explore cultural and social relations between the different communities from different religious and ethnic background that existed in Famagusta. By doing so, it is aimed to investigate social and cultural boundaries among communities and people from different social classes that came into contact with each other.

In general, the island of Cyprus always hosted different ethnic groups living together. The port cities like Limassol, Kyrenia, Pafos and Famagusta and their economic importance always attracted merchants and immigrants from neighbouring peripheries. In this sense, the strategic importance and the economic role of Famagusta in Mediterranean trade, especially during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries when the city enjoyed a great wealth, always attracted merchants and ethnic groups from different nations since they were able to conduct their business and enjoy religious freedom at the same time.\footnote{For religious aspects; see following section.} In the early thirteenth century, the existence of Syrians, Jacobites, Maronites, Armenians, Nestorians, Latins and Greeks is attested by the official records. Unfortunately, these records provide only general information about the ethnic groups rather than giving detailed information about the demographic structure of the city. However, when official records are examined together with travellers’ notes it becomes possible to speak about Famagustan society. Regarding the multi-cultural aspects of the island, Chris Schabel already stressed that the papal letter of 1222 refers to the religious groups as ‘Syrians, Jacobites, Nestorians and others’ living all together in the island.\footnote{Schabel, C. “Religion” in A. Nicolaou-Konnari and C. Schabel (eds.) Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374 (Brill, 2005), p. 161.} Moreover, James of Verona, an Augustinian monk, during his visit to Famagusta in 1335 reported that he saw Armenians, Jacobites, Nestorians, Georgians and Maronites all living together there.\footnote{Excerpta Cypria, pp. 16-7.} Shortly afterwards, in 1394, this time Martoni after he arrived Famagusta, reported that ‘‘women [in Famagusta] wear black mantles on their heads [...] and this custom began and has been followed on account of the sorrow and dire grief for the loss of that city of Acre [...]. [Yet, the] greater part of the city of Famagusta was made up of the people of Acre’’.\footnote{Ibid, p. 24.}
The information derived from the travellers’ accounts also finds some confirmation in the notarial registers. The registers of Lamberto di Sambuceto yield important information about the social groups that were active in Famagusta during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Although the notarial evidence does not provide the whole picture of the society, the surnames and specialisations of individuals recorded by the notaries reveal important hints about the social segments. For example, individuals recorded by Sambuceto referred as Vivian de Gennibaldi of Acre, Giovanni de Castello of Acre, Stefania of Acre, Lorenzo de Gozi of Ragusa, Johannes of Tripoli, Nicola of Ancona, Viviano of Messina, Bachemus of Pisa, Peyre de Tortosa, Baldoynus of Savona, Iosellini of Gibeletto, and on the occasions that surnames were not deterministic notaries preferred to mention their place of origin directly. Among the large variety of commercial places, Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, Montpellier, Barcelona, Ancona, Narbonne, Messina, Acre, Tyre, Armenia, Tunis, Candelor and Syria are the ones mentioned most often. A considerable amount of merchants originating from Europe are also described as inhabitants of Famagusta in the business contracts. However, while some of the contracts refer to them as ‘habitator Famagoste’ or ‘burgenssi Famagoste’, others yield no information about the individuals, as if they were permanent (or temporary) residents. Moreover, besides the information provided by notarial records regarding the place of origin and terms of residency, notarial documents also reveal the profession of the residents of Famagusta. For instance, several artisanal professions such as farmers, cloth dyers, carpenters, fishermen, smiths, tavern-keepers, crossbowmen, spice-dealers, candle-makers, tailors, furriers, caulkers, painters, skinners, drapers, barbers

---


and shoe-makers are all mentioned in the acts. As one can imagine, notarial records provide more information about the local and international networks, and the scale of the trade, while less can be gathered about the social status of the various groups. Nevertheless, relatively important individuals such as ‘rector of the Genoese in Famagusta’, ‘members of consular families’, ‘viscounts’, officers ‘of the court of the lord king at Famagusta’, ‘consuls in Famagusta’, ‘the magister capellanus of Famagusta cathedral’, ‘magister axie’, ‘magister scolarum ianuensis’, ‘placerius’, ‘magister cirurgicus’, ‘iudex’, ‘money-changers’, ‘bankers’, ‘doctors’, ‘physicians’, ‘dragomans’, and warehouse owners were all mentioned as people involved in commerce, either selling or buying commodities, or witnessing wills or drawing up their wills.

Apart from the artisans and officials enjoying eminent status, there were also important groups operating in the city that dominated the internal and external trade. Unfortunately, it is not known whether these prominent families and certain groups were all long-term residents of Famagusta or visited the city for a short period of time in order to conduct business. However, they were part of the society whether they were long-term or short-term residents. They possessed houses, shops, estates, and they were also politically well represented. Among them, there were Military Orders, the Venetian Corner family,

---


Genoese Aristocratic families, Pisan and Florentine banking houses, and Syrian Christians. In particular, there well-known families all dwelling (and/or operating) in Famagusta, for instance the Genoese such as de Mari, Spinola, Doria, Squarciafico, de Nigro, Tartari, Grimaldi, Bestagni, Cibo, Guisulfi, de Sexto, Ginnembaldo, and Savona; and Venetians such as Corner, Verona, Barbaro, and Martini; and Piacenzan and Florentine banking houses, namely Bardi, Peruzzi, Mozzi, Scozzi, Diani, Guagnabene and Cavazolli, together with Syrian families de Lezia, Audeth, and Mistaha.⁵⁶³

There is no doubt that, aside from its economic importance, the existence of diverse communities was one of the most distinctive characteristics of medieval Famagusta. The existence of different ethnic and religious groups and the socio-religious interactions among them will be illustrated in a separate section.⁵⁶⁴ Unfortunately, the socio-cultural dynamics of medieval Famagusta still remain as a gap that needs to be fulfilled. The recent scholarship mainly focused on the artistic and architectural features of the island.⁵⁶⁵ Although a small amount of literature has been published on socio-cultural aspects of medieval Cyprus,

---

⁵⁶³ For the full list of agents and local families and their commercial activities, see Chapter two (sections three and four).
⁵⁶⁴ See Chapter three, section two.
significant questions regarding Famagusta remain unanswered. The first of these questions could be the gender roles and responsibilities in the society. What was the role of women in the society? Did they take an active part in the Famagustan community or deal more with domestic affairs? Is there any evidence of the social life of the ecclesiastical entourage? How did these groups of people from several ethnic backgrounds communicate with each other? Could we talk about peaceful relations? If so, how did these ethnic groups intermingle without losing their self-identity? And last but not least, what was the role of slaves in society? Could we consider them as a part of society or were they regarded as a commodity?

As it is well-known, without understanding the borderlands of a medieval society it is impossible to determine the socio-cultural processes. In this sense, it is crucial to answer the aforementioned questions in order to visualise the society of Famagusta comprehensively.

To start with, one of the most neglected aspects of medieval Famagusta is the role of woman. There is no work examining profoundly the gender role in medieval Famagusta. This is partly due to the scarcity of archival and archaeological evidence that prevents scholars from offering more analytical examinations about the socio-political and socio-cultural aspects of Famagusta. However, available archival documents are partly helpful to define the distinctive characteristics of Famagustan society, based on the economic activities of individuals (both male and female), ethnicity, religion and language. Yet, one of the

---


sources that yields precious information about women is travellers’ notes. James de Verona, an Augustinian monk, during his visit to Famagusta in 1335, wrote that he attended the funeral of a rich man in Famagusta and saw “women [at the door of deceased] singing sweetly, then [he] entered the house, and looked where the corpse lay, and lo, at his head were two women singing aloud, and two at his feet piously wailing, and these are the flute-players of whom the Evangelist speaks. They were singing in Greek tongue, [....] they understand well the Saracen and Frankish tongues, but chiefly use Greek.”

The appearance of a woman as a mourner or flute player during the funerary performance was not uncommon. Indeed, women always played a prominent role in rituals considering the wide range of cultures all over the world. In this sense, M. Bloch and J. Parry pointed out that women are always associated with ‘regeneration’ and took active roles in funerary rituals even during the ancient periods.

The presence of women in the funerals also became a matter of debate within Latin piety that is attested by ecclesiastical records. It is more likely that this tradition was maintained in the island long before James de Verona’s visit of Famagusta. In the record of church legislation, Hugh, the Latin archbishop of Nicosia, around 1252 describes the ‘singing’ and ‘flute playing’ woman at the funerals as a ‘certain sickness’, ‘destructive’ and ‘close to infidelitas’. The depiction of a certain tradition on the island by Hugh is interesting. He states that “[...] in the funeral rites for the dead, in houses, churches, and cemeteries, they summon flute players who play the mourning tone, whom they call ‘singing women’. These women not only disturb the divine service, but with words and incantations that are vain and in agreement with the ritual of pagans and Jews, they even provoke or excite other

568 Excerpta Cypria, p. 17.
570 The ecclesiastical records and Papal registers are partly published by C. Schabel. see Schabel, C. The Synodicium Nicosiense and Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus, 1196-1373, (Nicosia, 2001) [Hereafter: Synodicium Nicosiense].
women to wail and to beat and wound themselves.’”571 After the proclamation concerning ‘singing women’, the archbishop prohibited all priests to ‘celebrate Mass in the presence of any woman’.572 Surely, the prohibitions imposed by the Latin Church were by no means effective. On 22 September 1298, Archbishop Gerard in provincial council, stressed that women singing at the funerals, church or cemeteries, together with the diviners and sorcerers, will all be excommunicated by the church.573

Apart from the ecclesiastical records, chronicle works also shed light on the role of woman in the socio-cultural life of Famagusta. One typical example is *Philippe de Mézières’s* hagiographical Vita about St. Peter Thomas, the papal legate, which includes a considerable amount of references to the society, nobility, and ecclesiastical issues besides political incidents.574 The closeness of Philippe de Mézières to Peter Thomas after he become the chancellor of the King Peter enabled Mézières to witness much of the incidents that he wrote about. As Smet pinpointed, apart from the parts where “[Mézières] writes of his friend [Peter Thomas] in terms of exaggerated praise, and though he tends to oversimplify motives and events, he is on the whole a trustworthy and at times a unique witness to many important occurrences of his times.”575

Among other incidents recorded by Mézières, he referred to the plague which hit the island in 1362. Such testimony that refers to Peter Thomas’ efforts to bring unity and solidarity to the suffering people and the funeral after his death which was associated with miracles reveals important hints about women and their social life in medieval Cyprus.

572 *Synodicum Nicosiense*, p. 105, no. A. XXVII.
According to Mézières, when the pestilence reached Cyprus, Peter Thomas appealed to the king in Nicosia to organize a processio gathering all of the population together in order to show their devotion to God. However, when Famagusta was ravaged by pestilence Peter organized another procession in Nicosia this time and ‘‘the king and his children, the queen, the nobles, the merchants, the citizens and people of Nicosia and the ladies of the royal palace’’ all came together to beg God’s forgiveness. Although the plague threat passed off without causing any devastation in Nicosia, the same could not be said for Famagusta. Philippe de Mézières noted that a pestilence ravaged the city and at least 30 to 40 people were dying each day. Then Peter Thomas went to Famagusta and organized another procession there, where he gathered all people regardless of their rites and language namely; ‘‘Graeci, Armeni, Nothorini, Iacobini, Georgiani, Nubiani, Indiani, Aethiopiani, et alii multi Christiani.’’

Indeed, the work of Mézières does not intentionally refer to women. However, the part that describes the funeral of Peter Thomas’s worth mentioning. Peter Thomas died in 1366 and his corpse was lying ready in the Carmelite Church of Famagusta. Before he was buried, Philippe de Mézières depicted the funeral as follows:

‘‘The church was filled with people of both sexes, Catholics but also schismatics and infidels, who unanimously and with devout reverence venerated the legate’s body as holy [...].’’

---


577 ‘‘Adveniente autem die processionis, et ecce rex cum omni progenie sua, nobilibus, burgensibus, et populo, una cum reginis et mulieribus de palatio regio, in pane et aqua omnibus ieiunibus, et nudis pedibus cum magna humilitate et devotione, simplicibus vestimentis indutis, per turmas ordinate in orationibus ad magnam cathedralem ecclesiam pervenerunt.’’ Philippe de Mézières (1954), p. 98.

578 Philippe de Mézières (1954), p. 100.

579 ‘Et quia de nocte transitus eius ex hoc mundo ad Patrem fuerat, per civitatem Famagustam pius eius recessus communiter ignorabatur. Mirabilia quippe Dei narrabo, nam mane facto campanis pulsantibus, quasi singuli
Most probably, the ‘utriusque sexus hominum’ does not merely refer to the clerics and nuns of ‘schismatic nations of Christians’ and ‘infidels’, as described by Mézières, but also inhabitants of Famagusta in general who were the members of the aforementioned sects. The substantial evidence of this can be found in the part called ‘Miracles’ in the hagiographical Vita, where Mézières included a detailed description of the miracles attributed to Peter Thomas. As Devaney stated, “the accounting of miracles was standard practice and a necessary part of the case for canonization, which was Mézières’s avowed goal. To this end, he and Bishop Simon of Laodicia, who was also the Latin Vicar of Famagusta, opened a formal inquiry into Peter Thomas’s miracles about three months after his death.”

Among the large amount of testimonies that Mézières included, there are women from different backgrounds. One of them belongs to a woman called Damma Sibilia, the wife of Nicolai de Ancona and inhabitant of Famagusta, whose Greek slave called Costa, was suffering from pain and fever. The said Costa was extremely ill for five days and none of the doctors were able to heal him. Therefore, his mistress Sibilia went to the Carmelite church of Famagusta where the corpse of Peter Thomas lay unburied and touched the body of the patriarch with a piece of cloth and once it was imbued with sanctity, she placed it to the head and sides of the slave in order to bring about healing. Immediately, his fever and pain went off and he come back to life as if nothing happened. Similarly, Elizabeth of the Nestorian nation, inhabitant of Famagusta, who was suffering from a certain disease recovered after she

---

came into contact with the relics of the patriarch, which could not be healed by the doctors.\textsuperscript{582} On another occasion, a woman called Candelora de Accon, sixty years old, testified that she saw some women suffering from an unknown disease and they were drinking the water poured on top of the patriarch’s tomb. At first, she thought that those women were fools and then suddenly she saw a light coming down from heaven on the tomb of Peter Thomas. After she witnessed all these miracles she decided to go back to her house with all these in mind and once she arrived she immediately started to suffer from cold and fever which lasted for six days.\textsuperscript{583} Another informative testimony is about the daughter of Maria, matron of Famagusta, called Katerina. The said Katerina was suffering from oedema (hydropsy) for three months and Maria, with great devotion, carried her to the Carmelite church where the tomb of the patriarch existed. After they prayed, Maria gave her daughter water that was poured from the tomb and also covered her body with soil and dust taken from the patriarch’s tomb. Once they reached their house, Katerina was feeling no pain at all, as if she never suffered from such a disease.\textsuperscript{584}

Unfortunately, apart from the few snippets of evidence, it is extremely difficult to extract detailed information about their daily life. Nevertheless, more illustrative information can be gathered from notarial acts. Prior to the examination of the notarial evidence, it should be noted that available notarial records are very limited and mostly refers to the Genoese or Venetian women. Also, the large time gaps between available documents make it even more difficult to provide profound analysis of the socio-cultural dynamics in general.\textsuperscript{585} According to the evidence, provided so far, the community of Famagusta contained sub-communities

\textsuperscript{582} Ibid, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{583} Ibid, p. 181.
\textsuperscript{584} Ibid, p. 183.
\textsuperscript{585} It should not be forgotten that Lamberto di Sambuceto, Giovanni de Rocha, Nicola de Boateriis and de Simeone were just a few of those who operated in Famagusta. There are many more whose records either do not survive or are waiting somewhere in the archives to be discovered. The said records that are under the examination here cover the years of: 1296-1299, 1299-1301, 1300-1301, 1302, 1304-1305, 1307, 1308-1310, 1355-65 and 1361-71.
within it. The fact that the notarial records include information generally about the Genoese and Venetians, the position of the woman belonging to the different sects and nations and also those described as ‘infidels’ in the society remains largely unanswered due to the commercial nature of notarial records. However, it is still possible to extract important information about their social activities by investigating the notarial records.

Although it is more likely that one can extract enormous information about commerce and business partnerships as well as the types and value of certain merchandise that were imported and exported, there are particular acts that reveal information about social aspects, for example wills, testaments, dowry contracts, sales or rents of property, and apprenticeships, which partly enables us to portrait the role of women in the Famagustan society. The social life of women in Famagusta, as notarial records indicate, was not typical and they maintained dynamic relations within the society. The appearance of women in the notarial documents varies considerably depending on the context. They appear making their wills, investing their money, selling or buying merchandise, lending or borrowing money, possessing properties, or as a trustee.

For instance, on 1 May 1294, Armano de Caffa, received 600 white besants from dame Lionor, widow of late Oglerio callergarius (shoemaker), in order to invest in Armenia, Anatolia, Tebriz and Savastum (Sivas) and return back to Cyprus. What is important here is that Lionor was acting on her own and did not appoint any procurator on her behalf. This indicates that a woman was able to be involved in trade without relying on any man in matters of protection. Moreover, Sibilia, the widow of late Nicola Carbonus and inhabitant of Nicosia, is another example of active women investing or borrowing money on their own. On 21 June 1297, she received 1700 white besants, on her own behalf and on behalf of her children, from Ambrogio de Camilla for which Sibilia or Pixius de Anfussis will pay in

586 LS [Balard] 39, no. 43.
Genoa within 6 months. At the same day, her name is mentioned in two acts once nominating Ambrogio de Camilla as her procurator to collect a certain amount of money from Pixius and the second time giving 1700 white besants, in an exchange contract (cambio), to Tomasso Bulla where he promised to pay 330 Genoese lire in equivalent in Genoa to Ambrogio. Clearly, Sibilia and Ambrogio were business partners and most probably Ambrogio was travelling to Genoa very often to import merchandise in order to sell in Cyprus.587

The involvement of married women in business affairs and their rights were also defined by the constitutional law. According to the Assizes of the Lusignan Kingdom of Cyprus,

‘if it happens that a man nominates a woman as his guarantor, and that the woman has a husband, know well that her husband can easily prevent her from honouring the guarantee, so that she will in no way act as a guarantor if he so wishes, and nor need the woman offer a defence in court over any issue, so long as her husband is alive, except as in the manner described above. If, however, the husband makes his spouse a trader so that she buys and sells, the law decrees that he is obliged to accept and to undertake all that she is owed or owes, for this is what is right according to the law and the assizes of Jerusalem’588

The above-mentioned article somehow explains the absence of married women in the notarial acts concerning business affairs. However, the evidence of women who were independently involved in commerce is not limited to the above-mentioned examples. Lamberto di Sambuceto recorded considerable examples of women either investing their money with their business partners or selling merchandise to others. On 14 March 1299,

587 *LS [Balard]* 39, nos. 52, 53, 54.
588 *The Assizes of the Lusignan Kingdom of Cyprus*, Cyprus Research Centre: Texts and Studies in the History of Cyprus XLII, trans. Nicholas Coureas (Nicosia, 2012), p. 298, Codex 2, Article no. 122. See also, Codex 1, Article no. 125-6. Hereafter cited as: [Assizes].
Isabella, acting on her own, sold a female slave called Sayda (12 years old) to Giovanni Nabar for 150 white besants.\(^{589}\) In 1300, Alis de Accon, widow of the late Vaxili de Castello of Acre, rented her nephew called Stephaninus (10 years old) for nearly 10 years to Benedicto Tartaro. In the same year, Margarita, widow of the late Symonis de Cellis, inhabitant of Nicosia, sold a Spanish female slave called Axia (20 years old) to Ansaldo de Modulo, inhabitant of Saragossa, for 100 white besants.\(^{590}\) The last incident clearly demonstrates that, whether the said Margarita was selling her own slave for once or she was involved in trade more than once in her life time, she was able to travel from Nicosia to Famagusta, where the famous slave market existed and hosted merchants from all over Europe, in order to sell her slave without nominating a man as a procurator. In some cases, the money received or invested by such women is impressive. For example, Dama Schiva de Tabaria, inhabitant of Nicosia, acknowledged a receipt before Giacomo Rubeus, Genoese, for the payment of 2,600 white besants.\(^{591}\) There were also others who co-operated with well known Genoese merchants such as Oddo de Sexto. On January 1302, Oddo de Sexto received 1000 white besants of Cyprus from Margherita, wife of the late Anthonius tinctor, in order to invest it in Cyprus only for one year. According to the contract, at the end of one year they will share the profit equally. On 6\(^{th}\) of February, Dama Lis, wife of Giacomo Porcus de Branducio, Genoese and inhabitant of Famagusta, was nominated by her husband as his procurator and acknowledging a receipt of 1,539 white besants\(^{592}\) received from Allegro Fateinanti for the silk which Giacomo kept in custody.\(^{593}\)

Furthermore, the appearance of women from leading merchant families and occasionally others possessing properties suggests that their role in social and commercial life

---

\(^{589}\) _LS, [Balard]_ 39, nos. 43 and 107.

\(^{590}\) _LS [Balard],_ nos. 108 and 172.

\(^{591}\) _LS [Balard]_ 39, no. 73.

\(^{592}\) For the currency and their equivalents see chapter two (sections three and four).

\(^{593}\) _LS [Pavoni]_ 49, nos. 36 and 65. For other examples of women actively taking part in socio-economic life of Famagusta, see; nos. 38, 39, 60, 102, 203, 211.
of Famagusta should not be underestimated. One of the representatives of a woman from a leading merchant family involving in business was Dama Isabella, the wife of well-known merchant Ansaldo de Sexto. On 8 May 1302, she acknowledged a receipt of 605 white besants and records that ‘publice recognosco tanquam fidecommissaria dicti Ansaldi’. An additional example, proving the existence of financially powerful women and their influence in business, was Agnesia, daughter of Ruggero Carri of Nicosia and wife of Antonio de Coronato, who borrowed 50 Venetian ducats from Bartholomeo de Levanto and 57 Venetian ducats from Andrea Cazolo, burgess of Famagusta, offering 3 shops in return as surety that she possessed in Famagusta on the market place. In this sense, as Catherine Otten-Froux rightly pointed out, money-borrowing or nominating procurator by women should not be regarded as a sign of poverty or weakness. According to the evidence, Agnes was not the only woman possessing property in Famagusta. Nicholas Coureas recently found that there were women running taverns. For instance, in 1310, Marinaria borrowed 200 white besants from a certain Genoese ‘for the purchase and sale of wine in the tavern’. Another female tavern-keeper was Marossa Pansana who in 1448 complained to the Genoese captain of Famagusta about John de Letta who allegedly had stolen a gold vessel from her and about Antonio de Alba who owed her 40 white besants in total for an unknown reason. In 1455, the same Marossa appears in the records buying a house with a tavern attached to it, located on a street where the marketplace and customs house of Famagusta existed. The records also reveal the name of another female tavern-keeper Eirini Kakotripiti, probably Greek, as her name suggests, but there is no further evidence about her activities. Indeed, it is

594 LS [Pavoni] 49, no. 200. See also, nos, 230 and 252.
596 Ibid, p. 345.
598 Ibid, 70. For primary evidence, see Otten-Froux, C. (ed.) Une enquête à Chypre au XVe siècle. Le sindicamentum de Napoleone Lomellini, capitaine génois de Famagouste (1459), (Nicosia, 2000); Raiteri,
noteworthy to mention that running a tavern was a lucrative business and required a large amount of capital together with intensive social links. Nicholas Coureas also observed that ‘the tavern keepers were manifestly wealthy and socially connected’. Therefore, relying on the existing evidence it is possible to conclude that women involved in the business sector must have had connections with other merchant groups at certain levels.

Beside the business contracts, wills and marriage contracts are also important sources that yield information about economic dependence and independence of women. In most of the cases women appear to receive dowries, of money or property from their family or husband. On some occasions, we find them investing their money left to them by their family as a dowry. On 16 August 1297, Tomasso Bulla received 450 white besants from Alis, daughter of the deceased Obertus Clavaro, to be invested in Cyprus only until she gets married. According to the contract, Tomasso agreed to invest her money in return for a quarter of the profit and once Alis claims the capital and profit, the said Tomasso must return it to her before the Syrian Court. Aysu Dincer, in her article, rightly categorised them as that kind of women who were able to manage their ‘dotal funds’ without relying on any procurator or mediator. In addition to this, it is also quite interesting that she prefers to claim her money from the Syrian Court rather than Genose authorities, despite the fact that her father’s surname clearly indicates Genoese background. Another interesting will mentioning the Syrian Court was drawn up by Venetian notary de Simeone. In April 1363, Fetus, son of the late Feras Semitecolo, citizen of Venice and inhabitant of Famagusta, stated in his will that he left 3,000 besants to his wife Maria that he was supposed to give her for his (or her) house sold to the Saint-Anthony monastery, a house which belonged to his brother Teodorus; this money is 'written to the court' of the Syrians at Famagusta in the name of


599 *LS [Balard]* 39, no. 60.

Fetus. Therefore, the ‘cour des Suriens’ in Famagusta did not only handle cases concerning Syrians and Greeks but also Latins. In this sense, the appearance of Genoese, Venetians and Greeks is of high importance for our understanding of the functioning of administrative structure established in Famagusta after the Latin takeover.

Sometimes, testators appointed someone they trust to protect the money to make sure that their heirs will receive their dowry when they get married. On 26 December 1300, Bernardus Zotardus in his last will stated that he left 500 white besants to his wife Maria and 2,000 white besants to his daughter as a dowry. However, Bernardus stipulated that if his daughter dies before she gets married then this money should go to the Senate of Genoa. And it seems as if the said Bernardus was not quite sure if his daughter was capable of managing the money he left. His son was responsible to make all arrangements and make sure that his sister receives that dowry even in case of his death. Moreover, beside the money, Bernardus also left her a female slave called Heleni (Eleni, obviously Greek) who was obliged to serve her until she gets married. And after the marriage she must set her free. Indeed, giving slaves as a dowry to the bride was not uncommon. In February 1307, Ansaldo Ioria of Savona sold his Greek slave Maria to the well-known merchant and shop owner in Famagusta called Berthozio the spice dealer. At the very same day, the said Berthozio gave Maria to his niece called Dama Gena as a dowry. Similarly, Bianchetto de Casanova received 650 white besants from his wife called Benvenuta as a dowry, but the aforementioned amount was

---

Footnotes:

601 [Simeone], no. 6.
including also the value of a female slave called Iara.\textsuperscript{605} William Phillips has observed that the custom of having slaves as a part of a dowry and giving them as gifts was common in Tuscany too.\textsuperscript{606}

Understandably, the wills generally concern rich inhabitants or merchants of Famagusta. For example, on 20 August 1301, Dama Placencia, wife of the late Ugeti Flexoni and Genoese, in her will wanted to be buried in the church of St. Michael of Famagusta and ordered her procurator that if the money that she left is not enough for the expenses she wants her house to be sold in order to cover all expenses. Yet, if the money left by her covers everything, her house should be rented and the income must be spent for her soul.\textsuperscript{607} The said Placencia was a rich woman who left 98 white besants together with a certain amount of silver, pearls, gold, camlet, cloths and other things for her heirs and a slave called Agnes. However, there were exceptions as well. There were also relatively poor ones, such as Isabella of Antioch who only left 52 besants to the church of Saint Nicholas for her soul.\textsuperscript{608} However, due to the scarcity of evidence it would not be consistent to draw certain conclusions about the socio-economic life of women in Famagusta by dividing them into ‘poor’ and ‘rich’. At first glance, it may be tempting to generalise that their scarcity can be regarded as an absence. However, even the limited amount of evidence suggests that at least a considerable number of women from Latin background were socially active, invested their money independently, possessed properties, or ran businesses. On the other hand, also the absence of notarial records of other nations prevents us from talking about Greek, Armenian, Jewish, Maronite, Syrian or Nestorian women whom we know constituted part of society.

\textsuperscript{605} LS [Balard] 39, no. 100.
\textsuperscript{607} LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 71.
\textsuperscript{608} LS [Balard], no. 198. See also, Dincer, A. (2012), p. 321.
Slaves were also an important part of the multi-cultural population mentioned often in the notarial records. Famagusta, as a most important slave market in the Eastern Mediterranean hosted a large amount of slaves from various ethnic backgrounds. A large percentage of slave cargoes carried especially by Genoese traders from the Western Mediterranean and Black Sea were auctioned in Famagusta, Pera, Sicily, Crete, Caffa and Ayas. In Cyprus, slaves were used for both domestic and agricultural purposes and a considerable amount of slaves from Saracen, Circassian, Tartar, Armenian, Bulgarian, Greek, African, Turkish, Serbian and ‘Rhodian’ (i.e. Greek) origins were all mentioned in the acts being sold, manumitted or received as a gift from their masters. The owner of the slave possessed the rights of ‘intromittendi, habendi, tenendi, gaudandi, incarcerandi, franchandi, liberandi, vendendi, donandi, alienandi’. The deeds of Genoese notary Sambuceto and the Venetian notaries Boateriis and Simeone contain significant information about the sale and manumission of the slaves from different ethnic backgrounds. On very rare occasions, some of the slaves were referred to as ‘servants’ rather than slaves, and on one occasion, a certain slave was referred to as a ‘best friend’ of his master.

The close relationship between slaves and their masters can also be seen through the bequests. The integration of slaves into the society and their economic future were also dependent on their masters. In many cases, testators left money and property to their slaves, as attested by the acts. On 21 December 1300, Ianuinus de Murta, Genoese inhabitant and

---

610 The slaves sold by Latin merchants in the Famagusta market are already examined in chapter two. In this section, the main focus will be the appearance of the slaves in the last will of their masters and their integration to the society after they were manumitted.
611 de Boateriis, no. 76, ‘[...] et postestate suprascriptam sclavam intromittendi, habendi, tenendi, gaudandi, incarcerandi, franchandi, liberandi, vendendi, donandi, alienandi, pro anima et corpora iudicandi et [...]’; intromittendi: to send, habendi: to have, tenendi: to keep, gaudandi: to enjoy, incarcerandi: to incarcerate, franchandi: to franchise or privilege (?), liberandi: to free, vendendi: to sell, donandi: to bestow, alienandi: to alienate.
612 LS [Balard] 43, no. 72. For manumission; LS [Balard] 43, nos. 34,73, 74, 76; LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 71, 107; de Boateriis, nos. 48, 52, 60, 75, 78, 100, 123, 165.
burgess of Famagusta, in his will left 50 white besants and a house for his female slave called Mariono and her daughter. Moreover, he left another house to Cathaline, daughter of his former slave. He also left another 50 white besants to another slave called Anayme. On 12 September 1301, Gregorius Niger manumitted his slave called Iocabinus. Gregorius stated that he freed the said Iocabinus from every servitude and from now on Iocabinus can sell, buy, exchange, obtain, and can take legal actions in the court. Evidently, some of the freed slaves were integrated into the society and continued to live in Famagusta. Aforementioned Iocabinus is manifested in a business contract as ‘olim sclavus Gregorii Nigri’ buying unspecified goods on the very same day Gregorius set him free. According to the record, he bought an unspecified amount of goods worth 200 white besants from someone called Gregorio and in return Iocabinus pledged his house and moveables in case he could not pay his debt. It is not clear whether the said Gregorio was Iocabinus’s former owner or a different business-man. However, in both cases this record reveals that Iocabinus was given at least one house by his master and possessed enough precious stuff to show as surety to buy goods worth 200 white besants.

Furthermore, the slaves were not used only for agricultural and domestic purposes. Despite the popularity of household slaves, especially among rich citizens, they were also common on the ecclesiastical estates. The inventory prepared by Vicar and clerk of the Latin Church recording the belongings of Archdeacon Geoffrey de Spanzota and late Bishop

613 LS [Polonio] 31, no. 165. ‘Ite, lego Mariono, olim sclavus mee, et eius filie, pro anime mea, domum meam parvam, positam in Famagosta,[...]’; ‘Item, volo et iubeo quod domus mea parva Famagosta esse debet filie Cathaline, olim sclava mee [...]’. Since he only left the said houses to Mariono and Cathaline and did not leave any properties to Anayme, although he had more properties, it is possible to suggest that Mariono and Cathaline probably were his daughters. However, we have no clear evidence supporting this hypothesis. ‘Item, volo et iubeo quod omnes domus et possessions mee que sunt in Famagosta vendantur et precium earum dari debet pro anime mea, [...]’.


Leodegar during the late fourteenth century included oxen, animals and slaves. In an undated notarial document from the 1360s recorded by Simeone, Alexander of Pisa received 75 besants from the prior of the Carmelite house in Famagusta, named Dominic Lustes, for the sale of a Tatar slave called Expertus. Indeed, it is likely that the labouring slaves were common in the ecclesiastical properties all over the island. Thus, Pope John XXII in his letter of 1321 stated that the Greek bishop of Solea complained about Latin, Greek and Syrian clergy that some of them made off with sums of money, various kinds of animals, wheat, barley and slaves that belonged to the estates of the Greek church of Solea and shared them amongst themselves.

Apparently, the involvement of clergy in the slave trade in medieval Cyprus was not unique at all. In general, there was not any restriction to priests imposed by the medieval Church concerning buying, selling or manumitting slaves. In Genoa, it is not a surprise to find priests buying or selling properties or dealing with issues regarding the properties of their Church. A similar phenomenon can also be observed in Genoese settlements such as Ayas. For instance, in 1274, a certain Genoese named Michele, the priest of the church of San Lorenzo in Ayas, sold a Muslim slave called Fatima to Filipino Tartari. Benjamin Yousey-Hindes has also observed that a priest called Giacomo of Ayas was acting as procurator of Giovanni the Latin archbishop of Tarsus. In 1279, Giovanni appointed Giacomo and another priest as his procurators for the sale of his ship called Sanctus Nicolaus anchored at the

617 Ibid, p.371; [Simeone], no. 168.
harbour of Ayas. Unfortunately, there is not any evidence indicating the way in which the archbishop Giovanni possessed this ship, which would reveal important hints about the commercial life of priests. Yousey-Hindes suggests that it could be either a bequest or forfeiture since the secular-priests and church in general received impressive amounts of donations. However, there is also another possibility that the archbishop of Tarsus was renting his ship to the merchants for commercial purposes. The rent of a ship for a long-distance commercial venture to another party was common in Famagusta as well. Nevertheless, examples from Famagusta do not include members of clergy owning a ship.

In Famagusta, secular priests were involved in trade in various ways. More precisely, they appear acting on behalf of others, collecting money, buying or selling goods, or witnessing contracts. The notarial records themselves tell us that priests were allowed to possess and trade slaves. However, notarial records concerning the activities of priests are not comprehensive enough to illustrate the commercial role of the secular clergy in Famagustan society. Analysing the role of seculars in socio-economic life of Famagusta, one should ask more profound ecclesiastical questions. For example, did the Latin Church impose strict restrictions regarding the social and economic activities of secular clergy? What were the rules pertaining to clergy? Did the Latin Church allow them to involve themselves in every type of business? Were they allowed to act as agents or procurators of others? How much and what type of properties did the church let them to have? And, last but not least, what were the diverse roles of clergy? In this respect, cross-check examinations on the cartularies of the Latin Church and the notarial acts mentioning priests are necessary.

Around the mid-thirteenth century, Archbishop Hugh of Fagiano stated that;

---

“All clerics should diligently abstain from drunkenness and inebriation. [...] Nor should they keep company with any women, or live in the same place with them, because such cohabitation is not only suspect, but even dangerous. [...] Again, clerics should not hold secular offices nor engage in commercial affairs, particularly dishonest ones. They should not attend the performance of mimics, jokers, and actors. They should completely avoid taverns except in case of necessity while travelling. They should not gamble or play at dice, nor be present at games of this sort [...]”.

Similarly, around 1283 religious authorities made clear once again that they ‘prohibit clerics, particularly priests and deacons, from being occupied with secular trade or offices, especially shameful ones, and from being lease-holders of estates or rents, bailiffs, or managers for knights, [...]’. Shortly afterwards, Archbishop Gerard in the provincial council of Limassol, on 22 September 1298, added that “all manifest usurers” and “all those who publicly maintain dice games in their houses” will be excommunicated. Strict regulations also followed during the fourteenth century. The regulations and ordinances made by the Archbishop of Nicosia on 7 April 1320 emphasized once again that priests were not allowed to be involved in “commercial dealings and [...] illicit business or profits, except those that are just sufficient for [clerics’] livelihood.”

However, notarial evidence suggests that orders of higher authorities were not taken seriously by some priests. On 30 October 1297, Ambrogio de Camulo, Genoese, guarantor of Andriola, wife of late Idetus Ususmaris, received 400 white besants from the Genoese priest named Guglielmo de Quercio who was acting on behalf of a member of the well-known merchant family of Giacomo Rubeus. The aforementioned 400 white besants were received

623 Synodicum Nicosiense (2001), Part 1, text A, nos. V, VI, VIII.
626 Ibid, Part 1, Text I, XVII.
as a balance of the 1000 white besants, that the lady Schiva Tabaria had to pay to the
deceased Nicola and to his heirs. The money was given by Nicola to Giacomo Rubeus for the
expense of the bathroom of the Genoese City Hall in Nicosia.\textsuperscript{627} On 3 December 1297,
Schiva \textit{de Tabaria} (possibly from Tiberias) acknowledged a receipt of 2,600 white besants
from the priest Guglielmo, who was appointed by Giacomo Rubeus for a second time.\textsuperscript{628} In
1301, Simone de Molazana, nominated a priest as his procurator called Simone Saporitus in
order to collect goods from his nephew’s estate worth 200 white besants.\textsuperscript{629} Although, the
evidence presented so far suggests nothing illegal, this is partly due to the obscure nature of
contracts mentioned above. But it will be seen in the following paragraph that they also dealt
with goods (such as spices) imported from the prohibited lands.

As notarial evidence suggest, the aforementioned priest Guglielmo was not the only
one having contacts with well-known merchants. A business contract concluded on 8 May
1302 mentions the names of two individuals, that of Faragius and Homodeus \textit{Presbiterus}, the
priest. According to the act, the famous spice dealer Berthozius Latinus sold spices, mixed
drugs and unspecified jars (?) to Nicolino de Sigestro which were held by Berthozius in the
storage of ‘Madii of cadelarii’ in Limassol for 816 white besants and 22 carats. Berthozius
also states that he will transfer the rest of the stuff from Famagusta to Limassol and all
merchandise he sold to Nicolino was evaluated by Faragius and Homodeus, the priest.
Interestingly, the act describes them as ‘Faragius et Homodeus Presbiterus, speciarius (spice
dealer)’, which suggests that Faragius and Homodeus were operating as agents of Nicolino
and well-equipped to estimate the value and quantity of the aforementioned merchandise.\textsuperscript{630}

\textsuperscript{627} \textit{LS [Balard]} 39, no. 74.
\textsuperscript{628} \textit{LS [Balard]} 39, no. 83.
\textsuperscript{630} \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 49, no. 197.
In another contract, dated to December 1373, Nicolaus de Nervi borrowed 13 gold florins from Anthonius de Montenero and the contract was drawn up ‘in domo presbiteri Stephani Ianuensis, in qua nunc habitat Margarita de Saragosa’. Probably, the priest Stephanus possessed more than one house in Famagusta and rented them to merchants or short-term residents where Margarita’s surname clearly indicates that she was a short-term Spanish resident of Famagusta. Apart from involving themselves in commercial activities, priests also served as witnesses. For instance, on 15 June 1302, Dimitri de Margato, burgess of Famagusta, borrowed 400 white besants from Saporito de Curia and promised to pay back in one month. Just four days later, Saporito acknowledged to Dimitri a receipt of 225 of the 400 white besants debt and the priest called Iohanes de Antioch was among the witnesses together with Petrus Pavisius and Petrus de Veneciis. On 25th of June, Saporito received the rest of money. Moreover, on 3 March 1363, two priests Gracianus and Iohannes witnessed a transaction of Venetian merchants where Franceschinus Griti received 150 gold ducats from Marchesina for a commercial venture in Venice. In September, the priest Mafeus Fradelo witnessed a transaction concerning the sale of a Tatar slave called Katerina.

Putting financial considerations of priests aside, another important issue that disturbed the Latin Church was the presence of priests in the taverns. Religious leaders of the Latin Church often proclaimed that clerics should not participate in dice games or visit taverns. These would be one of the most serious problems that the Church encountered in Cyprus. In 1313, Peter of Pleine-Chassaigne, Legate of the Apostolic See in the areas of Outremer, proclaimed in Nicosia that ‘no cleric shall drink or eat in a tavern, except out of great
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necessity [...]’ and in 1320 the Archbishop of Nicosia declared that ‘each and every cleric of whatever condition and status [must] flee from taverns, indecent places, and games of chance.’ However, an incident happened in 1428, where a citizen of Famagusta called Bisarra was allegedly stabbed by a cleric named Anthony Mansour in one of the taverns of Famagusta, who was eating bread and pasta with his company, which suggests that clerics were still visiting taverns despite the prohibitions.

The comparison of ecclesiastical and notarial records becomes even more interesting when one includes the transactions concluded in the churches. As mentioned before, the Latin Church prohibited secular business given the reason that ‘the Lord expelled buyers and sellers from the Temple’. However, on 11 February 1297, Viviano de Milleo, of Messina, acting on his own behalf and Rugero de Lorea, admiral of the king of Sicily, chartered a ship called ‘Santa Maria de Scara’ to transport 50 cantars of cotton, 8 cantars of alum and an unspecified quantity of bechuniarum (buckram?) from Cyprus to Venice. The transaction took place ‘in ecclesia sancti Nicolai Famagoste’. On 6 March 1299, Giofreo de Corvieria, from Marseilles, acknowledged a receipt for a payment for 159 pondi of spices from Baldo and Andriolo Spinolo ‘in domo sive palacii episcopi Famagoste’. Beside the churches acting as witnesses and repositories of business deeds, the types of merchandise and impressive amounts of payments made by the merchants in churches, suggest that the church somehow condoned the illicit (banned) trade. In fact, as was examined in the previous chapter, the special types of merchandise such as cotton, alum, buckram and especially spices were imported from the Islamic world and transported to Europe through Famagusta.

635 Synodicum Nicosiense, Text H, no. XI and Text I, no. XVI.
637 Synodicum Nicosiense, Text I, no. XVII.
638 LS [Balard] 39, no. 34. Also, an act concerning the manumission of a slave was concluded ‘ante dictam Nicolai ecclesiam’. LS [Balard] 39, no. 31. (9 February 1297).
Although, Cyprus was an important cotton and sugar supplier for the West a considerable amount of the cotton, sugar, alum and oriental spices was imported from the prohibited areas by Latin and other Christian merchants. Thus, it can be safely assumed that spices definitely found their way to Famagusta from the Islamic world even if cotton, alum and buckram did not. Further examples may be cited though. For example, on May 21\textsuperscript{st}, Arnaldo and Guglielmo, both from Barcelona, loaded 40 sacks of cotton from Aleppo on the ship called ‘San Nicola’ that was to be transported to Barcelona and the transaction took place in the courtyard of the hospital of Famagusta. To a certain extent, this transaction also reveals the ineffectiveness of papal prohibitions when it is considered that they obtained the cotton from the Muslim dominions. As it can be seen, it did not pose any danger to merchants to state that the cotton was from Aleppo even though the transaction took place \textit{in the church}. Another impressive amount of payment was made by Manuele de Vinderico \textit{‘in sive ante ecclesiam Fratrum Minorum’} on 23 July 1302. Manuele, acting on behalf of Lapo de Deo and Percivalle Donatus, made a payment of 2,200 white besants of Cyprus to Viviano de Ginnembaldo for the cotton they bought before from him. Although, the cotton’s origin was not mentioned it was probably either from Egypt or Syria. Indeed, Viviano Ginnembaldo was one of the most notorious merchants in Famagusta who was excommunicated by the church for conducting trade in Egypt and for some reason was absolved by the church in 1301.

\begin{footnotes}
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\item[643] \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 49, no. 239.
\item[644] \textit{LS [Pavoni]} 32, no. 13. See also; Act of 8 May 1374; ‘\textit{Actum Famagoste, in domo habitacionis dominorum Barnabe et Martinii de Cataneis, videlicet in contracta Sancti Georgii Gerchorum, videlicet sub portico dicte domus, [...]’’. Balard, M., Balletto, L. and Schabel, C. (eds.) \textit{Gênes et l ‘Outre-mer : actes notariés de Famagouste et d’autres localités du Proche-Orient (XIVe-XVe s.)} (Nicosia, 2013), IV, no.23.
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Of equal importance was the choice of burial places and donations of the testators. As stated earlier, Famagusta hosted a large merchant community and a considerable amount of them were long-period residents. The testaments of the Latin citizens of Famagusta indicate unique patterns of socio-cultural interaction that could not be easily explained by its so-called economic revival. In this sense, acts drawn up by Venetian notary Simeone yield valuable hints for more detailed observation. In 1363, Michael Caibach, inhabitant of Famagusta and son of the late Costa de Candia, in his will stated that he wanted to be buried in the Church of St. Sabbas, to which he bequeathed 50 white besants. He manumitted all his slaves and left them 360 white besants in total. Furthermore, Michael left 200 white besants to the Monastery of St. Catherine of Sinai and another 200 white besants to Saint George of the Greeks in Famagusta. As the notarial record suggests, Michael was one of the rich citizens of Famagusta who bequeathed his horse to a certain Georgius, his donkey to St. George of Dades (Ayia Napa), and all his ornaments of gold, silver and pearls along with linen fabrics to his wife. Among his bequests, one of the most notable was the 2,000 white besants for the dowry of his wife and 500 white besants for his burial and funeral expenses for a whole year. Relatively, leaving 500 white besants for the Masses indicates that he was probably one of the most prominent merchants of Famagusta. Indeed, the three churches bequeathed by Michael might lead someone to reach the conclusion that he was from Greek origin. However, after bequeathing to Greek churches Michael also bequeathed some money to the lodge of the commune of Venetians. In either case, whether he was Greek or Venetian, this document reveals the level of cultural interaction taking place in medieval Famagusta.645

Another interesting testament is from 3 April 1363, when a rich citizen of Venice and inhabitant of Famagusta called Fetus, son of late Feras Semitecolo, prepared his last will stating in which way the distribution of his wealth should be made by his procurators. Said

645 [Simeone], no. 4. For further examination of religious interaction between different religious groups see next section.
Fetus stated that he wanted to be buried in the church of Saint-Epiphanios of Famagusta and bequeathed 7,000 white besants and another 3,000 white besants together with gold, silver, pearls and precious stones to his wife called Maria. Also, the said Maria was appointed as a procurator by Fetus taking the responsibility for giving 150 white besants every year to Saint Nicholas church, and 50 white besants to the Greek monastery of St. Yerasimos on behalf of Fetus. Moreover, Fetus bequeathed 100 white besants to the commune of Venice, 1,000 white besants to Saint George of the Greeks, and another 10 besants to the Greek clergy for the salvation of his soul. He left another 3,000 white besants to his wife Maria which shall be distributed to the poor Christians for his soul. Roughly speaking, Fetus left at least 24,794 white besants to his family members, slaves and ecclesiastical places.646

The Greek churches were not always a first choice of Latins. For instance, on 7 April 1363, Barnardus Barbo, ‘filius nobilis uiri’ Barbo of Venice and merchant of Famagusta, chose to be buried in St. Francis, the church of the Friars Minor of Famagusta. Shortly afterwards, a Venetian merchant of Famagusta named Lodovicus Cornario, chose to be buried in St. Dominic’s church. In 22th of May, Bartolomeus de Castro, citizen of Venice and inhabitant of Famagusta, chose as his burial place Saint Dominic’s church which was close to the main gate.647 Unfortunately, sources are scarce about the burial choices of Greeks. As Nicholas Coureas has shown, five tombstones found in the Augustinian church were inscribed in Greek dateable from thirteenth to early fifteenth century. However, as Coureas stressed, it is not clear whether the Greeks buried in Augustinian church were servants of friars or were converted to the Latin rite.648 On the other hand, Sally McKee observed that a

646 [Simeone], no. 6. Feras Semitecolo also appears in the records of Boateriis manumitting a slave. de Boateriis, no. 169.
647 [Simeone], nos. 7 and 16. It is necessary to mention that Venetians were not the only ones who chose to be buried in or bequeathed to, the Greek churches but Genoese as well. Similarly, Carmelite, Dominican, Augustinian and Franciscan churches are often mentioned by Latin’s in their testimonies as their burial place of choice or places that they left money to. de Boateriis, nos. 157, 168; [Simeone], nos. 175, 181, 183, 185, 187; LS [Balard] 43, no. 82.
similar phenomenon can be seen in medieval Crete where ten Greek testators have been found in the records leaving bequests to the Latin Church.\textsuperscript{649} The actual reasons of the bequests and the choice of burial places by Latins and Greeks is a difficult question to answer. Undoubtedly, when documents are examined from the socio-cultural point of view, it is not possible to talk about a generalized social model of ‘indigenous’ and ‘others’ based on the society in medieval Famagusta. At some point, however, it would be pointless to ignore that society consisted of social classes and different social classes existed in medieval Famagusta as well. But, relying on the evidence provided by the notarial records, albeit limited, it would be an oversimplification to describe Famagustan society only in terms of its social classes.

It would be illustrative at this point to examine linguistic interaction in order to identify the level of cultural mixture. One of the most important aspects of multi-cultural society is the co-existence of several languages together with ethnic backgrounds. Considering the co-existence of Greeks, Franks, Venetians, Genoese, Syrians, Armenians and Jews, the linguistic interaction was inevitable. Beyond doubt, the Famagustan society was bilingual and it would not be pointless to argue that mutual intelligibility existed among different ethnic groups.

First of all, French was common among the nobility during the early periods and it was necessary for the ones who held political or administrative positions. It is argued by Jacoby that during the thirteenth century ‘French was the language of oral communication and of literature [and] alongside Latin, it was also the language used by the royal administration, in legislation, some wills and commercial contracts, as well as in numerous

funerary or commemorative inscriptions.' According to him, the French spoken in Cyprus differed from the Parisian dialect, or from the French used in the Frankish states of the mainland which was polished with Arabic. Understandably, the French of Cyprus come into contact with Greek and followed its own way. The traveller Jean de Marignolli during his visit to Aleppo reported that he heard two Cypriots talking French, most probably merchants, and recognized their language as a 'lingua quasi gallica, scilicet quasi de Cipro'. It is argued by scholars that the French spoken in Cyprus was not necessarily 'lingua franca' but more close to the 'langue d'oïl' which is described as 'Levantine French' including words and forms borrowed from Provençal tongue.

On the other hand, Jean Richard has emphasized that the usage of French in the royal administration of Cyprus has no parallel with the usage of French in the kingdom of Jerusalem. In Jerusalem, Frankish feudal lords appointed dragomans as interpreters between the Arabic speaking population and themselves. Thus, for the royal service there was a clear distinction between 'Saracen scribes’ who wrote in Arabic and others who used French. However, in Cyprus the Greeks, Syrians and ‘others’ who served the royal service were obliged to learn French. In this sense, the chronicler Leontios Makhairas complained that

---
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654 Richard, J. "Multiculturalism and Multilingualism”, p. 134. It should be also noted that whether J. Richard is right in his hypothesis or not, notarial records suggest that 'dragomans' were active in Famagusta. Also on some occasions, notarial acts refer to interpreters during the late fourteenth century. For instance, 'Testes Johannes de Bargalio, civis Ianue, Uncinius de Saona, habitator Saone, quondam Michaelis, Manuel Pichus de Albingena quondam Oberti et Georgius domicellus dicto Martini, interpretans michi notario de grecho ydiomate in latinum' and 'Testes Bartholomeus de Corvaria notarius, Illarius de Vigaliano de Nervio, Symon Cam de Vulturo et Christianus quondam Georgii Gomame, censarius et interpretator de arabico in latinum et intelligenciam mei notarii et testium supradictorum, ad hec vocatorum et rogatorum’’. Balard, M., Balletto, L. and Schabel, C. (eds.) Gênes et l’ Outre-mer: actes notariés de Famagouste et d ’autres localités du Proche - Orient (XIVe-XVe s.), (Nicosia, 2013), IV, nos. 18 and 20.
after the arrival of Latins, Greek people started to learn French and their language became a mixture of French and Greek which led him to describe it as ‘barbaric’.  

Gilles Grivaud goes far beyond stating that “within the Frankish community, quite naturally French dominated as a language of administration, culture, and communication, undoubtedly reaching a large portion of the Latin-rite population, the Italians in particular, both those who were completely integrated in the local society, like Philip Novara, and those who were only temporarily on the island, as attested by the will of the Venetian merchant Obertin of Saint Antonin, written in French in Famagusta in January 1294.” Although, it can be said that French was used as a language of administration, it would be an oversimplification to say French was dominant among the society. That is not to say that bilingualism was only societal. As it is well-known, in early periods French did affect the ‘literary expression’ and intellectuals like Philip Novara were writing in French, although he was of Italian origin. However, this situation seems to be changed during the later periods. In the fifteenth century, Leontios Makhairas and George Boustronios both wrote in Greek and a century later Amadi, Florio Bustron, Diomede Strambaldi, and Etienne de Lusignan were all writing in Italian. 

Several other facts also lead one to question the dominance of French throughout the society. First of all, considering the indigenous Greek population and Italian speaking merchant community the social value of French should be overviewed again. Latin was used by the Church, scholarship and notaries but it is more likely that Greek was more common in oral communication during the early Lusignan period since settled Franks were in small

---

Certainly, it was a necessity for the Greeks to learn French and Latin where the Westerners were dominant socially and demographically and to understand Greek by Frank’s means communication with the native Greek population. It is hard to conclude that French was dominant among the indigenous Greek population. It was rather a spontaneous linguistic interaction between different groups. Latin was also used by Italian notaries and also texts translated from Arabic into Latin by Dominicans during the mid-fourteenth century in Famagusta, and the existence of trilingual interpreters active on the island suggests that Famagustan society was bilingual. Latin was also taught by Dominicans and Franciscans in their own studia in Famagusta, Limassol and Nicosia, and most probably other orders such as Carmelites, Augustinians, and Cistercians had their own theology schools. It is well known that centres of education were Famagusta and Nicosia and Greek monasteries on the island were also an important part of it.

Furthermore, given the existence of the Jacobite, Nestorian, Maronite and Orthodox-Melkite groups in Famagusta, certainly Arabic language was among the languages spoken in daily-life of Famagusta. The usage of Arabic in medieval Famagusta was also attested by traveller James of Verona who observed that Famagustan society did ‘chiefly use Greek but understands well the Saracen and Frankish tongues’. Indeed, the aforementioned prominent Latin merchant called Vivian de Ginembaldo seems to have acquired a good level of Arabic as well. Moreover, there are marriage contracts and wills drawn up in Arabic in Famagusta during the late fourteenth century. For instance, when in 1361 a ‘white

660 Ibid, pp. 224-5. The usage of Greek language in the administrative institutions and the Greeks employed in such institutions by Latins are examined in the chapter four (section one).
661 Excerpta Cypria, p. 17.
663 Grivaud, G. ‘Literature’, p. 223; Boateriis, no. 70.
Venetian’ married the sister of Sir Philip Mistahel, a noble Syrian, the contract was written in Arabic and translated into the Latin. In 1426, members of the prominent Syrian family called Audeth were negotiating with Mamluks after the surrender of the city. The appearance of Syrians in the notarial records written in Greek and Latin suggests that alongside Arabic they were able to understand Latin and Greek. According to Jean Richard, some of them took their education in Latin and most of them had a good command of Greek. At the same time, the usage of Greek by the royal administration in fifteenth century indicates that Arabic, Latin, and Greek languages were still in use among the society of Famagusta.664

Indeed, the existence of several languages and their mutual usage by society demonstrates how far we are from understanding the socio-cultural aspects of medieval Famagusta. The simultaneous usage of French, Latin, Arabic, Italian and Greek both in literature and daily life, besides nobility, indicates that multilingualism was not only a pragmatic tool of church and nobility, but also experienced by society as well. However, available evidence makes it nearly impossible to determine the wideness of multilingualism of medieval Famagusta.

3.2 Tolerance or Intolerance?: Social Interaction and Cultural Diversity between Religious Groups in Medieval Famagusta

“In all the cities and dioceses in the Kingdom of Cyprus there are mixed peoples of diverse languages having, under one faith, various rites and customs, as we relate through experience. Their bishops and leaders should instruct them in word and by example with respect to the diverse rites and languages, so that when all the darkness of errors has been banished, the aforesaid leaders can walk in the bright rays of the True Light that illuminated those who profess to be Catholics, and so that they can instruct more clearly their subjects or the people committed to their care. Therefore we [are] determined to declare explicitly the profession of faith that the Holy Roman Church firmly holds, teaches, and preaches, so that when the rays of the True Light are before them they can follow the path of Truth and reject the various diversions into error.”  

So utters Elias of Nabinaux, Archbishop of Nicosia, in the hall of the archbishopric of Nicosia where all three Latin bishops on the island, four Greeks, a Maronite, and an Armenian, in addition to representatives of the Nestorians and Jabocites, leaders of the Franciscan and Dominican provinces, and members of the various clergies were assembled on January 17, 1340. This extract can give us a good idea of the multi-religious aspects of the island during the late medieval era. According to William Duba, the assemblage of 1340 also represents the efforts of the Latin Church, in their attempt to reconcile traditional and theological differences between themselves and other Christian groups that existed in Cyprus. This congregation of 1340 has been recently regarded as evidence of the correctness of St Neophytos the Recluse concerning the so-called ‘hostility’ between Latins and indigenous

Greek population.\textsuperscript{666} By doing this, Duba not only attributes this success to Elias of Nabinaux but also claims that the profession of faith in 1340 was one of Rome’s greatest triumphs in the Levant.\textsuperscript{667}

Unfortunately, the religious dynamics of medieval Famagusta are one of the most neglected topics in Cypriot historiography. Apart from the work of a few scholars, secondary literature about the religious aspects of medieval Cyprus mainly relies on native chronicles. Recently, a limited number of studies have challenged traditional historiography and have shown that cultural interaction between religious groups was impressive. But although extensive investigation has been carried out through written evidence, the focus is rather limited. This is because of the lack of archaeological evidence due to the political restrictions. In this sense, the religious historiography of Famagusta can be divided into two; traditional and modern historiography.\textsuperscript{668} According to the traditional historiography the Latin conquest was mainly characterized by the clash of two religions, the decline of the economy, and the oppressive Frankish regime ruling over the indigenous population. However, recently modern historiography has provided a more comprehensive and unbiased analysis of religious matters not only relying on chronicles but also archival, ecclesiastical, and notarial evidence showing that the Latins and indigenous Greeks maintained peaceful relations. The primary concern of this section is to examine the secondary literature together with the chronicle, ecclesiastical and architectural evidence in order to provide a more consistent picture. By doing so, it is also aimed to challenge the traditional historiography by providing evidence not only concerning Famagusta but Cyprus in general. In order to understand the social relations between different religious groups which existed in Famagusta this research will consult the chronicles, travellers’ notes and documents of the Latin Church in order to provide a

\textsuperscript{666} In this regard see Ozkutlu, S. Greeks and Latins on Thirteenth and Fourteenth Century Cyprus: A Study of Cultural Diversity and Cultural Interaction, Master’s Thesis, University of Birmingham (2010).
\textsuperscript{667} Duba (2000), p. 169.
\textsuperscript{668} The traditional and modern historiography on medieval Famagusta is cited in the following footnotes.
comparative and objective analysis. Moreover, the economic and political dynamics of the
Greek Orthodox Church will be examined separately in order to analyse the economic power
of the church both before and after the Latin conquest. Although the lack of archaeological
evidence does not allow us to provide profound examinations regarding some social and
cultural boundaries and religious characteristics of the period, the use of a wide variety of
evidence and comparative analysis in this section will help to broaden our understanding of
Orthodox and Catholic relations in medieval Cyprus. Additionally, this section aims to
explore cultural crossovers and religious convergence in Famagusta by using the
ecclesiastical records and monumental evidence.
3.2.1 Historiography derived from native Chronicles:

It has almost become a cliché to portray the situation of native Greeks after the Frankish takeover as an example of oppression by using native chronicles as evidence. There is a popular theory maintained amongst mainstream historians who interpret the Lusignan period of rule as oppressive for the indigenous Greek population. The traditional theory relies mostly on native chronicles and prefers to define the Lusignan period as a clash of two religions and the reduction of social rights as a result of a new Western feudal and administrative system introduced to the island by the Franks. Despite the long reliance on native chronicles, whose objectivity is often questionable, and Greek sources, which are open to distortion in nationalistic interpretations, this pessimistic view has now begun to alter slightly in the view of some historians. It appears that the most important factor leading to the alienation of the indigenous Greek population during Frankish rule, in traditional historiography, is the process of Latinization. However, as shown in chapter four, native Greek families who bore administrative titles appeared in several administrative institutions during both the Byzantine and Lusignan periods. The traditional historiography, however, neglects both the appearance of native Greeks in important governmental positions and socio-
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cultural contact between Greeks and Latins like those discussed in chapter four. Regarding the chronicles, a more careful interpretation is called for. In other words, the reliability of chronicles depends on two component elements which were the dynamics of the period in which the chronicler lived and the religious and ethnic background he belonged to. However, the reliability of these kinds of sources is still questionable since the incidents detailed and prioritised in these works may change according to the characteristics of the writer – especially according to the social and cultural influences the chronicler was exposed to (i.e. religious group, ethnic background, social class and so on).

First of all, the chronicles are problematic, which makes interpretation slightly more complicated. In interpreting the works of a chronicler, the historian must first be aware that, authorial intention, assumptions and the formal framework of the time when he lived together with nationalistic feelings played an important role in shaping his work. Secondly, the source can be about the early Lusignan period but it is important to know if it was written in the same period or later. For example, Leontios Makhairas is a good example of this, living in the fifteenth century but also writing about the earlier periods as well. There are also technical problems, for example, dates for events, calculation of eras, and reuse of material, especially well-known stories. These are the problems that historians and readers need to be aware of in order to understand whether they are historiographically useful or not.\(^\text{671}\) In this case, the Greek chronicle of Saint Neophytos (1134-c.1220) was one of the main sources for the social and political changes taking place in Lusignan Cyprus. One of the reasons that the works of Neophytos the Recluse are very much in demand among historians interested in social and religious history of medieval Cyprus is that he witnessed the regimes of the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. However, Neophytos was not a historian and most of his works are not related to history. Even his treatise ‘Concerning the misfortunes of the land

of Cyprus’ is not about the history of the island but has a spiritual intention. Nevertheless, his other works which refer directly to the Latin period are his homilies, ‘On the Seven Ecumenical Councils and on why and when the elder Rome and the new Rome grew apart from each other’ and ‘On the high priesthood of Christ and the Azymes’, which have a didactic and polemical purpose rather than historical. Perhaps the best example for understanding the unreliability of St. Neophytos the Recluse is the small treatise (known from Cod. Marc. 575 (saec. XV) fols. 395-396 and Paris, Gr. 1335 (saec. XIV) fol. 6-6) where he mentions the twelve years of disaster which is regarded as primary evidence by the aforementioned traditionalist historians and has contributed to the pessimistic viewpoint. There is also an inherited methodological mistake among some historians in the manner of examining the native chronicles, such as accurate dates for events and calculation of eras. For instance, regarding the small treatise of St. Neophytos, it raises the question whether we should calculate the year of composition by adding twelve disastrous years to 1185, which was the beginning of the tyranny of Isaac Komnenos, or to the year 1191 when the Richard the Lionheart conquered the island.

On the other hand, in the writings of Neophytos a certain hostility towards the Frankish settlers can plainly be seen. According to him, Franks were a ‘foreign people’, ‘of another race’, ‘alien’, ‘lawless’, ‘hostile’, ‘persecuting’, ‘criminal’, ‘those who hate us’, and the Frankish regime was a ‘temporary evil permitted by God for our deeply sinful life and lack of repentance’, ‘perverse disposition’, ‘mad rage’, ‘bitterness and burning’, ‘rough water’, ‘capture’, ‘tyranny of the unorthodox’ and ‘terrible slavery’. St Neophytos in his work mentions the same Franks frequently as ‘wolves in
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sheep’s clothing”, “thievish”, and “rapacious” and described Richard the Lionhearted as “totally vile”, “abominable” and “like the godless Saladin”. According to St Neophytos, Richard the Lionhearted “having accomplished nothing against Saladin, whom he resembled, he sold the country [of Cyprus] to the Latins for two hundred thousand pounds of gold”. St Neophytos also describes the failure of the Third Crusade as follows: “for providence was not disposed to drive out dogs only to bring in wolves instead”, which clearly reflects his hostility towards the Latins. Indeed, later on the same nationalistic sentiments were becoming more mainstream in Byzantium as the last Grand Duke, reflecting on the occupation of Constantinople by the armies of fourth Crusade in 1204: “It is better to see the Turkish turban ruling in the midst of the city than the Latin tiara.”

Despite all evidence, Benedict Englezakis, after a long description of the differences between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, explains the importance of the works of St. Neophytos in the history of medieval Cyprus as follows:

“The attitude of Neophytos is purely religious and never exclusively patriotic, even though it always has political implications. The saint himself, however, is first and last always a monk, is interested primarily in the preservation of the Orthodox faith and remains until the end a heavenly-minded recluse who has renounced the world and transitory things for the sake of perfect devotion to the divine.”

Contrary to the biased description of Englezakis, Nicholas Coureas describes the situation in a more objective way:

---
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“His remark shows that anti Western feeling among the Byzantines to the point of regarding Muslims as preferable to the Westerners was not confined to the Imperial court at Constantinople, but was a popular sentiment by the close of the twelfth century. The sack of Constantinople in 1204 by the forces of the fourth Crusade, originally bound for Egypt, was the culmination of long running hostility between Latins and Greeks.”

With all this in mind, it is also necessary to note here that neither the monastery of Makhairas nor the Hermitage, dedicated to the True Cross had been faced with Latin interference at the time both foundation rules were completed. Therefore, the information given above could suggest that considerable Byzantine hostility was shown towards the Westerners amongst the indigenous Greek clergy during the early Lusignan period considering that rule by the Latins or the Turks made no difference to St Neophytos. Nevertheless, St. Neophytos clearly states that the island belonged to the Byzantines and that all Westerners were enemies of the Greeks just as Muslims were. The common hostility against Catholics must have affected St Neophytos and the Cypriot clergy as well and in this respect one cannot expect to find anything objective in the works of Neophytos. It is also necessary to look more closely into the life of St. Neophytos. It is known that he came from a middle class family, had his own monastery and had political contacts with the Frankish government, which contradicts the traditional idea that “The Crusader Kingdom of Cyprus (1191-1571) failed to establish a bridge between Eastern and Western Christianity. In the end, the Frankish period was nothing other than the Latin captivity of the Church of

---
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Furthermore, several official letters indicate that the Hermitage of St Neophytos had close contact with Orthodox institutions abroad during the Lusignan and Venetian rule and both monasteries mentioned above survived the era of Latin rule unharmed and obviously were able to maintain contacts with other Orthodox religious establishments outside of Cyprus.  


684 Coureas (2003), pp. 52-53.
3.2.2 The Economic and Political Power of Religious Institutions:

As Schabel outlined, apart from a few snippets of information, the modern historiography is comprised of a tripartite structure: the execution of the thirteen Kantara monks in 1231, the riot provoked by the papal legate Peter of Pleine-Chassagne in 1313, and Peter Thomas preaching to the Greeks in 1360. Although the native chronicles and several other narratives provide an important clue about the politics and daily life of medieval Cyprus, restricting the history of Cyprus to the chronicle and narrative evidence has meant disregarding much that is of fundamental importance. To understand the inconsistency in native chronicles it is necessary to take a closer look at the reasons behind the pessimistic view of native chroniclers by comparing them with other chroniclers who wrote about the same incident. For instance, the Greek Cypriot chronicler of the fifteenth century, Leontios Makhairas, noted the incident of 1360 as that of Peter Thomas intending ‘to make the Greeks Latins’ and ‘to confirm them by force’, whereas Philip of Mézières (1327-1405), chronicler and chancellor of Cyprus, states that Peter Thomas explained to them their schismatic ‘error’ using Scripture, and after that the Greek clergy opened the doors of the cathedral to the mob, who were shouting ‘‘death to the legate’’, and protected a Carmelite friar from any harm by the arrival of prince. However, this is never mentioned along with the religious processions (for which see previous section) in the work of Makhairas at all.\(^{685}\)

On the other hand, the post-Byzantine period does not appear as an ‘economic decline’ for the Greek Church. Contrary to the traditional belief, it is clear from the documentary evidence that there are only three cases mentioned where a Greek Church or monastery was confiscated by the Latins. One of them was Hagia Sophia (Nicosia) owned by

\(^{685}\) Schabel (2005), pp. 158-159.
the archbishopric of Nicosia in 1196. However, Schabel suggests that the cathedral Hagia Sophia (also known as Sancta Sophia) borrowed its name from the old Greek cathedral. In this sense, it is more probable that Hagia Sophia was the name of the Byzantine church of Bedestan (adjacent to the Hagia Sophia) and if this is so the Latins returned it to the Greeks afterwards.\textsuperscript{686} The second confiscated Greek property was Bellapais Abbey, which was given to the Augustinians around 1200. However, there is some circumstantial evidence that in this case it was given by the crown and not by the Latin Church. The only clear information concerning the confiscation of Greek ecclesiastical property is about the Stavrovouni, which ended up in Benedictine hands in 1254.\textsuperscript{687} As Chris Schabel observed, apart from the aforementioned incidents, the Latin Church obtained more Venetian churches and properties than Greek ones.\textsuperscript{688} Therefore, it would be deceptive to interpret the Latin period as oppressive for the Orthodox population based on the limited amount of evidence.

It is important to examine the estimated degree of wealthy religious Greek individuals in order to realise that information provided by native Greek chronicles and narratives concerning the religious incidents is so fragmentary and it is for this reason that they can provide only a small amount of information about social and religious dynamics. Although native Greek chronicles do not include detailed information about economic patterns, it is known that after the Frankish conquest Greek ecclesiastical establishments continued to receive donations from some of the individual Greeks and even some Latins.\textsuperscript{689} Furthermore, the foundation rules of the monasteries of Makhairas and St Neophytos indicate that both monasteries possessed considerable amounts of properties (daughter houses) and received substantial incomes (dependent serfs, purchases of land and expansion due to numbers of monks). As for the early thirteenth century, we already know that Pope Honorius
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III confirmed the considerable amount of Cypriot properties possessed by the monasteries of *St Theodosios of Palestine* and *St Catherine of Mount Sinai*. Towards the fourteenth century the proportion of properties possessed by St Catherine increased. Evidence of the acquired properties can be found in Papal letters. For instance, Pope John XXII wrote to King Leo V of Armenia in 1326 demanding money for the restoration of the abbey of *St George of Mangana* (daughter house of *St George Lampron* in Armenia). Moreover, it is well known that the monastery of Koutsovendis had a monastery in Palestine called St Sabbas, acquired after 1334.

Judging from well-known examples, the Greek Church also received financial support and on some occasions was prioritized by the Latin Church. For instance, it is known that the monastery of St Margaret in Agros and St Mary of Stilo had close ties to the papacy until the end of Latin rule. St George of Mangana was another Greek monastery that received papal protection for its property in Cyprus and in Cilician Armenia. In addition, in the late thirteenth century all the expenses for the repair of Kykkos Monastery were covered by King Peter I. Many more similar examples of support can also be found. For example, after the promulgation of the *Bulla Cypria* in 1260, Pope Alexander IV stated that the Greek Archbishop Germanos ‘humbly begged us to consider the poverty of the Church of the Greeks’ and around 1320 Greek Bishop Leo of Solea, while in Avignon, complained that his estate was poor and not able to support him. On another occasion Leo complained that he was swindled by his Greek, Syrian, and Latin enemies and his ‘serfs, money, herds of various species, and large quantities of wheat and barley’ were taken from him. However, despite all of this, a Latin knight was still able to steal 1,000 silver bezants and ten gold florins from Leo. Afterwards, Abbot Germanos of Mangana states that the annual income of Leo was

---
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1,500 gold florins.\textsuperscript{694} There is no doubt that, presented with this example of Leo, historians could broaden the picture concerning the economic state of the Greek Church and clergy in general. However, it does suggest that wealthy indigenous Greek clerics existed and that they had political contacts both with the Latin Church of Cyprus and Avignon papacy.

The available evidence, albeit scarce, reveals also that over \emph{thirty} Greek monasteries at least continued to function after the conquest of 1191 and that their number reached \emph{fifty-two} during the Venetian period while the Greeks had over \emph{forty} monasteries during the middle Byzantine period (965-1191). In addition, Stephen of Lusignan (1537-1590) mentioned \emph{twenty-four} Greek monasteries by name and eighteen small houses located in the Troodos Mountains. Moreover, the fact that the monastery of St Yerasimos functioned in Famagusta, as mentioned in the Venetian notarial document, is already discussed by Chris Schabel.\textsuperscript{695} The existence of a considerable amount of Greek monastic establishments on the island until the end of Venetian period also indicates the economic stability of the Greek Church.

Furthermore, another important aspect that is exaggerated by the mainstream historians is the hegemonic power the Latin Church of Cyprus held over other religious groups. Contrary to the traditional belief, the Latin Church of Cyprus failed to establish networks with other religious groups. As a result of this, the Latin Church of Cyprus can be regarded more as a symbolic representative of Catholicism than the sole religious power on the island. Also, the relocation of the papacy to Avignon was detrimental in several respects to the Latin Church of Cyprus. Normally, the clergy of the island’s four cathedral chapters were from the South-West of France. Therefore, the relocation of the papacy to Avignon meant that the archiepiscopal province of Cyprus was now more distant from the papacy and
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the clergy serving Cyprus could be away from the island for long periods of time. One of the strongest effects the Avignon papacy had on the Latin Church in Cyprus was the development of a native Latin Cypriot clergy. Without doubt, the tradition of appointing Latin clergy from abroad prevented the development of an indigenous clergy, which kept the proportion of native Latin clergy and the population low. Despite the limited number of Latin clergy on the island, the Latin Church of Cyprus played an important role in diplomatic missions, peace and marriage negotiations between Cyprus, Sicilian Armenia and Genoa. Looked at from a broader perspective, it can easily be seen that alongside the Latin Church, Latin monastic orders were also generally urban establishments. The Latin regular clergy and monastic orders in Cyprus were established primarily in Nicosia and Famagusta, as well as to a lesser extent, monastic orders in the towns of Limassol and Paphos. Although mendicant orders such as the Franciscans and Dominicans had houses in all towns, others like the Augustinians and Carmelites established themselves only in Nicosia and Famagusta. Besides the Greeks, Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians and Carmelites, Famagusta and Nicosia also hosted Syrian Melkites, Copts, Nestorians, Armenians and Jacobites. In this respect, considering that there were only twelve Latin rural chapels after the Latin conquest of Cyprus, it would not be wrong to suggest that the Latin Church of Cyprus was heavily reliant upon their bases in Nicosia and Famagusta. Apart from the so-called religious tension between the Latin and indigenous Greek clergy, the Latin church was not even able to convert the small number of non-Latin Christians who shared the island with the larger population of indigenous Greeks. When compared to medieval Sicily, where the Latin Church was successful in converting non-Latin Christians, who formed most of the

population, where the Greeks were brought into the Roman Catholic Church, the Latin policy in Cyprus appears as a most complex phenomenon. As Coureas highlighted, although the Latin Church of Cyprus and its policy from the top to the bottom of the Latin hierarchy may be described as weak and ineffective, it should not be compared to its counterparts such as Sicily and re-conquered Muslim Spain, which were operating under totally different conditions.  

As will be shown, the Latin Church of Cyprus did not attempt to Latinize the island as did their counterparts in Sicily and Muslim Spain. Indeed, the Latin Church of Cyprus can easily be differentiated from the other Latin Churches of the Crusader kingdoms by its functionality and unique characteristics. In Coureas’ words; ‘the Latin Church on Cyprus differed from the churches of Western Europe, where the churches could claim the allegiance of nearly the whole population’. Firstly, the personnel of the Latin episcopal offices were chosen from outside the island although the population of native Latin clergy of Cyprus was considerable during the fourteenth century. This can be considered the main difference between the Latin Church of Cyprus and Europe, comparing it primarily to England and Germany. Indeed, although the Greek Church of Cyprus accepted the Roman ecclesiastical primacy and jurisdiction under the terms of the Bulla Cypria in 1260, the Greek Church of Cyprus remained separate institutionally and maintained its Episcopal offices and monastic structures independently. Secondly, the concentration of Latin secular clergy in urban areas (mainly in Famagusta and Nicosia) rather than in the countryside remains one of the main differences between the Latin Church of Cyprus and its European counterparts.

---

3.2.3 Social and Cultural Interactions between different Religious Groups:

Leaving all traditional interpretations and political assumptions aside, most of the other references to the religious incidents between the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries present a more balanced view. Existing evidence reveals that impressive levels of social and cultural interaction took place among different religious groups in Famagusta. One of the most important surviving records concerning the social and religious life of Famagusta are the travellers’ notes, among them James of Verona’s report of 1335. James was an Augustinian monk who visited Cyprus during his pilgrimage to the Holy Land and his report provides a clearer picture concerning the religious dynamics that can be supported by several other written sources. James of Verona, in his report stated that:

“Also in the same city [Famagusta] are several sects which have their own worship and their own churches. First, true Christians; secondly the Greeks, who consecrate not with unleavened wafers, but leavened breads; they do not elevate the Body of Christ, nor do they believe that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. There are also Jacobites, who are circumcised, and are baptised with the Greek rite. There are also Armenians, who perform their worship like true Christians, but say the service in the Greek tongue, also Georgians and Maronites. Those two sects are baptised like Christians, but use the Greek service. Also Nestorians, so called from the faithless heretic Nestor, who says that Christ was only a mere man, and perform their services in Greek, but do not follow the Greeks but have a service of their own.”

Moreover, Verona during his stay at Famagusta reported that he saw Greek women singing in the Catholic funeral and that the Greeks of Cyprus were also fluent in Arabic

---
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The reliability of the information provided by Verona’s reports can be confirmed by the documents of the Latin Church. Thus, according to the ecclesiastical evidence concerning the common rituals by several religious groups this was not a new phenomenon. As mentioned before, in the mid-thirteenth century, Archbishop Hugh of Fagiano, stated in the regulations of the church of Nicosia that Greek ‘singing women’ in the funeral rites disturb the divine service and no one should summon flute players in their funeral rites or houses.  

The same prohibition was announced on 22 September 1298 in the Council of Limassol as well. This time Archbishop Gerard stated that “all sorcerers and diviners, men and women who perform incantations and ‘singing women’ at the funerals of the deceased, whether in church or in cemeteries” will be excommunicated by the Latin Church. Summoning Greek flute players and ‘singing women’ to the Latin funerals and even churches and the performance of rituals together by different ethnic groups is also mentioned in the fourteenth century chronicles. One of the key works revealing information about religious affairs is the hagiographical Vita about St. Peter Thomas written by Philippe de Mézières. 

Peter Thomas visited Famagusta for the procession and together with the Latins gathered all the ‘Greeks, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Georgians, Nubians, Indians, Ethiopians, and many other Christians’ living in Famagusta as already mentioned in the previous section. In addition to the aforementioned Christian groups, Philippe de Mézières states that also ‘many infidel Turks, Saracens, and Jews’ accompanied the crowd with bare feet and each group sang hymns and songs in their own language. The observations of Philippe de Mézières as

---
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705 Synodicon Nicosiense, Text. A and nos. XX and XXVI. see chapter 3 and section 1.
706 Ibid, p. 193, G. IV. g.
707 Philippe de Mézières (1954).
an eye-witness concerning the social and religious interaction between the Latin and non-Latin populations are not limited to the processions arranged by Peter Thomas in Nicosia and Famagusta. Mézières also describes the funeral ceremony in the Carmelite church in Famagusta after Peter Thomas’s death in 1366. According to the chronicle, the Carmelite church was filled with Catholics, schismatics and infidels namely: Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Jacobites, Copts and Maronites who venerated Peter Thomas’s body as holy. Moreover, Mézières states that the Greeks and their monks showed ultimate respect to Peter Thomas for;

‘‘[...] quia errores eorum claris demonstrationibus confuderat, ipsosque ad gremium sanctae ecclesiae Romanae debere venire moverat, nunc omnium iniuriarum obliti, sed quasi ab erroribus suis conversi, aut eius legati filii devotissimi, capitibus discopertis contra morem ipsorum, cum profunda reverentia altero non expectato pedes et manus sancti legati deosculabantur.’’

Surely, the level of devotion shown by Greeks towards the Catholic legate and the story of conversion to the holy church of Rome is exaggerated by Mézières. However, the parts concerning the processions both in Nicosia and Famagusta and the attendance of different religious groups, including infidels, were not invented by the chronicle. In fact, common rituals and shared processions in medieval Cyprus were reported not only by Mézières and aforementioned travellers. There is solid evidence suggesting that common

\footnote{Mézières (1954), pp. 155-6. English translation: ‘‘The church was filled with people of both sexes, Catholics but also schismatics and infidels, who unanimously and with devout reverence venerated the legate’s body as holy. Wondrous to say, for the nations of schismatic Christians, that is, the Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Jacobites, Copts, Maronites, and others divided from the Catholic Church – but especially the Greeks and their monks, who when the legate was alive drank freely of his blood as a kind of sacrifice of oblation – now forgot all their injuries and were partially converted from their errors or even become the devoted sons of the legate. Because he had refuted their errors with clear arguments and convinced them that they should come back to the holy church of Rome, they kissed the feet and hands of the holy legate with profound reverence with heads bare and in contrast to their customs.” Devaney (2013), pp. 337-8; Schabel, ‘Religion’, pp. 218-9.}
processions, festivals and rituals were existent both in Famagusta and Nicosia. For instance, the chronicle of Amadi mentions another procession organized in November 1330 by John of Conti, the Dominican archbishop of Nicosia, that lasted 40 days and included ‘‘Franks, Greeks, Armenians, Copts, Nestorians, Jacobites, Maronites and others’’.\textsuperscript{710} In 1393 when plague ravaged Nicosia, the Bishop of Nicosia ordered a procession that was headed by a Greek preacher and a group of Orthodox priests who were followed by the Latin aristocracy and walked to the church of Saint Therapon where they met a massive crowd there.\textsuperscript{711} By the mid-fifteenth century, in fact, the same phenomenon apparently still existed. The Dominican Stephen of Lusignan while describing the ‘Corpus Christi’ procession states that:

‘‘The spectator can see at first the Greek cross, and the crowds of people go around it without any order. Then the Greek priests follow, then the image of the Holy Virgin, followed by crowds of women. This is the usual way in which Greeks always organize their processions. Then there are the Latin mendicants, arranged according to their order; then follow the Indian priest, who wear a turban on their heads (these turbans are made of turquoise or blue linen), and the bishop and his mitre; then come the Nestorians, the Jacobites, the Maronites, the Copts, and the Armenians, and almost all of them wear turbans. Also, all of them wear the chasuble, following the Latin custom, except for the Armenians, who wear round birettas with a white band. Then follow the Latin priests, accompanied by their archbishop or by a suffragan, then the regimento and the noblemen.’’\textsuperscript{712}

Moreover, on several occasions it is reported by travellers that the Latins frequented Greek churches in Famagusta. In one case, the Augustinian friar Verona visited a Greek

church, the Lady de la Cava, during his journey to Cyprus in 1335 and he states that they went the Greek Church together with other merchants, pilgrims, sailors and crew and celebrated mass there.\textsuperscript{713} Likewise, the Italian pilgrim Nicholas de Martoni noted in 1394 that ‘Outside the city of Famagusta there were formerly large and populous villages... There are many seemly churches, among which is the church of S. Maria of the cave, very seemly, and many people, Latins, and Greeks, go to the said church to pray’.\textsuperscript{714} Indeed, what Felix Faber, the Dominican friar observed on the island during his visits both in 1480 and 1483 is corroborated by what Martoni and Verona witnessed. Faber states: ‘Many Latin priests go over to the Greek rite, and presume to take wives, but they wish at the same time to enjoy the privileges of Latin priests, in which they take no part’.\textsuperscript{715}

\textsuperscript{713} Excerpta Cypria, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{714} Ibid, p. 24.
\textsuperscript{715} Ibid, p. 41.
3.2.4 The Visual Evidence: Art, Architecture and Archaeology:

Apart from the written evidence, the artistic and architectural structure and the style of ecclesiastical monuments as an indicator of social interaction should not be neglected. The religious monuments and their architectural and artistic styles surely provide us with hints as to the social and religious dialogue between different ethnic groups. Indeed, in order to see the whole picture one needs to conduct comparative examination of the visual culture and common functionality of the churches of Famagusta. The history of the art and architecture of medieval Cyprus has been well-examined by scholars as far as the current state of historiography is concerned. Rather than relying on traditional perspectives, modern scholarship has produced examples of a unique ‘‘Gothic’’ and ‘‘Crusader’’ mixture of buildings and an artistic production bearing the traces of both Eastern and Western ideologies.\(^{716}\) In this sense, the stylistic details of ecclesiastical art and architecture of Famagusta surely contributes to the critique of traditional historiography about socio-cultural relations during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Firstly the examination of Saint George of the Greeks which was built at the southern end of the city, probably in the last decades of the fourteenth century, and served as a cathedral for the Greek-Orthodox community, would be appropriate as it was the most important church for the indigenous population.\textsuperscript{717} Unfortunately, it now stands half-ruined but still bearing traces of Gothic style, and facing the Latin cathedral of St. Nicholas: a picture giving almost the best example of the hybrid characteristic of the city.\textsuperscript{718} Camille Enlart described the Greek Orthodox cathedral as Gothic in style and the interior paintings accompanied by Greek inscriptions in an Italian style called “Giotto” by him.\textsuperscript{719} Although, the templon between the fourth and fifth bay, synthronon and typical Orthodox basilica gives the impression of a traditional Orthodox church, the tracery, ribbed vaults and flying buttresses represents the Gothic and early Crusader architectural forms blended together.\textsuperscript{720} In addition to the apparent imitation of Western Gothic architectural decoration, the Western


\textsuperscript{719} Enlart (1987), pp. 253 and 257.

tradition of including tombs in the naos was reproduced.⁷²¹ The Greek Orthodox Church also bears close similarities with the SS Peter and Paul, St. Francis and St. Mary of Carmel churches of Famagusta. For instance, the round windows of the church resemble those in the St. Francis and its plan, elevation and general outlook (for example: flying buttresses, nave vaults) are almost identical with the SS Peter and Paul.⁷²² Regarding the paintings of the church of St. George of the Greeks, there is a clear consensus among art historians that there is more than one type of style. Interestingly, some of the images such as the Cimabuesque Crucifixion on the interior west wall are in Italian, while others such as the Betrayal of Judas are recognized as Palaeologan in style.⁷²³ Annemarie Weyl-Carr has already reported the similarities between the paintings at St George of the Greeks and the Italo-Byzantine murals at the Panagia Podithou church, in Cyprus, where she believes that the painter of Podithou copied the frescoes of St. George of Famagusta.⁷²⁴

The so called ‘Gothic-Palaeologan’ style can also be traced to other Greek churches, both in Famagusta and other parts of Cyprus. For instance, one of the most distinctive examples of the Gothic style of dressed stone masonry and cross-vaulted construction can be seen in St. Nicholas of the Greeks and St. Zoni in Famagusta, the Bedestan in Nicosia, St Mamas in Sotira, St James in Trikomo and the church of the Archangel in Lakatamia.⁷²⁵ Michelle Bacci has also noticed the same phenomenon in the Nestorian church of Famagusta, which bears traces of both Eastern and Western patterns in artistic and architectural aspects of the church. According to Bacci, the features of the shafts of columns supporting the vaulting of the central nave and starting out of the wall in the form of a right angle are

⁷²³ Andrews, J. “Gothic and Byzantine in the Monumental Arts of Famagusta”, p. 161; Carr, A. “‘Art’”, p. 315 and fig. 31.
⁷²⁴ Carr, A. “‘Art’”, p. 318.
reminiscent of the elbow-columns known from Crusader monuments in Palestine (as, for example, the church at Abu Ghosh).\textsuperscript{726} Also, the use of groined vaults shows similarities with the ‘Hospitallers’ church and chapel of Saint Anne in Famagusta.\textsuperscript{727} According to Enlart, the characteristic style of the church is derived from the south of France, the decorative scheme is Italian and some of the architectural features are derived from Byzantine art.\textsuperscript{728} Moreover, a detailed observation of Michelle Bacci has revealed that the frescoes of the Nestorian church are painted in Syrian, Gothic and Palaeologan styles. For instance, the image of Saint Anne and the painting style and composition of the fresco of the Virgin of Mercy and Saint Mary Magdalene are described as being in a Latin Western artistic tradition.\textsuperscript{729} On the other hand, the figures of the Archangel Michael, a holy monk, an Egyptian martyr Menas and the figure of a young Apostle (possibly Saint Philip) are all painted in the Palaeologian style.\textsuperscript{730}

The mixture of Latin and Byzantine elements in the artistic and architectural aspects, especially in the Greek cathedral of Famagusta might lead some to think that it was possibly funded by the Latins. However, although it is possible to argue that the patron of the church could be of Latin origin, which is possible, the Western style paintings and iconography of the Greek churches sponsored by Orthodox patrons in the rural areas still needs a comprehensive explanation. As it is already explained by Peter Edbury, there was no attempt to colonize the countryside during the Latin hegemony and the Byzantine structure of society preserved itself in the rural areas.\textsuperscript{731} There is no doubt that Byzantine culture was more powerful in the countryside if not in cosmopolitan cities (such as Limassol, Famagusta and

\textsuperscript{727} The usage of groined vaults explained as an influence of local tradition by C. Enlart. However, M. Bacci argues that the same technique was used in Italy and Crusader states in a much more complicated way. Bacci (2006), p. 209; Enlart (1987), pp. 274-85.
\textsuperscript{728} Enlart (1987), pp. 282-3.
\textsuperscript{729} Bacci (2006), pp. 214 and 217.
\textsuperscript{730} Ibid, p. 214.
Nicosia) and penetrated more into the social life. However, Weyl-Carr has observed the same tradition even in the rural areas. For example, the paintings in the church of the Holy Cross of Pelendri stand as a unique example of this tradition. The dome of the church was painted in the true Palaeologan style while the north aisle contains the crest of John of Lusignan and portraits of a Latin couple. Although, the patron of the paintings is unknown the different painting styles suggest the work of more than one painter in different periods. Another striking example of artistic interaction can be seen in the ‘Royal Chapel’ of Pyrga, patronized by or for King Janus and his wife Charlotte, whose portraits are in pure Byzantine style. As Carr pointed out, the chapel of Pyrga, containing the Latin-labelled Greek images and of Latin and Greek saints portrayed together, provides an almost unique example of Byzantine and Latin elements blended together in an Orthodox chapel. Equally, the murals sponsored by Orthodox patrons, such as the Crucifixion at Kalopanagiotis and at Pelendri are painted in the Italian style. One can also add the Italianate version of the icon of Crucifixion with the striped loincloth in the mural paintings of Moutoullas, St Herakleidios in Kalopanagiotis, and St Nicholas tis Stegis. Furthermore, the figure of St. Nicholas in the wall painting of Saint Themonianos at Lysi (modern Akdoğan) is Byzantine though the patron was a Frank. Another unique example of the hybrid iconography comes from an Orthodox icon from Paphos where the Virgin’s red veil is Byzantine in style, but her little segmental crown finds its best parallels in thirteenth-century Italy.

---

732 However, it should be mentioned here that they would be Greeks dressing in Western style which is clear by ca. 1500 frescoes.
733 Carr, A. ‘‘Art’’, p. 317; Carr, A. ‘Byzantines and Italians on Cyprus’, p. 347.
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3.2.5 Conclusion:

Overall, it is not accurate to say that the written and visual evidence provided above allows us to describe the whole Latin era as a period of ‘peaceful’ relations between Catholic rulers and Orthodox indigenous population. However, it provides quite enough evidence to say that scholars must reconsider the socio-cultural and religious relations between the ethnic groups which existed both in Famagusta and other cosmopolitan cities during the Latin hegemony. Despite the nationalistic discourses and radical approaches that shaped the traditional historiography, the limited amount of primary evidence and analyses provided by modern scholarship indicates the simultaneous presence of Eastern and Western elements both in social and religious life, despite the lack of archaeological evidence which is crucial for our understanding of socio-cultural dynamics.

Clearly, the arguments that traditional historiography favours, such as the ‘Latinization’ of the island and the ‘clash of two religions’ that reduced the religious independence and social rights of the indigenous Orthodox population during the Latin hegemony, are quite simplistic for such a complex phenomenon. Indeed, relying on the presented primary evidence it is safe to argue that religion and religious practices in Famagusta were often something that could bring together different religious and ethnic groups, which contradicts the traditional historiography. Additionally, the evidence regarding the economic power of the Greek Church indicates that the Latin Church did not attempt to reduce the economic and political power of Greek Church as is argued by the mainstream historians. Thus, emphasis should be placed on the increasing numbers of Greek ecclesiastical properties comparing to the Byzantine period and the financial support provided by the Latin Church to the Greek Church which provides solid evidence for understanding the economic and political relations between two churches.
Indeed, the bequests are also important evidence not only indicating the financial income of the churches but also dialogue between different religious groups. As was shown earlier, the Latins bequeathed considerable amounts of financial sums and donated properties to the Greek churches in Famagusta. Similarly, the Greek inhabitants of Famagusta donating to the Venetian commune and Latin Churches shows how theological differences were respected amongst the religious groups existed in Famagusta. One of the best examples testifying to the ‘peaceful’ existence of diverse religious groups is the simultaneous presence of Latins, Greeks, Jews, Nestorians, Jacobites, Georgians etc. and ‘infidels’ attending the funeral of Peter Thomas in the Carmelite church of Famagusta. Furthermore, the Latin priests frequenting the Greek churches and Greek women singing hymns and playing flute at Latin funerals as attested by the ecclesiastical records indicates the opposite of what the traditional historiography suggests. The picture becomes clearer when one includes the commercial activities of the indigenous Greeks and their collaborations with Latin merchants.

Moreover, the artistic and architectural evidence coming from ecclesiastical monuments in rural areas suggest that cultural interaction was not limited to the cosmopolitan cities but also in highly Greek populated areas. In this sense, although the limited amount of written sources and lack of archaeological evidence leads scholars to be more careful in describing the religious dynamics of medieval Cyprus, the evidence presented above suggests that the religious and cultural dynamics of Famagusta under the Latin rule cannot be categorized solely by class, faith, or ethnic group. As it is previously noted, the simultaneous appearance of Gothic elements in Greek Churches and Byzantine elements in Latin Churches is a highly important factor shedding light on the complex existence of unique religious and cultural elements. At this point, the common use of ecclesiastical space and monumental evidence should be analysed together with primary evidence in order to provide a clearer

737 See chapter three (section one) and Coureas, N. The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312 (Ashgate, 1997), p. 265.
picture which cannot be explained with the reductionist approaches that have shaped the traditional historiography. However, for more objective and consistent examination further archaeological evidence is necessary.
CHAPTER 4

Structure, Function and Activities of the Administration

4.1 Establishment of the Latin Administration: Institutions, Jurisdiction and Personnel

In attempting to visualise the socio-economic and socio-cultural aspects of medieval Famagusta from late thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, the administrative structure and the changes it underwent during the Latin hegemony must be examined in order to understand the social and economic hierarchy on the island. By analysing the new constitutional model established by the Latins, this section seeks to explore the structure and process of the administrative system and societal ranks that emerged with the arrival of Franks. To begin with, it is clear that, in spite of the considerable respect for Byzantine culture and identity on the island, the Lusignans established a sort of hybrid administrative system inspired by both Westerner and Easterner traditions. However it seems that, if Latins occupied higher administrative levels, the appearance of Greek and Syrian families in the administrative system, and as a landowning elite, and references to wealthy landed families in rural sites, suggest a substantial-enough degree of continuity. Yet, it is not known if all the wealthy landed families from the Byzantine period still kept their high social status or if the new Frankish regime brought a totally new elite class to the island. In this case, two significant questions are raised: what was the socio-economic position of the Frankish elites? Did the existence of a new social group (i.e Franks) affect the already existing social balance and access to rank and status?
After the conquest of Cyprus in 1191 by Richard the Lion Heart, the island witnessed radical administrative changes. As political and economical dynamics started to change in the island especially during the early Lusignan period, new social and political classes emerged. Shortly after the conquest the Latin ecclesiastical hierarchy was established on the island in 1196. With the recognition of pope’s authority by the Franks, the king was at the top of the social strata surrounded by the Frankish knights and clerics.\(^{738}\) Apparently, the most visible social stratum from the Frankish period is the emergence of a new elite class who replaced the Greek provincial elites of the middle Byzantine period. It is well-known that Guy de Lusignan invited the knights, nobles and burgesses from the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia and Frankish states offering them irrevocable privileges.\(^{739}\) The nobles and burgesses who arrived mainly dwelt in Nicosia, Famagusta, Paphos and Limassol. The aforementioned groups together with the Frankish lords and the Hospitallers, who arrived later on, shaped the early administration in Cyprus. Moreover, the immigration of high-ranking classes from the mainland to Cyprus also continued after the second half of thirteenth century. The invasion of Syria and Palestine in 1244 by Khwarezmians, and conquests of Caesarea in 1265, Antioch in 1268, Latakia in 1287, Tripoli in 1289 and finally Acre in 1291 by Mamluks resulted in a massive influx of immigrants towards Cyprus including nobles, barons, and knights. But it also included people from lower ranks,\(^{740}\) the Frankish elite class, constituted a small proportion of the Cypriot community in general.

Starting with the formation and functioning of the new administration established after the arrival of Franks, it was clearly the intention of the Lusignans to create a unique constitutional model in order to keep the integration process going, continue the recruitment


of nobility from the mainland (especially from Jerusalem, the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia, and Syria), and at the same time to maintain good relations with the indigenous population for the maintainability of the Frankish regime on the island. The legal system established by the Lusignans was comprised of the Assizes of Jerusalem and the Byzantine constitutional laws. There were two main legal institutions, namely the High Court (Haute Cour) and the Court of Burgesses (Cour des Bourgeois), and their function was copied from those of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. However, although the High Court and the Court of Burgesses observed the same laws as the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, the Kingdom of Cyprus was not jurisdictionally subordinate to its counterpart. Although the ‘Assizes of the High Court’ and ‘Assizes of the Court of Burgesses’ in the Kingdom of Cyprus describe the jurisdictional system as same as the Assizes of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, the ‘constitution’ was a mixture of Eastern (Byzantine) and Western (Jerusalem’s) traditions which can be described as ‘unique’ in some instances.

The usage of the Byzantine administrative practices enabled Franks to maintain relatively peaceful relations with the multi-ethnic society for the continuation of Latin hegemony on the island. For example, the Court of Burgesses served not only Franks but also Greeks and other ethnic groups as well. Also any social group from any ethnic background was entitled to take an oath according to their language and religion in the court. Moreover, Greeks, Syrians and Armenians enjoyed judicial autonomy and social privileges under the Lusignan hegemony. Both Syrians and Greeks had their own courts in the island as is attested by the records. Although, the establishment of ‘Cour des Suriens’ on the island

---

is not known, there is a mention of a Syrian ‘raicius’\textsuperscript{745} in 1210. The existence of ‘Cour des Suriens’ both in Nicosia and Famagusta during the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is obvious from the notarial records. Interestingly, the Court of Syrians was not only handling the cases concerning the Syrians but also held cases involving Genoese, Venetians and Greeks.\textsuperscript{746} Similarly, the Greek Episcopal courts and local tribunals that existed during the Byzantine period continued to serve Greeks during the Latin hegemony. Their existence was guaranteed by the \textit{Bulla Cypria} in 1260, and more importantly ‘family law’ was also under the jurisdiction of the Greek church tribunals. In fact, the Lusignans did not force Greek courts to fully adopt the new administrative practices transferred from the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem and neither did their newly established administration function in the same way as its counterparts in the Latin East. As Angel Konnari already mentioned, “[…] the compiler of a ca. 1300 manual of the Episcopal court of Paphos/Arsinoe inserted a selection of Byzantine law that included articles on property transactions between spouses or individuals, loans, testaments, guardianship, the Farmer’s law, and the Sea law, some of which cover aspects of penal law.”\textsuperscript{747}

Regarding the differences and similarities in the function of the administration before and after the conquest of Richard the Lionheart available evidence does not offer too much. One way of approaching this issue is to compare the form of Byzantine and Lusignan administration to the social classes that existed in both periods. To start with the twelfth century while Cyprus was a Byzantine province and civil, military and religious issues were controlled by the emperor from Constantinople, the appointment of court dignitaries to the highest local offices and the nomination of its archbishops were both carried out by the

\textsuperscript{745} Raicius (or ra’is), the headman of the community, was a knight in Cyprus as in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Edbury, P. \textit{The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191-1374} (Cambridge, 1991), p. 194; Richard, J. “La Cour des Syriens de Famagouste D’apres un Texte de 1448” in \textit{Croisades et États latins d’Orient}, Variorum Reprints, (Ashgate, 1992), pp. 383-398.

\textsuperscript{746} Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘Greeks’, 24; \textit{LS [Balard] 39}, no. 60 and \textit{[Simeone]}, no. 6.

\textsuperscript{747} Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘Greeks’, pp. 24-5.
emperor.\textsuperscript{748} However, the island also had close contacts with the Greek ‘oikoumene’ because of its political connection with the Byzantine capital. Due to the network of contacts with the ‘oikoumene’, strong ties were established between monastic foundations, and several monasteries were owned daughter houses and properties on the island.\textsuperscript{749} During the twelfth century, the highest level of the stratification was the ‘archontes’, in other words a group of powerful individuals including land owners, officials of the imperial administration and hierarchs. At the same time the peasant class also known as ‘paroikoi’ constituted the lower level of the hierarchy. Furthermore, cities also hosted artisans and merchants who were powerful enough to drive the Templars from Nicosia during 1192.\textsuperscript{750}

Under the Latin hegemony, the Greeks divided into three classes. The lowest class was the ‘paroikoi’ (the Greek serfs) who were under the jurisdiction of the lord and seigneurial baillis. The second class was the ‘francomati’ (the Greek free peasants) and no special body existed for them. Most probably this class was inherited from the Byzantine class of ‘eleutheroi’ (free peasants).\textsuperscript{751} Eleutheroi are normally mentioned at the moment when imperial permission was granted for them to settle on the property of landlords. The third class was the ‘perpyriarioi’ also known as the Greek burgesses.\textsuperscript{752} Also, a high-ranking class of ‘archontes’ continued to exist after the Byzantine period as well. According to the chronicle of Benedict of Peterborough after the defeat of Isaac’s armies by Richard:

‘‘Counts, barons and men from all over the island agreed to hand over to the king half their property, on the condition that they could keep the laws and institutions in force at the

\textsuperscript{749} Ibid, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{752} Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘Greeks’, pp. 16 and 24.
time of the emperor Manuel Comnenus; this request was granted by the king and confirmed by a charter.’”

Richard the Lionheart’s regime allowed all inhabitants to keep half of their properties. However, after the revolts (1191-2) property belonging to the Greek ‘archontes’ and also all state and imperial land together with some of the ecclesiastical property were confiscated by Guy de Lusignan. The confiscations also involved also those who did not co-operate and rose against the Lusignan regime. Properties confiscated in 1191 from the Byzantine crown and archontes was redistributed by Guy de Lusignan and his brother Aimery to attract more knights, fiefs and nobles to the island. Although, there is a common belief that the Lusignan regime introduced a new ruling class that replaced the Greek archontes, the available evidence suggests that the Greek archontes and their properties still existed. Moreover, the Greeks were not the only ones whose properties were confiscated by the Lusignans. For instance, in the 1240s most of the Venetian properties in Limassol were appropriated by the Lusignan government and re-distributed among the knights, turcopoles, Latin secular clergy, some Greeks and other trade communes. The existence of wealthy Greek families and a group of educated Greeks during the Lusignan regime is attested by the official records. Titles such as quir (κυρ), messire (μεζίρ), sire (σίρ) and lord (αύτήριος) that appear in the thirteenth and fourteenth century texts referring to the Greeks suggest that some of them belonged to the classes of ‘francomati’ and ‘perpyriarios’. As a result of the emergence of a hybrid system comprised of the Byzantine and Latin kingdoms administrative traditions, the new class of Greek bureaucrats were actually the part of Lusignan

754 Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘Greeks’, p. 27.
755 Ibid, p. 27 and fn. 44. Grivaud (2007), p. 108. Edbury, P. ‘Franks’, p. 77. According to Leontios Makhairas, Guy de Lusignan granted privileges to ‘the Syrians [...] that they should pay in all cases the half of the fees due for buying and selling, and whatever dues the natives paid they [the Syrians] were not to pay’. Makhairas, I, no. 26.
administration where Westerners had to rely on them concerning both the bi-lingualism of administration and bureaucratic contacts with Byzantium.\textsuperscript{757}

Additionally, the Frankish administration model inherited the main body called ‘secrète’ which functioned like the ‘sekreton’ of the Byzantine imperial ‘genikon’. The ‘secrète’, as it was during the Byzantine period, was responsible for keeping cadastral and fiscal records and also functioned as a central financial office monitoring the income of the royal domain and government expenditure.\textsuperscript{758} Also, private administrative procedures such as engagement, marriage, divorce and inheritance were attached to diocesan courts and their function suggests that these institutions were the continuation of their predecessors existing during the period of Manuel Comnenus.\textsuperscript{759} The office of ‘secrète’ in Cyprus was comprised of secretains, scribes and accountants who were managed by a bailiff until the end of the fourteenth century. In the fifteenth century, the bailiff was appointed from among the Frankish aristocracy.\textsuperscript{760} Moreover, another important institution that continued to function during the Lusignan period was the ‘comerc’ and it directly derived from the Byzantine ‘kommerkion’. The institution of ‘comerc’ was in charge of commercial traffic and the duties on export and import. In Byzantium, these commercial transactions were controlled by the state through the ‘kommerkiarioi’ and these agents’ field of activity was trade.\textsuperscript{761} It is argued that kommerkiarioi maintained strong connections with state power in Byzantium and they were powerful enough to supply weapons to the Byzantine army. In addition, the officials

\textsuperscript{757} Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘Greeks’, pp. 53-5.
\textsuperscript{758} Ibid, p. 29; Grivaud (2007), p. 108.

Regardless of the nature and form of Lusignan administration, some of the aspects of the newly established state system remained undifferentiated from its Byzantine predecessor, as can also be seen from its staff. Some historians have detected that educated groups of Greek families, such as \textit{Kappadokas (or Capadoca), Boustronios (or Bustron), and Sekretikos (or Syngritico)} still existed and participated in royal administration. The Greek Syngritico family was the main one who benefited from the administrative transformation. In other words, the Syngritico family members both staffed the Byzantine ‘sekreton’ and the Lusignan ‘secrète’ from the early thirteenth to sixteenth century.\footnote{Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘‘Greeks’’, pp. 50-1; Grivaud (2007), p. 109. Also for the existence of Greek notaries and continuity of local Byzantine chancery tradition see: Beihammer, A. ‘Byzantine Chancery Traditions in Frankish Cyprus: The Case of the Vatican MS Palatinus Graecus 367’’ in Identités Croisées en un milieu Méditerranéen: le cas de Chypre (Antiquité - Moyen Âge), Sabine Fourrier and Gilles Grivaud (ed.), Publications des Universités de Rouen et du Havre (1970), pp. 301-315.} The surname ‘\textit{Syngritico}’ (or Sekretikos) designates the profession of an official who held place in ‘secrète’. The earliest mention of a ‘secretain’ from the Sekretikos family was Constantine Sekretikos who died in 5 April 1261. Others such as Theodara, daughter of Constantine Sekretikos, Ioannis, son of Constantine Sekretikos, George Syngritikos, Sir Nikolaos Syngritikos, ‘maestro’ Gioan Synglitica and Antonios Sinkritikos, were all mentioned in several texts dated both from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\footnote{Nicolaou-Konnari, A. ‘‘Greeks’’, p. 51.} Apart from the Sekretikos family, other prominent Greek families such as the \textit{Kontostephanos (Condostefano), Apodehatoro (Podocatoro), Kappadokas (Capadoca), Boustronios (Bustron) and Sozomenos (Sozomeno)} were all mentioned in the records of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. For instance, Theodore
Condostefano was bilingual scribe of the ‘secrète’ of the Latin bishopric of Limassol in late fourteenth century. Georgius Capadocius is mentioned in 1411 bearing the title of ‘consiliaris regni’. Others such as Sava Sozomeno, Michel Apodicator, Sitlianos Kontostephanos, Sir John Apodehatoro, and Johan Quinnamo were all mentioned in the records either as holding official titles or belonging to the well-known families.\textsuperscript{765} In 1237, Pope Gregory IX stated that lords in the Kingdom of Cyprus rather preferred Greek and Syrian baillis in their casalia which diminished the number of Latin baillis in general.\textsuperscript{766} Some of the individuals of Greek and Syrian origin also must have been converted to the Latin rite as their status suggests. The ‘praktoras’ Nicol Bili was married the sister of John Sozomenos who later married to the sister of Leontios Makhairas allegedly joined to the Frankish nobility around 1370s. Other examples include ‘Quir Dimitri Boustron, the knight ‘messire Thomas Boustrou’, some members of the old Byzantine family ‘Kinnamos’, Strambali (bailli?), Theodoros the liege-man, a Greek burgess called Sir Thomas Barech who became a Latin knight and lastly Thibald Belfarage who adopted the Latin rite in order to achieve higher status are just some of them to mention.\textsuperscript{767} In fact, the conversion to the Latin rite was probably ineluctable for those who wanted to become knights. Other than that cross-marriage between prominent families, such as that of Isabella of Lusignan and Manuel Cantacuzenos of Mystras in 1355, partly explains the appearance of prominent Greek families in the governmental body.\textsuperscript{768}

Overall, from an institutional point of view, the presence of Greek and Syrian officials in administrative units was a pre-requisite for the early stages of Latin hegemony. However,

the appearance of prominent Greek and Syrian families in important official positions from the thirteenth to sixteenth century suggests that these communities from different ethnic backgrounds acquired special legal and social privileges until the Ottoman conquest. Indeed, the participation of Greek scholars in the royal court also indicates how indigenous Greek aristocrats and Latins co-operated during the Lusignan period. The presence of Greek archontes during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is also attested by the Greek texts. In the early thirteenth century, a Greek monk called Neophytos the Recluse stated that he borrowed religious manuscripts from wealthy archontes. Similarly, at the same period Greek bishop Neilos asked for financial support for a monastery from the Greek archontes of the island. In the fourteenth century, moreover, the Greek scholar George Laphides participated in the court of King Hugh IV to discuss theology and philosophy. At this point, it is necessary to mention that no rebellion is recorded against the Frankish regime by archontes or peasants in Cyprus whereas in Crete four of them were suppressed by Venice during the thirteenth century. It is not known whether the Greek archontes’ silence was due to their pleasant relations with the Frankish regime or that their economic power was weakened by Latins. As Angel Konnari pointed out, they neither exist as a ‘social class’ like in Venetian Crete nor can be described as a ‘special class of Greek aristocracy like in Frankish Morea’. However, it would not be correct to describe them as a ‘second class aristocracy’ either.


771 Konnari ‘Greeks’, p. 43. Angel Nicolaou-Konnari suggests that during the Latin hegemony on the island a new class of Greek nobility emerged which was a natural result of a process of social mobility that started in the thirteenth century. On the contrary, Benjamin Arbel suggest that it was rather certain individuals from various social groups who became somehow wealthy than emergence of a new class of Greek nobility. He believes that, except the title ‘magnifico’, others such as ‘messer’ and ‘sir’ that were attributed to the Greeks do not necessarily indicate nobility. However, the hypothesis of Arbel seems to fit partly with the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries where the Haute Cour was abolished by Venice and title ‘magnifico’ referred to the nobles. Konnari ‘Greeks’, pp. 48-50 and Arbel, B. ‘The Cypriot Nobility from the Fourteenth to the Sixteenth Century: A New Interpretation’ in *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th Centuries* (Ashgate, 2000), pp. 176-9 and 187-90.
It is beyond doubt that the central organs of the newly established Latin administration on the island included Greek and Syrian officials who also acquired royal prerogatives during the Lusignan period. However, equally important is the functionality of the administrative institutions established in Famagusta. The re-orientation of institutional policies and functionality of institutions seems to differ from their predecessors in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The available evidence regarding the process and evaluation of administration in Famagusta during the Lusignan and Venetian periods enables us to examine similarities and differences between the Kingdom of Cyprus, the Latin West and Kingdom of Jerusalem. As it will be seen, on some occasions the function and nature of institutions differ even between Famagusta and other cities of Cyprus. First of all, among the most important legal institutions were the Haute Court (High Court) and the Burgess Courts. The Haute Court represented the royal power and dealt with feudal issues whereas the Court of Burgesses handled non-feudal cases.\footnote{Assizes, p. 35; J. Richard, ‘The Institutions of the Kingdom of Cyprus’, p. 155.} The burgess court existed both in Nicosia and Famagusta presided over by viscounts. The viscounts were nominated by the king and were responsible for the administration of justice.\footnote{Assizes, p. 30; J. Richard, ‘The Institutions of the Kingdom of Cyprus’, p. 160.} Although, it is not known when exactly the burgess court was established in Famagusta, the first mention can be found in the notarial documents during the late thirteenth century. The work of Genoese notary Lamberto Sambuceto refers to the court of burgesses and its officers in Famagusta very often.\footnote{Assizes, pp. 30-1 and fn. 70. For original source; LS [Balard] 39, nos. 13, 46, 155; LS [Pavoni] 32, nos. 36, 89; LS [Pavoni] 49, nos. 278. Regarding to the establishment of Burgess Court Nicholas Coureas suggests that it was more likely established between 1285 and 1296: The Assizes, p. 31.} Apart from the burgess court, the Syrian Court was presided over by a ‘rais’ and the ‘comerc’ was presided over by a bailli whose duty was to deal with customs duties all are mentioned in the records concerning Famagusta.\footnote{Assizes, p. 31; Richard, J. ‘The Institutions of the Kingdom of Cyprus’, p. 164; Pegolotti, ‘Pratica della mercatura’, pp. 83-4; Richard, J. ‘Le peuplement latin et syrien en Chypre au XIIIe siècle’ in Croises, Missionnaires et Voyageurs (London, 1983), pp. 157-73; Richard, J. ‘Le droit et les institutions franques dans le royaume de Chypre’ in Croises, Missionnaires et Voyageurs (London, 1983), pp. 3-20; Richard, J. ‘La court des
viscount and dealt in civil cases just like the burgess court in Famagusta. As it is examined in
detail in the Chapter three, the Court of the Syrians also handled cases concerning Greeks and
probably Latins as well. More importantly, the viscount of the Syrian Court of Famagusta
in late fifteenth century was a certain Greek called *Andreas Kazolis*, which indicates that the
court was multi-ethnic in nature.

Moreover, the existence of the *Marine Court* and *Market Court* in Famagusta is
attested by the Assizes of the Lusignan Kingdom of Cyprus. The Marine Court was
presided over by the castellan of Famagusta and dealt only with the cases involving overseas
transportation and maritime law. However, as Nicholas Coureas observed, the maritime law
applied in the Marine Court of Famagusta was functionally different from Roman
(Byzantine) and French maritime law. According to the Assizes,

‘‘[i]f ship or boat run into danger on account of bad weather, and have a small or
major part of its cargo thrown overboard [or] the sailors’ put their life into a risk] due to a
bad weather, the law decrees that it should be judged in the Marine Court. [However] they
should not have recourse to duelling, that is trial by battle, nor for any claim regarding the
journey, for recourse to trial by battle can be had in other courts of the burgesses, should the
summons concern a sum of one silver mark or more. And this is the purpose of the Marine
Court, the so-called Court of the Chain, for the resolution of such issues, and so it was not

---

776 See section on society in general. Also, for notarial evidence Simeone, no. 6. Edbury, P. *The Kingdom of
Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191-1374*, (Cambridge, 1991), p. 194 and Coureas, N. *The Latin Church in Cyprus,
1313-1378* in general.
777 For original source, The Chronicle of George Boustronios, 1456-1489, trans. R. M. Dawkins (Melbourne,
778 [Assizes], Codex 1, Article nos. 41, 43, 45, 46, 230, 274, 288, 290-4.
779 [Assizes], p. 99 and fn. 208.
established for cases of theft, murder, or conspiracy. For such matters [one] should go [to the cour de bourgeois].”

On the other hand, the Market Court was involved in cases regarding customs duties payable by those arriving by sea and land. The Market Court was presided over by a bailli and aimed to serve ‘‘Muslims, Syrians, Jews, Samaritans, Christians and all the other races’’. The Market Court was comprised of six assessors (four Syrians and two Latins) in its judicial body that was responsible for claims coming before the bailli. Apart from the custom duties, the cases such as ‘lost or destroyed debt securities, rents from houses, or any other matter done by a Syrian, a Jew, a Samaritan, a Muslim, a (Latin) Christian, a Nestorian, a Greek, a Jacobite, or an Armenian’ were dealt in the Market Court. However, since there is no mention of the Market Court in the official records of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries it would not be wrong to assume that it had lost its function generally on the island. It is more likely that the Market Court functioned in Famagusta for a brief period during the early Lusignan period and was then replaced by the bailli of the commerchium.

The economic institutions (such as commerchium, fondouk, bancum) and the commercial quarter established in Famagusta will be observed comprehensively in the following section. However, it is highly necessary to examine the nature of the urban institutions which evolved in Famagusta in order to see the whole picture. Identifiable institutions that existed both in Famagusta and Nicosia were ‘universita’ and ‘popolo’. The universita in Nicosia was comprised of nobles, knights, feudatories, burgesses and commoners, while in Famagusta it included Genoese settlers and local burgesses as well.

---

780 [Assizes], Codex One, Article nos. 41 and 43.
781 [Assizes], Codex One, Article no. 288.
782 [Assizes], no. 288.
783 [Assizes], p. 31. See also section on establishment of economic institutions in Famagusta for the notarial evidence for function of commerchium in Famagusta.
On the other hand, the popolo was comprised of members from lower strata of the population. However, both establishments must have been politically and economically powerful enough to be involved in public affairs. For example, when the Genoese authority decided to transfer the administration of Famagusta to the Casa di san Giorgio in 1447, they had to negotiate first with the members of the ‘universita’ and ‘popolo’. Moreover, when the city surrendered to the King Jacques II in 1464, the negotiator of the terms of surrender was a delegator representing the universita of Famagusta. According to Benjamin Arbel, one of the most visible differences between the universita in Nicosia and Famagusta was their personnel. Opposite to Famagusta, the universita of Nicosia contained only the members of high rank, that is nobility and burgesses. The same phenomenon can be seen for the early sixteenth century regarding the town councils of both cities. Apparently, during the early sixteenth century membership of the town councils in Nicosia required high rank standards whereas council in Famagusta was open to the artisan guilds. According to Benjamin Arbel, this was due to the poorer population of Famagusta compared to the capital. However, the major problem with this hypothesis is that the socio-economic importance of Famagusta during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is not considered. As it is already observed, Famagusta not only served as a major port but also hosted a considerable amount of nobles, burgesses, knights and rich families. Therefore, to consider Famagusta as a favourite place for only merchants and Nicosia for nobles would mislead historians. Arbel’s approach would have been much more convincing if notarial records revealed no burgesses and nobles dwelling in Famagusta. In fact, as is shown in the following sections, the legal and ‘economic’ institutions established in Famagusta were all referred to in the notarial records together with their official personnel. The city was legally and socially well-organized and urban institutions played an important role in socio-political affairs. In this sense, the

participation of people from the lower strata in urban institutions could be explained by the cosmopolitan nature of the city. Considering the multi-ethnic population and economic importance of Famagusta, the urban institutions were probably more active and developed than those in the Nicosia. However, since there is not adequate evidence attesting to the early formation and function of these institutions it would not be appropriate to draw definitive conclusions about their development.
4.2 Establishment of A Western Commercial Quarter:

Beginning in the thirteenth century, the commercial buildings such as the fondaco, the loggia, and the commerzium established in Famagusta became part of the main urban centre and constituted an important part of the trade patterns. They most likely existed in the city from the early decades of the thirteenth century, when the Genoese merchants of Famagusta were already involved in trade (see section 2.2). However, these buildings were becoming more common toward the end of thirteenth century and reached their peak during the fourteenth century. The emergence of new merchant companies in Famagusta and the changing networks in the Mediterranean after the year 1291 facilitated the development of such buildings in the matter of their economic and social features. An archaeological study of such buildings is needed in order to better understand the patterns of the complex web of connections between East and West. On the other hand, the analysis of the historical development of commercial institutions in medieval Famagusta will reveal the operational features of the merchant companies as well.

As far as western trade is concerned, the commerchio (customs house) was the main institution in Famagusta, which served as a tax office and monitored exchanged commodities. It was located in the mercantile district close to the port, with the banks of the money changers and warehouses. At the beginning the functions of the comerc were highly related with its Byzantine ancestor the kommerkion. In Byzantium, the state used to control commercial transactions through the kommerkiarioi and there was a strong connection with its Byzantine ancestor the kommerkion.

---

between the *kommerkiarioi* and state power in Byzantium. Similarly, these institutions somehow enhanced urban space and they become commercial magnets attracting constant merchant immigration into the city. The Byzantine *kommerkiarioi* continued to exist after the conquest of Richard Lionheart in 1191. Lusignan documents from the period mentions a tariff called ‘‘*comerc’’ as well. Moreover, Venetian official records of the later periods also certify the receipt of a tax called ‘‘*comerchio’’ until the Ottoman conquest of the island. In Byzantium, the kommerkion designated simultaneously the place where trade takes place and a tax imposed on goods. However, in medieval Cyprus the *comerchio* served both commercial and administrative functions. We knew from the acts of Lamberto Sambuceto that occasionally he drafted contracts at or near this location, and also two documents from 1300 clearly indicate that the *Comerzium* was adjacent to the Venetian *loggia*. Indeed, this fact finds confirmation in the chronicle of Leontios Makhairas, who recorded that in 1368 during the fight between the Genoese and the Venetians, the Genoese climbed on to the roof of the *Comerzium* and threw stones at the Venetians. Evidence from the fourteenth century provides much more information about the functionality of the ‘*comerc’’. The *Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois* thus includes several indications of fraud regarding the drafting of commercial acts and requires that *secretaires* must proceed to the offices located in ports. Along with its official feature during the Lusignan period, *Comerzium* also served as a public place where the transactions were made by king’s officers, secretaries and foreign notaries.

---


793 LS [Balard], no. 148 “*Actum Famaguste, ante comerzium, die XVIII iunii, circa compleotorium’’ and no. 206 "*Actum Famaguste, ante comerzium Famagusta, die VIIII Augusti, circa vesperas.’’ For later periods; LS [Pavoni] 32, no. 235 and LS [Pavoni] 49, no. 36.

The Genoese notary Lamberto Sambuceto drafted transactions on several occasions in the commerzium during the fourteenth century, and its multi-functional feature is mentioned later by Pegolotti who described it as a customs place where business transactions was performed.

The oldest record concerning the ‘comerc’ dates back to the year 1216, when Hugh I provides a three-year truce with the Seljuk Sultan of Rum and guarantees the freedom and safety of Seljuk merchants who were involved in trade in Cyprus. The functions of the commerzium established in Famagusta during the Latin period is important to explain the Lusignan policy of monitoring market activities and functions of warehouse, customs office, commercial court, and specific types of transactions. However, although there were similarities between Byzantine kommerkion and Latin commerzium in earlier periods, from the late twelfth century to fifteenth century, it is not possible to say that the commerzium of Famagusta was an imitation of its Byzantine ancestor due to the lack of evidence especially regarding the twelfth century commercial establishments. It is highly possible that the main structures of Byzantine kommerkion were borrowed by Latins for a temporary period. However, it is unclear whether this ‘borrowed’ institution continued to share similarities with the Byzantine kommerkion in the manner of functionality after the twelfth century. Nevertheless, after 1300, there were certain differences between the two institutions, at least in the terms of structure and functionality. In this case, Gilles Grivaud suggests that the commerc established during the Latin period can therefore suggest the decisive role that Byzantine institutions played in the medieval Kingdom of Cyprus. Belonging to the field of indirect taxation, the commerc of medieval Cyprus partly resembles its Byzantine ancestor, but

---

795 See following pages.
the economic and administrative sectors in general were under the Italian influence, which suggests that Byzantine principles were weathered after the twelfth century.\footnote{Ibid, pp. 144-145.}

In some cases, statement of the name of the office of the *comerzium* was used as evidence in the contracts concluded by Latin merchants even though the transaction took place at different place.\footnote{MacKenzie (1994), p. 202.} In an act of 22 November 1300 drafted in *stacione*, Giacomo Signago, Genoese burgess of Famagusta, guaranteed Pietro Gabrielis from Venice, an owner of a galley called “Santa Maria” on which Giacomo loaded wheat and barley, that he will compensate any damage and problem caused by the government of Cyprus due to the departure without authorization. The act was “*actum Famagoste, ad dictam stacionem, die XXII novembris, circa terciam*”. At the very same day, an inhabitant of Famagusta called Jacopo Leo received 984 white besants from Pietro, declared that included in the sum were “*bisancii quingentis albis qui scripti sunt ad Comerzium Famagoste*”. Although there is a reference to the *comerzium* this act was drafted “*actum Famagoste, ad dictam stacionem, die XXII novembris, circa vesperas*”.\footnote{*Stacio*: is a temporary stopping-point for merchants.} The mention of the *Comerzium* in the acts recorded at the *stacione* suggests that these two institutions existed and functioned separately. However, the request by people to the notary to refer to the *Comerzium* in the acts drafted in the *stacione* clearly indicates that the first institution was more reliable and prestigious among the merchants. Moreover, in the following years some of the merchants preferred to mention only the *Comerzium* while the act was composed somewhere near a *stacione*. For example, in the act of 1302 drafted in an unspecified place close to a *stacione* (*iuxta stacionem predictam*), David Ferri, Genoese, received 225 white besants from Margherita, wife of Marco Veneticus, and the act includes the declaration that a sum of money was recorded at

\footnote{LS [Polonio] 31, nos. 127 and 128.
Interestingly, the commercial act, dated back to 5 July 1300, where the Venetian Stephanus Magnus sold half of his ship to another Venetian called Nicolaus Paulus at a price of 825 white besants, was ‘‘Actum Famaguste, iuxta stacionem Berthozii Florentini, speciarii, die quinta iulii, inter primam et terciam’’. In fact, ‘‘Berthozius’’ was a spice dealer who had a shop (probably spice shop) in Famagusta. It is quite clear from the notarial records that this shop also functioned as *stacio* and Sambuceto drafted several acts here. In this sense, it can be said that although the *Commerzium* and *stacio* institutionally differ from each other they also shared functional similarities.

Clearly, the *Commerzium* was not the only institution involved with the commercial affairs. The deeds drafted by Lamberto di Sambuceto and his colleague, Giovanni de Rocha, include a list of several places where the commercial contracts were drawn up: churches, hospitals, and houses of testators on their death bed. Among them the *loggia* appears most frequently as a place for the notarial contracts. One notarial act from 1299 mentions ‘‘...the galley moored directly alongside the Genoese loggia’’, which suggests that the Genoese *loggia* was situated on the harbour side and there was open access to the harbour. According to Peter Edbury, this was the site, which was granted in 1232 whereas the other documents are dated apparently in the 1300s. Sambuceto’s registers include contracts from the late thirteenth century referring to the Genoese loggia around the harbour side. In 1297, Ugezonus Rubeo, a Florentine, concluded a contract ‘‘in logia Ianuensium’’ and received a sum of money in ‘‘white besants’’ from Simone Palacio, inhabitant of Barcelona, and in return he would repay it in gold in 15 days upon arrival in Agrigento (Sicily). In 1300,

---

802 *LS [Pavoni]* 49, no. 176.  
808 LS [Balard] 39, no. 36. See also nos. 32 and 35.
Thomas Albertengus acknowledges having received 32 pounds of Genoa from Ambrosius Salvaigus ‘‘ante logiam Ianuensium’’ and the contract was concluded in front of Niger Sturla, Fredericus, placerius (juris) of the court of Genoa in Famagusta, and a Genoese called Opecinus Arcola.\footnote{LS [Balard], no. 267.} On another occasion, Philipinus, son of Gandulfus Iona de Savone, received 24 pounds of Genoa from Thomas Albertengus in commendam, money borrowed for a commercial venture, and in return Philipinus promised to share a quarter of the profit with Thomas.\footnote{LS [Balard], no. 271.} On 23 September 1300, Maria, a widow of Venetian Iohannes Culcho, received goods that were left her by Iohannes in his will. The contract was ‘‘Actum Famaguste, in logia Venetorum’’.\footnote{LS [Balard], no. 308 and for more examples of contracts concluded in Venetian loggia see: LS[ Pavoni] 32, no. 53.} Interestingly, as a Genoese notary, Lamberto Sambuceto in fact drew up contracts in the Venetian loggia and on one occasion in a Pisan loggia.\footnote{Edbury (1999), p. 346. See also LS [Desimoni], nos. 127, 252, 308; LS [Balard] 43, no. 143.} As notarial evidence suggests, the Genoese and Venetian loggias were situated very close to the harbour at the beginning. However, in the second half of the fourteenth century, the Genoese established a new loggia next to the Franciscan church, which was next to the royal palace at the centre of the city. In 1372 when a riot broke out during the coronation of King Peter II, a large number of Genoese were killed.\footnote{Ibid, p. 340.}

Apart from the Commerzium and loggia, there are mentions of several different commercial places like the fondicus, stacio, volta,\footnote{Volta: arch-vault (Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus, Brill, 2002, p. 1453, or see Balard’s explanation: “The term that designates the Genoese volta, the merchants store, is often situated against a house was not employed in Famagusta. Most probably the swampy nature of the soil precluded the construction of these stores where the buildings identified by C. Enlart were half buried”. Balard, “Famagouste au début du XVle siècle”, pp. 286-287.} bancum,\footnote{Bancum: “[...] the profession of banker was primarily that of a moneychanger who, installed behind a counter (banco), knew the types and value of the specie in circulation, checked the quality of money and practised the manual exchange of coins”. Encyclopaedia of the Middle Ages, A. Vauchez (eds.) vol. 1(Cambridge, 2000), pp. 146-47; Bancum (-s), (-ch-), (-ius), (-a), (-ia): bench Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus (Brill, 2002), p. 106; “or bench at which the money-changer conducted his operations”. R. S. Lopez and I. W.} cambia,\footnote{LS [Balard], no. 267.} apotheca,\footnote{LS [Balard], no. 271.}
hospitals and fish market. In 1302, a Genoese called Raimondino Ugone receive the sum of 400 ‘‘saracen besants’’ and gold worth up to 100 Genoese pounds from Giacomo Tornellus, admiral of the King of Armenia, for his daughters’ dowry and expenses for the marriage ceremony. The contract was drawn up near to the Hospital of St. Anthony and the fish market, which suggests that the Genoese community had another loggia beside the ‘‘logia Ianuensium’’. One of the important commercial places in Famagusta was a stacio which functioned as a temporary stopping point for merchants and also a warehouse for caravans, including stables for horses and accommodation for foreign merchants. Located on the main roads of the city, staciones were considered a variety of caravanserais. On the 15th of February in 1302, a contract concluded in stacione states that the galley called Santa Croce in the Famagusta port, of 300 Genoese cantar was hired to sail to Genoa and Provence for trading purposes. During the same year, Maceus de Addo, an inhabitant of Famagusta declares that he received 300 white besants from a Florentine called Venozius Latinus, in stacione, in order to invest it in trade, keeping for himself one fourth of the profits. It appears in Famagusta there was some overlap between the two kinds of place, where the notary might use the apotheca as a synonym for stacio(ne). Indeed, the act drafted in apotheca mentioned by the notary in 1300 was near to the Genoese loggia which was probably located between the Castle and Arsenal tower. The main concern of the traders


was, of course, the institutions like *commerzium*, *loggia* and *stacio(ne)*. However, on some occasions they preferred *bancum*, *cambia*, churches, or their own places. For example, on the 22nd of March 1300, Ugozonus Caxina authorized Vivianus Ginibaldo and Iacobus Cassina to recover his 280 saracen besants from Bacorinus Luterio and in another act concluded on 7 September 1300, Zuchus acting on behalf of the Pisan, called Nerus Runcha acknowledged that Vivianus Ginembaldo, a money changer, was owed a debt of 431 white besants and 8 carats. Both acts were concluded ‘‘*ad bancum predicti Viviani’’’.823 Again, on the 11th of September 1300, Gregorius Niger declared that Georgius Seccamedaglia purchased a ship called ‘Sanctus Georgius’ in the auction that took place in the Genoese loggia and the deed was drawn up ‘‘*ante cambia Famaguste’’’.824 In addition to the cambia, a considerable amount of notarial deeds were drawn up ‘‘*in ecclesia sancti Nicholai Famagoste’’’,825 the Hospital of St. Anthony (*Sanctum Anthonium*),826 and private houses such as ‘‘*in domo domini seneschalchi (royal official)*’’,827 ‘‘*in domo Guillielmi de Monleone’’’, ‘‘*in domo domini Philip de Bellino’’’ and ‘‘*in domo dicti Viviani’’’.828

Moreover, probably one of the most important commercial places that needs to be discussed here is the *fondicus*. As one of the most frequently visited buildings, the *fondicus* likely existed even during the Byzantine period in Cyprus. From the seventh century onwards, the Muslim countries in the Levant became familiar with the *funduq*.829 Although Islamic *funduqs* began appearing in a somewhat different form from the pre-existing *pandocheions*, they also preserved functional similarities.830 Apart from the fact that funduqs
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served as commercial institutions, they were also used as a part of governmental system by Muslim rulers and local governors in order to control the trade, collect the taxes and sometimes for charity as well.\textsuperscript{831} During the eleventh-twelfth centuries, as a result of the increased East-West trade and considerable number of foreign merchants, trading in the Islamic ports necessitated a new type of funduq. The establishment of funduq in the Islamic lands was to differentiate the Western business and this institution served as a secure accommodation both for European and local merchants and provided every commercial facility to its members.\textsuperscript{832} Attempting to analyse the existence and functionality of funduq established in Famagusta, it is necessary to give a brief outline of diplomatic relations between East and West concerning the evaluation of European commercial institutions in the Islamic lands.

Western maritime republics, namely Venice, Genoa, and Pisa, and trading cities like Marseille, were all interested in establishing fondacos in Egypt and they had close contacts with the Ayyubid government. The first negotiations between Latins and Ayyubids started around the 1170s with Venetian ambassadors and were followed by Genoa and Marseille shortly afterwards. In 1173, Venice established a fondaco in Alexandria and access to the church of St. Michael was granted in the early thirteenth century. Moreover, the Venetian treaty of 1238 clearly states that the keepers of the Venetian fondacos in Egypt have the right to open and close the doors of fondacos as they wished and the internal administration of these institutions was controlled by the Venetians. However, this situation was changed during the Mamluk period, when the keys of the fondacos were kept by Mamluk officials and opening and closing times were arranged by them.\textsuperscript{833} The Pisan merchant community was also present in Egypt. In 1207 the Pisan ambassador was given instructions that he was

\textsuperscript{831} Constable (2003), pp. 6-8.
\textsuperscript{832} Ibid, p. 8.
\textsuperscript{833} Ibid, pp. 123-124.
supposed to make peace with the Ayyubid sultan and also ‘‘to request the Church of St. Nicholas, a fondaco, scales, and bath, and everything else which the Pisans had been accustomed to have in Alexandria in the past.’’ In response, in 1208 Sultan al-‘Adil I decided to exempt Pisans from new taxes and impositions, and give their rights back that they had been granted in the past. At the same time, wider privileges were granted to Venice and Pisa in Aleppo in the early thirteenth century, where the important eastern goods (such as: cotton, silk, pistachios, and medicinal drugs) that were not available in the West circulated in the market. At first sight, to have a fondaco in Aleppo meant that western merchants automatically had access to the goods from Anatolia, Kurdistan, Iraq, and Iran. However, the transition period from the Ayyubid to Mamluk rule in 1250 brought new economic dynamics together with several political upheavals. In this period Byzantium retook Constantinople and the Mongol threat in northern Syria affected the eastern trade. The loss of Christian strongholds such as Acre, Tyre, and Beirut resulted in the replacement of Aleppo with Damascus as the main market for Christian merchants in Syria.

The European type of fondaco most probably existed in Cyprus during the early twelfth century. However, the two terms fondaco and loggia were related and even intermingled. This is well indicated in the notarial act dated to 1297. On 21 July 1297, the widow of Nicola Carbonus called Sibilia signed a contract in Nicosia which took place in ‘‘fondico Ianuensium Nicossie, in quo est logia dictorum Ianuensium’’. On 8 August 1300 Iohannes Tarragore acknowledged receipt from Petrus Carabacerius of Tarragone in ‘‘fondicum comunis Ianue, quod tenebat quondam Petrus Rubeus’’ and the deed was drawn up on 2 May 1301 by Genoese citizens stating the conditions of hiring a ship called
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“Sancta Amancia” again took place in “fondico communis Ianue”.

The notarial deed of 8 August 1300 also suggests that some of the fondicos were leased by the individuals where a Petrus Rubeus appears as a holder (“tenebat”) of the fondico.

On 11 October 1299, Guglielmo Carato and Raimondo Marchetus, the patron of the ship, both from Barcelona, promised to Bartolomeo Basterius, consul of the Catalans, to act on their own behalf and on behalf of the Catalan merchants in their ship to transport their goods safely from Aigues-Mortes, and get paid 100 saracen besants. Interestingly, this notarial deed was drafted in the house of seneschal cited as “in domo sive fondico domini seneschalchi Famagoste”.

Hence, it is quite clear that a Genoese fondaco functioned separately from the Genoese loggia and although they can be separate commercial buildings on some occasions they might be in the house of a seneschal.

To sum up, in many ways the use of commercial space in the late thirteenth-century and early-fourteenth century Famagusta is the indication of economic and social patterns that existed on the Crusader mainland. Meanwhile, large quantities of commercial institutions accumulated at the ‘commercial street’ close to the port also indicate the commercial importance of the city, where the presence of the principal maritime powers reveals the level of economic activity.
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4.3 The Personnel of Genoese Administration in Famagusta:

Understanding the role of Genoese officials operated in Famagusta is also important to understand the nature of the ‘commercial quarter’ and the importance of the Genoese commune regarding the commercial and political role they played in medieval Famagusta. Although it is impossible to examine the full nature of the ‘economic’ administration established by Genoese and its officials with the available evidence, every scrap of information helps to picture the socio-political aspects of medieval Famagusta. The information about high and low-ranked official personnel of Genoese administration, albeit limited can be gathered from notarial records. As there are a considerable amount of official titles mentioned in notarial records there are still certain difficulties in describing the exact role or duty of some ‘titles’ mentioned in the acts. In this sense, the aim of this section is firstly to reveal the ‘key’ officials mentioned by notaries and their co-operative role among the Genoese commune. By doing so, an attempt is made to reflect the commercial character of the officials and how the administrative bureaucracy intertwined with the interests of the Genoese merchant community operating in Famagusta.

The Genoese administration of Famagusta was relatively a new establishment compared to the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. This, however, was not specific to Famagusta but more related to the political and economic interests of Genoa in the Holy Land. The early Genoese administration in the island, which occurred in the thirteenth century, has more in common with those of the Latin Kingdoms. The Genoese consuls were representing the commune’s interests but in actual terms it would not be wrong to suggest that administration on the island was controlled by Genoese consuls in Syria. It is also known that the properties
belonging to the Genoese commune, especially in Nicosia and Famagusta, were administered from Syria.\footnote{MacKenzie (1994), p. 224. See also, Mas Latrie, Histoire de Chypre, ii, 39 and 51.} Also, the Genoese administration in Syria was probably not autonomous either. The political and economic affairs both in Syria and in cities of other Crusader states such as Acre, Tyre, Beirut, Tripoli, Ayas, and in Cyprus, were all controlled by the consuls and vicecomites appointed by Genoa in each city. From the twelfth to thirteenth century, Genoese administrations in the Levant were all controlled by officials called ‘consuls’ and ‘vicecomites’ who apparently enjoyed equal status. Nevertheless, it can be said that generally in the Levantine colonies consuls were responsible for the commercial issues and vicecomites were involved in the political and judicial matters. The same phenomenon can be seen for the structure of Genoese administration in Cyprus until 1291.\footnote{MacKenzie (1994), pp. 226-7 and 228-9; Mas Latrie, Histoire de Chypre, ii, p. 51. ‘liberam et meram curiam tam consulates quam vicecomitatus’.} It is therefore reasonable to suggest that the establishment of autonomous or semi-autonomous Genoese administration in the island’s encountered roughly with the early fourteenth century.

There is no doubt that the most developed and well structured Genoese administration on the island was in Famagusta. This was partly due to the commercial importance of Famagusta especially after the loss of Crusader strongholds in the Levant. However, the most important reason for the formalisation of its administration was due to the policy of more centralised administrations in the overseas colonies imposed by Genoa during the thirteenth century. Moreover, even more comprehensive legislative arrangements concerning the colonial administrations in the Mediterranean and Black Sea started during the fourteenth century. The first legislation issued by the Genoese government in 1304 covered all Genoese colonies overseas and comprised of six sections including the duties of officials serving the colonial administrations.\footnote{MacKenzie (1994), pp.229, 231 and fn. 13. See also, Byrne, E. H. ‘The Genoese colonies in Syria’ in L. J. Paetow (ed.), The Crusades and other historical essays presented to Dana C. Munro by his former students,} There isn’t substantial evidence to describe the bureaucratic
duties of Genoese officials in Cyprus before the fourteenth century. However, what is known is that a consul called Guglielmo di Pegli operated in Famagusta in 1277, which is attested by the notarial records of Ayas. The actual responsibility of consuls and vicecomites was defined in 1304 as ‘omnia negotia comunis et ad commune spectantia sive ad communitatem mercatorum et Ianuensium’. The first mention of the Genoese podestà on the island was in 1292 where Matteo Zaccharia was described as ‘potestas et vicecomes Ianuensis in regno Cypri’. The podestà was a city manager and chief judge and enjoyed a more direct authority than the consuls. The existence of a podestà on the island after 1291 is not a surprise at all. Apart from the formalisation attempts by Genoa covering all the colonial administrations, Famagusta was also representing the most important headquarters of Genoa’s Levantine administration after the political and economic defeat of the Latins in 1291. The podestà and consuls in Cyprus were probably chosen from prominent families such as de Mari, Doria, de Nigro and Spinola. For instance, the notarial act dated back to 1297 mentions Pasquale de Mari as a podestà of Nicosia; Babillano Doria was described as a former podestà and Simon Feliranus was former consul of Famagusta. On 14 March 1297, Bonifacius de Nigro, consul, witnessed a business contract of Ugezonus de Rubeo from Florence which was concluded in the Genoese loggia in Famagusta. In January 1299, Viviano de Ginembaldo issued a receipt of 228
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Saracen besants to Maceus Aliatus and contract was witnessed by Iacobus de Groppo, *consul Ianuensium in Famagostte* and Petrus *placerius Famagostte*.\textsuperscript{850}

The consuls were also responsible for the possessions of individuals belonging to the Genoese commune who died intestate due to several reasons. An interesting example comes from the act concluded on 31 May 1300. Nicola Zugneto, the consul of the Venetians in Cyprus, acting on behalf of the *Venetian commune*, sold the galley of Andrea Aycardo, from Negroponte, who died intestate in Satalia (Antalya), to a certain Genoese Maceo *de Clavaro* for 1,500 white besants.\textsuperscript{851} The Venetian consul was not the only one mentioned by Genoese notary Lamberto Sambuceto. In March 1299, Belcare de Belcare, inhabitant of Famagusta received 514 \(\frac{1}{4}\) white besants from Viviano de Ginembaldo, who was acting on behalf of a Pisan consul called Filippo, for 7 sacks of cotton.\textsuperscript{852} On 6 March 1299, Bernardo Faidir, the consul of Narbonne, issued a receipt in Famagusta to Guideto *Spinola* and this transaction was witnessed by Ugo Raymondus de Jerusalem, the consul of Marseille. On the same day, the consul Raymondus issued a receipt to Guideto *Spinola* on behalf of a certain merchant from Marseilles and the witnesses included the aforementioned Genoese *consul* Iacobus *de Groppo*, Percivalis *de Mari* and Petrus *de Negro*.\textsuperscript{853}

Some of the official titles seem to have overlapped from time to time. For example, the aforementioned Genoese consul in Famagusta Iacobus de Groppo is occasionally mentioned as *‘rector Ianuensium in Famagosta’* and Jacobo Rubeo and Pasquale de Mari mentioned as *rectors* of the Genoese in Cyprus.\textsuperscript{854} In this sense, available evidence is inadequate to explain the difference between the *‘rector of the Genoese in Cyprus’* and *‘rector Ianuensium in Famagosta’*. Moreover, the rectorship was divided in itself into the
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different classes as well. A Genoese Iacobus de Signago was ‘rector ordinates in Famagosta super Ianuenses’ and another one ‘rectoris pro Comuni Ianue constituti’. Another official mentioned in the records, whose duty is rather obscure, was vicarius. In Genoa, the vicarious existed in the administrative body responsible for the justice like consuls. In the colonies of Genoa their job was to receive complaints and confirm documents drawn up by the notaries. In Cyprus, however, it seems like they did not hold any office and podestà were allowed to act as vicarii at the same time. In 1297, Pasquale de Mari was mentioned in the notarial act as ‘potestas et vicarius Ianuensium’ and in 1304 Francesco Traverio was ‘vicarius Ianuensium’ without holding any office like podestà and consul. Also, when Giacomo of Accon, priest of Famagusta church, absolved the Florentine merchant Viviano de Ginnembaldo in June 1301, witnesses included the Pisanus vicarius.

Other officials such as ‘seneschal’, ‘castellan’ and ‘bailli’ were also mentioned in the notarial records. In 1299, Guglielmo de Carato, from Barcelona, promised to Bartolomeo Basterius, Catalan consul, transport of a certain amount of cotton to Aigues-Mortes. The transaction took place ‘in domo sive fondico domini seneschalchi Famaguste’. Moreover, in August 1302, Manuele de Vinderico acting on his own behalf and Lapo de Deo, Percivalle Donatus and ‘aliorum sociorum’, gave guarantee before the ‘castellanum Famagoste’ to the Viviano Ginnembaldo, ‘cambitori [et] burgennsi Famagoste’ that their company would not act against Giorgio Focaa, Hoste de Beruto and Tommaso de Sayto for the unspecified amount of cloth. Also Manuele guaranteed that if things happened otherwise he would reimburse all losses. On another occasion, Anthonius of Ancona, acting on behalf of himself and his associates, recognized Ianucius Bartholi of Florance as a guarantor of his ship that the latter
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was about to rent and this agreement had to be also recorded ‘in curia Famaguste domini castelani loci eiusdem Famaguste’.

There were also other officials mentioned in the acts, such as *placerius*, *baculerius*, *nuncius*, *serviens*, *scribania*, and *notarius*, who can be considered as a ‘staff of minor officials’ whose duties are uncertain. Among them *placerius* (juris) is the one mentioned more often in the notarial contracts. Although, the relationship of this job to other officials is unclear they witnessed a considerable amount of business contracts. For example, in September 1297, one issued a receipt of 1,450 white besants to Giovanni in front of the curator Oberto Alenus and the *podestà* Pasquale de Mari, and witnesses were ‘Gregorius placerius comunis Ianue et Liacius, serviens domini potestatis’. On another occasion, Federico di Mantoa, *Ianuensis placerius Famagoste*, appointed two procurators, namely Leonardo and Borborino Aurie, who were responsible for dealing with any issues on his behalf. It is worth mentioning that this act was also witnessed by the aforementioned Iacobus de Groppo, the consul. In December 1299, Leonardus de Recho, *magister axie*, received 100 white besants of Cyprus from the well-known Genoese family member Rabella de Grimaldi, promising to repay within 6 months. The transaction took place ‘in logia Ianuensium Famaguste’ and witnessed by ‘Iacobus de Signago, rector Ianuensium in Famagusta, Abraynus, custos logie, et Becaria, placerius comunis Famaguste’. The placerius probably had more legitimate power than *vicarius* and was involved more in social and administrative affairs regarding the Genoese commune. The *placerii* were probably well-known in society as well as the fact that the act drawn up in June 1300 in the ‘iuxta domum
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qua moratur Garinus’ stated that this place was ‘ad portam domus Oberti, olim placerii comunis Famaguste Ianuensium’ just to prevent any complication based upon the location. The notaries and scribanii were also part of the ‘staff of minor officials’ whose duties become more comprehensive as the colonial administrations of the Genoese developed. Their main job was to record the official business of the commune and they generally played a supervisory role. In the early fourteenth century, Genoa imposed an obligation that all notaries operating in the Genoese colonies had to be members of the College of notaries in Genoa. However, the subscribae were the only exception and they were not forced into membership of the College. In the fourteenth century, there were three principal Genoese scribanie specifically in Pera, Caffa and Cyprus. Since it is certain that there were also other notaries in other places that Genoa conducted trade, the title ‘scribanie’ and official ‘scribanie office’ established in the aforementioned port cities represented the major emporia that played important role for the success of Genoa in the Mediterranean and Black Sea trade. For example, in 1299, the Genoese notary Lamberto Sambuceto was ‘notario scribe Comunis in Famagosta’, a certain Abranus was ‘scriba domini vicecomitis’ and Andrea de Vercelli was ‘notarii, scribe episcope Famagusta’. Indeed, the scribes were also employed in the Venetian administration while maintaining the same role as in Genoese ones. On 5 July 1300, the Venetian Stephanus Magnus sold half share of a galley called ‘Saint Nicholas’ to another Venetian Leonardus Paradisius for 825 white besants. According to the act, Nicolaus Bastianus of Venice was ‘scriba dicte galee’. In fact, the appearance of Nicolaus as a scribe of the galley indicates that Venetian scribes were responsible for the records of business affairs concerning the Venetian commune of Famagusta. The actual difference
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between *notary, scribe* and *‘notarii et scribae’* is difficult to describe. The mentions of the ‘notarius’ in the business transactions are however impressive. For instance, Nicolinus Binellus, ‘notarius’, Iacobi, Grimaldi, ‘notarii’, Conradi Stephanoni, ‘notarii’, Bernabonis de Meda ‘notarii’ were all mentioned as ‘publico scripte’. 870

There were probably more officials operating in the Genoese and Venetian ‘economic’ administrative body that notarial records do not mention. However, despite the uncertainties regarding the exact role of mentioned officials, the available evidence indicates how important Famagusta was as a commercial hub for Genoa. Unfortunately, it is impossible to display the whole picture since we do not have adequate data about the Venetian, Pisan, Anconitan and Florentine officials and the body of their official structure. But it would not be wrong to suggest that both the ‘judicial’ and ‘economic’ administrative structures established in Famagusta were more comprehensive and complex than the limited amount of evidence presented above suggests.
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CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Economic, Social and Administrative Development of Famagusta in comparison with Rhodes in Late Middle Ages

The aim of this chapter is to summarise the results that were reached in each chapter and apply the previously established questions to the whole corpus of data. In this respect, this concluding chapter will collate and summarise all the previously presented arguments and facts from the previous chapters in an effort to draw more certain conclusions. However, comparative analysis is necessary in this case due to the unavailability of specific archival sources and lack of archaeological data. To this end, the comparison between Famagusta and Rhodes in terms of their economic and administrative development together with the architectural aspects will certainly help to draw clearer picture. The analyses provided in this thesis rely fundamentally on archival and visual material. The major problem encountered when analyzing such data assembled from archival material is (1) the large time gaps between the published notarial records and (2) a lack of archaeological evidence that prevented comparative analysis between the archival and archaeological evidence. Although available notarial records concerning Famagusta yield invaluable insights into the subject under examination, the numismatic, ceramic, pottery and underwater survey data from the harbour are crucial for a better understanding of economic dynamics. Beside the archival evidence, the urban development of Famagusta can be partly uncovered by examining the visual evidence (such as ecclesiastical and administrative buildings) in order to portray the economic, social, and religious dynamics of the city as a whole. By providing an analysis of diverse sources, this research has revealed the role of Famagusta in the Levantine trade and
its merchant companies, the administrative development and functionality of the city, the socio-cultural interaction among society and the relatively peaceful relations between the diverse religious groups that existed in medieval Famagusta. Despite the paucity of archaeological data that made the comparative examination of the development of urban and religious buildings impossible, the data regarding the population and religious relations between several ethnic groups yielded by archival material provided invaluable insights to this study thus making the economic and urban development of medieval Famagusta more understandable.

Indeed, the archival and visual evidence presented in this thesis offers a new understanding of the economic and social dynamics of medieval Famagusta. The economic and socio-cultural analyses have demonstrated how Famagusta was transformed from a port city to an *emporium* and become a vital part of the Levantine trade policy of Venice and Genoa. It has also demonstrated how peaceful relations among diverse communities in the society provided for the economic growth of medieval Famagusta. The transformation and economic development of medieval Famagusta is a complex phenomenon. It is almost impossible to solve by focussing only on the political or economic dynamics of the period. To understand the development and structure of the new *emporium* in the Eastern Mediterranean one must examine the economic process together with the social and cultural dynamics to establish a *comprehensive* and *consistent* context. Indeed, having a harbour consisting of an outer and inner port and providing safe anchorage facilities is not enough to transform a port city into an *emporium*. There were multiple actors and factors that paved the way for economic growth, urbanization, and social unification or polarization. In this sense, trying to explain the economic and social development of Famagusta solely with political factors, that is mainly fall of Acre and its consequences, would not be enough to answer the question.
As it is mentioned at the beginning of the thesis, the origins of the early economic development of Famagusta cannot be understood without developing the historical chronology of Salamis/Constantia. However, the analyses of numismatic data provided in the Appendix reveals that it is not possible to establish a certain date for the ‘decline’ of Salamis/Constantia. The evidence presented in the Appendix indicates that Salamis/Constantia did not lose its importance after the Muslim raids and there were continuous monetized economic activities both before and after the Arab occupation of Cyprus. In this sense, the discovery of the twelfth-century hoard from the Crusades period in Salamis should be taken into account. Despite the lack of topographical and stratigraphical data due to the sub-par archaeological excavations, the incidental discovery of eighteen French billon deniers suggests the question of whether Salamis/Constantia was still inhabited during the twelfth century. Moreover, a copy of an Arabic manuscript dated back to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century and compiled in the early eleventh century also supports the theory of continuity. The detailed maps provided by an anonymous Arab author (fourteen in total including Lunar mansion maps, Rectangular world map, map of the Mediterranean and map of Cyprus) include diagrams and detailed information about the distance between port cities and their functionality. These were undoubtedly gathered from merchants and served commercial interests. The mention of twenty-seven port cities on the map of Cyprus and the re-mentioning twelve of them again in the Mediterranean map certainly provides important hints regarding commerce. In fact, the frequent specific mentions of the harbours of Ammochostos (Famagusta), Konstantia (Salamis), Akraia, Akrobuoni (?), Dades (Cape Kiti), Kitium (or Kition), Basileus, Hagios Georgios, Curias (Kourion) and three other unidentified harbours on the map of the Mediterranean was probably due to their commercial importance. However, that is not to say that these harbours were extremely busy but they surely witnessed commercial activity at some level. Additionally, the appearance of
Famagusta and Salamis/Constantia together with several other harbours categorized as ‘fortressed harbours’ by the anonymous Arab author is another important point to mention. The port of Salamis probably continued to serve the island’s commercial interests in the twelfth century at reduced levels if not fully. However, there is not adequate evidence to suggest a certain date when its harbour was silted-up. Relying on numismatic evidence it is indeed possible to suggest that Salamis/Constantia witnessed an economic decline towards the late Byzantine period and this was one of the main reasons for the depopulation of the city. If this assumption is right then one can safely argue that a considerable amount of its population settled in Famagusta when its proximity and anchorage facilities are considered.

Moreover, apart from the inadequate data offered by limited archaeological and written evidence concerning the ‘decline’ of Salamis, the lack of archaeological evidence in a way obligates scholars to explain the complex development of Famagusta with political ‘turning points’ and the facilities provided by its harbour. Unfortunately, explaining the economic development of Famagusta by political and demographic factors triggered by Muslim expansion in the Middle East does not provide the full answer. The political chaos and Muslim attacks in the Levant during the late thirteenth century surely opened a new era in the economic history of Famagusta. However, the ‘immigrants’ from fallen Crusader cities and dislocation of commercial routes are alone not enough to transform the port city into an ‘emporium’. Moreover, the idea that immigrants from fallen Frankish states such as Antioch (1268), Jaffa (1268) and Margat (1285) established commercial links between Famagusta and Cilician Armenia cannot be supported with any archival evidence. Indeed, if we assume that this theory is the right one it still needs to explain how a small amount of refugee groups who lost all their properties were able to establish strong commercial networks that transformed the city into an ‘emporium’ in such a short time. On the other hand, the theory that these immigrants chose Famagusta because of its proximity to Cilician Armenia is not acceptable.
either. The closeness of Famagusta to Cilician Armenia could not be the reason for immigrants to settle there if historians are right to argue that Limassol was more developed and active compared to Famagusta in the thirteenth century. Also Limassol already hosted a considerable amount of merchant groups who already maintained commercial networks within the Levant. In this sense, it would not be beneficial for them to settle at Famagusta when the distance between Limassol-Famagusta and Limassol-Cilician Armenia is considered. If distance was to be the deciding factor they should have chosen Kyrenia which provided good anchorage facilities and was closer to the Ayas, Tarsus, Korykos, Silifke, Anamur and also Candelor (modern Alanya) and Sattalia (modern Antalya).871

The transformation of the port cities occurs stage by stage and there is not only one factor but multiple ones. There are three fundamental attributes needed for medieval port cities to be able to bear the title of ‘emporium’. If we happen to classify them, a harbour with good anchorage facilities, access to good agricultural resources, and an active merchant community are prerequisites for port cities in order to maintain permanent commercial networks. In this sense, considering the proximity of Famagusta to the Mesaria plain, the centre of grain and cotton production, agricultural merchandise was most probably transported either from the Kyrenia or Famagusta ports rather than all the way back to Limassol. In fact, the mention of the Genoese community owning properties in both Nicosia and Famagusta in the early thirteenth century official records should not be underestimated. The existence of Genoese merchants in Famagusta during the early thirteenth century definitely suggests that the city already maintained commercial networks at some level. Their commercial activities after the second half of the thirteenth century as attested by notarial evidence most probably encounters with the early stages of Famagusta’s economic

871 For the merchant groups operating in Kyrenia around 1270s and fourteenth century see Coureas, N. ‘Economy’, pp. 126 and 150. For notarial evidence see Nicola de Bouteris, notaio in Famagusta e Venezia (1355-1365), (ed.) A. Lombardo (Venice, 1973) and Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti rogati a Lalazio da Federico di Piazzalunga (1274) e Pietro di Bargone (1277, 1279), (ed.) L. Balletto, CSFS 53 (Genoa, 1989).
development. It is more likely that one of the key points in understanding the early dynamics of economic development is the activities and presence of Latin merchants in Famagusta. Considering that the Latin community in Cyprus primarily dealt with the commercial business, Genoese presence in Famagusta at least by 1218 indicates the early commercial networks established in Famagusta.

The fall of Acre in 1291 represents the new era of commercial networks and relations in the Levant trade and Famagusta was surely an important part of it. As many scholars would agree, commercial networks emerge, expand, and shift depending on various reasons and processes such as urbanization, political ‘up’ and ‘downs’, wars, state formation and migration. In this sense, the large influx of immigrants from Acre into Famagusta contributed to the economic development at some level. However, hosting a considerable amount of refugees itself is not enough to establish permanent commercial networks. One of the main reasons for Famagusta’s relatively rapid growth was the Latin merchant companies. Famagusta was not only strategically important for the Latin merchants who had contacts with Oriental markets but also as an important supplier of grain, sugar and cotton. As is shown in chapter two, Venetian, Genoese, Pisan, Florentine and Syrian prominent merchant companies transported impressive amounts of cotton, sugar and grain to the West in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The presence of leading Genoese families such as de Mari, Spinola, de Nigro and Doria in Famagusta also indicates how commercially important the city was during the late medieval period. Regarding the other Latin, Syrian and Jewish merchants Genoese companies appear to be the most active merchant group in Famagusta. Their presence and activities most probably accelerated the economic and social development of the city towards the late thirteenth century.

Another important aspect of Levantine trade was the collaboration of prominent merchant companies operating in Famagusta. The permanency of commercial networks
depends on connection and social actions. The inter-organizational relations and collective activities of several merchant companies in Famagusta were the fundamental reasons for the success of Genoa and Venice in overseas trade. The large investments, financial power, and impressive sums recorded in Famagusta reveals how Genoa and Venice managed to control Levantine trade and how the vital role of overseas merchant networks enabled Italian maritime powers to have access to the Oriental markets. The organization of the colonial economy was simple. Agricultural resources and trade routes were controlled by the Venetians, the Genoese, and the Hospitallers. Amongst them the Genoese administrative organization was well formed. The existence of prominent merchant companies in Famagusta with dense network ties in the Levant enabled Genoese merchants to flourish. They were powerful enough to ignore the papal restrictions and continue carrying trade in the Muslim East. The ineffectiveness of the papal bans in preventing Genoese merchants from conducting trade in banned areas also indicates how such powerful mercantile organizations operated independent from the political dynamics. Despite the continuous political conflicts between Latins and Muslims during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Latin merchants continued to dominate the Eastern markets.

Moreover, contrary to popular belief Famagusta did not lose its importance in the Levantine trade after the second half of fourteenth century. The considerable increase in licences granted by popes during the late fourteenth century comparing to the period from 1291 to 1344 suggests a dramatic increase in the volume Levantine trade.\textsuperscript{872} The Venetian convoys of Cyprus, Little Armenia and Alexandria continued in the late fourteenth century and there is a considerable increase in the amount of Oriental articles exported to Famagusta from Oriental markets. Similarly the organization of Genoese convoys to Famagusta, Alexandria and Beyrouth during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is enough to

\textsuperscript{872} See chapter 2 and section 3.
understand the economic potential of Famagusta. The recent publication of Hospitaller records concerning Cyprus in the fifteenth century reveals that the island was still agriculturally very productive. The appearance of prominent Venetian individuals and Genoese merchant companies in the Hospitaller transactions buying sugar, grain or vegetables from the Hospitaller estates near Limassol and its transportation to Famagusta shows that Famagusta was still serving as a main port of the island in the fifteenth century. 873

The economic development and commercial potential of Famagusta is more observable when compared to Rhodes. In economic terms Famagusta was identical with Rhodes. When the Hospitallers conquered Rhodes in the early fourteenth century the island offered them a functional harbour and fertile lands for cultivation. However, unlike Cyprus, the island of Rhodes was depopulated and suffered from the lack of Latin merchant groups operating there. Hence, in 1313 the Hospitallers offered lands to the Latin colonists to attract them to settle in Rhodes, and estates to anyone to be held as a fief ‘iuxta usus et consuetudines Regni Jerusalem et Cipri’. 874 The most important factor that prevented Rhodes’ transformation into an ‘emporium’ was the lack of Latin merchants. Although the Venetians established a protectorate at Rhodes in 1234, it was soon after replaced by Genoese, prominent merchant companies who did not prefer to establish themselves in Rhodes as they did in Cyprus. This was mainly due to the tension between the Hospitallers and Venetian and Genoese prominent merchant families. For instance, in 1311 a Genoese galley belonging to Antonio Spinola was confiscated by the Hospitallers. After the unsuccessful negotiations between the Genoese and the Hospitallers for the compensation of the ship, Antonio Spinola and his company offered 50,000 florins to the emirate of Menteshe to conquer Rhodes! The important role played by the Spinola family in the Levantine trade is

873 See chapter 2 and section 4.
already discussed in chapter two and unpeaceful relations between the Spinola family and the Hospitalizers could suggest that Genoese merchants belonging to the Spinola clan did not operate in Rhodes during the early fourteenth century. Similarly, the relations between the Hospitalizers and the Venetians were not excellent either. The Venetians were uncomfortable with the papal restrictions and with the collaboration between the Hospitalizers and the Pope in preventing illicit trade with the Muslims. Their relations got even worse when the Hospitalizers seized Carpathos and other islands between Rhodes and Crete from Byzantium in 1312 and the prominent Venetian Andrew Cornaro.\textsuperscript{875} After the incident of 1312, the Venetian government sequestered Hospitaller funds in Venice and even though the Hospitalizers returned the island to the Venetians in 1316 political tension continued between them.\textsuperscript{876} Indeed, after realizing that the Hospitalizers could not get any commercial support from Venetian and Genoese mercantile associations, they maintained close relations with James II of Aragon. Moreover, in the fourteenth century the island of Rhodes mainly hosted Catalan and Florentine merchant companies who had no Levantine colonies and were ineffective regarding the Levantine trade compared to the Venetian and Genoese merchants.\textsuperscript{877} Another important aspect that needs to be mentioned is the lack of Latin inhabitants in Rhodes. Unlike Famagusta, a very small amount of Latins operated in Rhodes as merchants, bankers, bureaucrats or priests and all were short-period residents. The Hospitalizers relied heavily upon the indigenous Greek population in Rhodes to cultivate their lands.\textsuperscript{878}

\textsuperscript{877} Luttrell, A. “The Hospitalizers at Rhodes”, pp. 287 and 311.
The Hospitaller conquest of Rhodes imposed a more defensive mission on the island. It seems that the most lucrative crop produced in Rhodes was sugar and the Hospitallers largely relied on Florentine ‘super-companies’, such as Bardi, Peruzzi and Acciaiuoli, in transferring grain, cloth, wool and other commodities. In fact, the Florentine companies were the only ones providing financial resources to the Hospitallers for the conquest of Rhodes in 1306. In 1320, the debt owed by the Hospitallers to the Florentines was over 575,000 gold florins. Indeed, the ineffectiveness of the financial system established by the Hospitallers in Rhodes became overt when Florentine banking houses started to receive the Hospitallers’ Western incomes. However, the large credits borrowed from the Florentines were used for naval campaigns by the Hospitallers and the economy of Rhodes still depended on the small amount of Latin settlers and agricultural production around the 1330s. In 1333, the Hospitallers joined the Christian naval campaigns against the Turkish emirates in the Aegean and in 1336 they were negotiating with Florentine banking houses for the financial support to organize further naval campaigns against the infidels. After the collapse of the Florentine banking companies around the mid-fourteenth century the Hospitallers relied on individual merchants from Florence, Narbonne, Montpellier and Barcelona who occasionally operated on the island. Yet, the privileges granted to the merchants from Narbonne and Montpellier coincides exactly with the period of the collapse of the Florentine banking houses. Considering the formation and activities of the merchant companies established in Famagusta around the fourteenth century, the economic development and agricultural potential of Cyprus and Rhodes is not even comparable. The Hospitaller government of Rhodes was receiving annual responiones of 10,000 gold florins from its Preceptory of Cyprus whereas

the Hospitallers organized another attack on Euboea in 1351 due to the fact that their minor estates in Greece offered more agricultural resources than Rhodes.\textsuperscript{883}

Regarding the economic and urban development, the differences between Famagusta and Rhodes becomes more obvious when the administrative structure and functionality of both islands are examined. The administrative mechanisms in Rhodes established by the Hospitallers were rather simple and less developed compared to Cyprus. As Anthony Luttrell pointed out, in Rhodes ‘there was no complex system of feudal tenures and money-fiefs, sub-infeudations and ligeances, assizes and feudal courts, such as existed in Jerusalem and Cyprus [...]’.\textsuperscript{884} Unlike Jerusalem and Cyprus, there was no formal feudal court in Rhodes and Roman Law in a slightly modified form was applied in the town. The \textit{Capitula Rodi} (town regulations) generally contained regulations for markets, prices, weights, measures, prohibitions, fines and other punishments. Likewise, the rules were administered in the court of the Castellan and there was a single court for civil and criminal cases, the \textit{curia civilium et criminalium}, until 1390.\textsuperscript{885} Although the judges and notaries were predominantly Italians, indigenous Greeks had their own notaries and officials.\textsuperscript{886} Moreover, there was a Greek court presided over by Greek clerics and Judges where their financial matters were handled. On the other hand, commercial business was conducted in the Greek metropolitan church of Rhodes.\textsuperscript{887} As Anthony Luttrell observed, the indigenous Greeks were divided into two; free Greeks described as ‘\textit{nobiles}’ who owed military service and ‘\textit{marinarii}’, a hereditary status, who served as galley oarsmen in the case of men but remain in the town in the case of female-family members. However, in Cyprus they divided into three groups; the ‘\textit{paraoikoi}’

\textsuperscript{885} Ibid, p. 766; Luttrell, A. \textit{‘The Town of Rhodes’} pp. 148-9.
\textsuperscript{886} Ibid, p. 148-9.
\textsuperscript{887} Ibid, p. 148.
(Greek serfs), the ‘francomati’ (the Greek free peasants), and the ‘perpyriarioi’ (Greek burgesses). Moreover, besides the two main legal institutions, namely the High Court and the Court of Burgesses, Greeks and Syrians had their own courts in the island which are attested by the thirteenth century records. Unlike Rhodes, the Greek, Syrian and Armenian inhabitants of Famagusta (and Cyprus) all enjoyed judicial autonomy and social privileges. The Greek Episcopal courts and local tribunals also continued to serve the indigenous Greek population of Cyprus. However, this was not the case for the indigenous Greeks of Rhodes. In this regard, Anthony Luttrell states that: “[Latin archbishop] enjoyed the iurisdictio libera over all the island’s Greeks, lay and clerical, both in visiting them and in receiving procuration payments [like the Latin prelates of Cyprus]. [However] the situation on Rhodes, where the Greek church was in effect subservient to the Hospital rather than to the Latin archbishop, was not at all similar to that on Cyprus [where] the Latin hierarchy [in Cyprus] never effectively secured the loyalty or the subordination of the Greeks and their clergy.”

A general overview of the commercial quarters of Rhodes and Famagusta could be more helpful analysing the institutional mechanism and its functionality in both islands. Similar to Famagusta, the customs house (the Comerc) was near the sea shore close to the Castellania building which was responsible for administrative issues. However, there is no evidence for the existence of loggias during the early fourteenth century. It is known that the commerchium was above the loggia in early sixteenth century but it is not known whether the loggia existed in a more simple form and structure during the fourteenth century. One of the major Latin administrative buildings was the Castellania established in the borgo that

---

888 Ibid, pp. 149-150; Chapter 4.
889 See Chapter 4, Section 1.
891 Ibid, pp. 256.
892 ‘borgo (burgum, bourc): that part of the town outside the castle or collachium’. Ibid, p. 58.
was presided over by the Castellan and included his court as well.\textsuperscript{893} Although the evidence concerning the administrative development of Hospitaller Rhodes is very scarce, the available evidence suggests that commercial buildings such as \textit{loggia}, \textit{commerc} and \textit{apotheca} started to flourish in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{894} However, the development and function of such buildings in Famagusta started far earlier. In Famagusta, the ‘\textit{commerchium}’ was not the only institution monitoring commercial traffic. There was also the \textit{Marine Court} that dealt with overseas transportation and the \textit{Market Court} that dealt with cases concerning customs duties payable by those arriving by sea and land. The commercial quarter (mercantile district) of Famagusta consisted of the \textit{apotheca}, \textit{bancum}, \textit{foundouk}, \textit{stacione}, \textit{comerc}, \textit{loggia}, \textit{volta}, \textit{cambia}, \textit{hospitals} and \textit{fish market}, which all are mentioned in the notarial acts, and there could be more that notarial records failed to mention.\textsuperscript{895} Considering that almost all ethnic groups whether short-term or long-term residents in Famagusta enjoyed legal and commercial privileges and had their own courts (the Greek, Syrian, Venetian, and Genoese courts are the ones known to us so far), Famagusta was the economically well-developed and self-sufficient ‘\textit{emporium}’ that Rhodes was not even close to being.

In addition to the economic and institutional development, this study also provides an analysis of untouched subjects regarding society, such as the role of women, slaves, artisans, shop owners, officials, and the religious and ethnic groups all described as inhabitants of Famagusta, which completes the overall picture. The diverse ethnic groups that existed in Famagusta, namely Syrians, Jacobites, Georgians, Maronites, Jews, Armenians, Nestorians, Greeks, and Latins, and Franciscans, and Dominicans and the socio-cultural interaction that took place between them, is visualised in order to show how unique Famagusta was compared to the other port cities located in the Mediterranean and even the Aegean. The

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{893} Ibid, p. 257.
\item \textsuperscript{894} Ibid, pp. 256-7.
\item \textsuperscript{895} See Chapter four for more detailed analysis.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
reference to the barbers, boot makers, carpenters, cloth dyers, fishermen, farmers, tailors, barrel makers, camlet weavers etc. as long-term residents indicates that Famagusta was not only a commercially important city but contained every single element necessary for the ‘emporium’ in urban terms. Unlike Rhodes, the prominent merchant families did not only visit Famagusta temporarily for business issues. The notarial evidence reveals that well-known families such as the de Mari, Spinola, Doria, de Nigro, Grimaldi, Corner, Martini etc. together with the agents of prominent banking companies like Bardi, Peruzzi, Mozzi, Scozzi all existed in the city as long-term citizens. Additionally, the appearance of consular families, viscounts, officers of the court, Dragomans, chaplains, judges, doctors, physicians, boutique owners and money-changers in society, sometimes selling drugs or spices and sometimes conducting business with other citizens, provides important clues about how the urban mechanism processed. There is no other port city in Cyprus and probably not in the eastern Mediterranean where one can find references to it saying ‘Greeks were singing in the funeral of Latins’, or ‘Armenians performing their service in the Greek tongue’, or ‘Jacobites circumcised and baptised with the Greek rites’, or ‘Greeks and Latins going to the same church to pray’ or ‘Latin priests going over to the Greek rite’. Perhaps the peaceful relations maintained between diverse religious groups is one of the most striking aspects that enabled Famagusta to flourish both economically and culturally. The peaceful existence of religious groups is another prerequisite factor for a city in order to maintain long-term commercial networks. The long-term existence of diverse merchant groups or leading banking houses did not only depend on the commercially strategic position of the cities but also a peaceful environment in which to conduct their business safely. This was most probably the main reason why the island of Rhodes failed to attract Latin merchants in general despite its strategic and agricultural potential. Despite the failure of attracting Venice

896 See Chapter three, section one.
897 See Chapter three, Section 3.2.3.
and Genoa to the island on the one hand, the Hospitaller reign also failed to maintain peaceful relations even with the indigenous Greek population of Rhodes.

However, in Famagusta indigenous Greeks were comfortable constructing and decorating their churches in the ‘Cypriot’ style blending ‘Byzantine’ and ‘Gothic’ elements together. Likewise, the unique artistic and architectural decoration of the Latin churches in Famagusta, which are identical to the other Latin ecclesiastical buildings of medieval Europe, indicates that a new cultural identity emerged after the Latin conquest of the island. As it is examined, this new culture blended with Eastern and Western traditions is more distinct when the ecclesiastical buildings of Famagusta are analysed. The hybrid culture that emerged in Famagusta was also exported overseas in artistic and architectural forms. The evidence from ecclesiastical buildings in the Hospitaller quarter of Rhodes reveals interesting correlations with those in Famagusta. After the conquest of Rhodes, the Hospitallers mainly adapted the Byzantine buildings both inside and outside the castle. Apparently the economic dependence upon the Florentine banking houses and naval campaigns of the Hospitallers in the fourteenth century were the main reasons for the limited amount of ecclesiastical buildings constructed by the Hospitallers. The most interesting ecclesiastical building that reveals the economic and social networks maintained between Cyprus and Rhodes during the fourteenth century is the Latin cathedral. The Hospitallers transformed the Byzantine metropolitan church into a Latin cathedral by introducing Gothic architectural elements into the Byzantine monument. The eleventh-century Greek cathedral was given to the Latin Archbishop in 1322 and a considerable part of the cathedral, including the upper parts of the eastern apses, window openings, the barrel vaults and upper parts of the walls, were rebuilt after 1322. It is suggested by scholars that the forms used in the cathedral, such as the oblong rib-vaulted
space in a five-sided apse, are of a typically Cypriot design. The architectural design of the Latin cathedral with prismatic ribs, transverse arches, and design of the windows, recalls the church of the hospital of St Anthony in Famagusta. Both churches share the flat, wide and shallow form of the buttresses and also the corbels carrying the ribs in the cathedral of Rhodes certainly resembles those in the Cypriot church. As it is mentioned by Michalis Olympios, the profile mutatis mutandis employed for the windows of the lateral apses of the church of Our Lady of the Borgo, located within the Collachium, can be also seen on the windows of the Nicosia cathedral dated back to the thirteenth century. Also, the prismatic ‘mullions’ bear similar forms with the Our Lady of Tortosa in Nicosia and the Franciscan church in Famagusta. It has also been argued that an Archbishop of Rhodes hired a master mason from Famagusta to repair the building in the fourteenth century. This hypothesis finds some confirmation when the simultaneous appearance of Cypriot masonry in Rhodes and the master craftsmen of Rhodes in Famagusta is considered. Moreover, Olympios’s observations reveal the similarities between the cathedral at Rhodes and the Carmelite church of Famagusta by comparing the clerestory, layout and design of both churches indicating that masons from Cyprus were available in Rhodes. Quoting him, ‘‘[...] from the ground plan to the similarly idiosyncratic corbels, to the pentagonal ribs and transverse arches, to the tall untraceried windows, to the extremely plain exterior aspects, the similarities between the two edifices are definitely more than simply coincidental.’

The Hospitaller church of Famagusta also provides more examples of Cypriot masonry and architectural connections between Rhodes and Famagusta. The Hospitaller

901 Ibid, pp. 53-4.
church of Famagusta, known as ‘Twin Churches’, is a unique example of Hospitaller construction where two small churches are adjacent to each other. The ‘Twin Churches’ became the property of the Hospitallers after 1308 and provides the unique example of Byzantine and Gothic artistic features blended together. However, the northern and manifestly Gothic one is known as the Templars’ and the southern one is known as the Hospitallers’ bearing the shield with a cross resembling the knights of St John of Jerusalem carved on Kolossi castle. Both buildings consist of a single nave and apse in the east end. The Templars’ church has three bays in the nave with ribbed vaults, and the arches of these vaults comprise a pyramid shape of grouped brackets. According to Camille Enlart, the doorways of the church are late Gothic style and the buttresses of the west end are constructed with a ‘clasping’ technique, similar to those on the west end of the Carmelite church of Famagusta. However, the Hospitallers’ church is relatively taller and built on the lines of a tower without buttresses. The traces of local masonry can be seen in its nave consisting of a single oblong bay with a groined vault. The apse has a single window, two small credences and an impost bearing Gothic features. Enlart already pointed out the similarities between the Hospitallers’ church and the Armenian church of Famagusta where the nave and windows of both churches are worked from the same masonry. Moreover, the painting of the interior of the church contains both Byzantine and late Giotto styles where there is an angel next to the Byzantine saint and a Virgin dated back to the fourteenth century.

Overall, the multi-cultural society of Famagusta seems to give rise to a hybrid style of artistic and architectural expression crossing the boundaries between Greeks and Franks and transported overseas during the fourteenth century. Yet, putting the commercial fame of

904 Ibid, pp. 191 and 291.
Famagusta aside, it was in the social interactions where links were found in the physical spaces of Famagusta. In other words, the multi-ethnic and religious identities that existed in Famagusta emerged strongly in ecclesiastical art and architecture. The transnational and commercial networks connecting Famagusta with its neighbouring peripheries and Europe played an important role not only in bringing a world-wide commercial reputation to the small Mediterranean island but also exporting its hybrid culture blended with Byzantine and Frankish elements overseas. In making Famagusta an ‘emporium’ of the East the political situation in the Levant, the agricultural potential and strategic position of the city were not the only factors. Alongside the economic development, the high level of urban development is a prerequisite for harbour cities in order to bear the title of ‘emporium’. In Famagusta, the existence of diverse religious and ethnic groups from Europe and the Middle East and the socio-cultural links maintained with their homelands was another reason for the rapid urban and economic growth of Famagusta compared to the other port cities of the island. The complex social interactions that took place among the diverse religious and ethnic groups of Famagusta paved the way for the creation of new cultural identity that emerged in ecclesiastical art and public spheres. As I attempted to show in chapter three, the new cultural identity that emerged after the Latin conquest of the island which embodied Eastern and Western values at the same time was embraced by the whole society. The cooperation among the inhabitants of Famagusta, namely women, slaves, artisans, merchants, religious groups, and their peaceful dialogue can also be seen in the culture they exported overseas in artistic, architectural and artisanal forms. Famagusta was not only an ‘emporium’ that shaped the dynamics of Levantine trade but also a cultural melting-pot that witnessed Catholic Latins visiting Greek Orthodox churches and indigenous Greeks building their churches in the Gothic style. Lastly, I wish to stress that there are still gaps that need to be fulfilled concerning the economic, cultural, and political history of medieval Famagusta. However,
Unlike the political dynamics, the archaeological evidence is crucial for the better understanding of economic and cultural dynamics of the city both before and after 1291. Hopefully, future archaeological excavations will make it possible to portray the whole picture of medieval Famagusta.
APPENDIX

Salamis as a key to understanding the economic development of medieval Famagusta: The case of economic “Continuity” and “Discontinuity”

“Near Famagusta is another city called Constantia or Salamina, set on the seashore, where [there] was once a harbour, and a very noble, famous and wealthy city, as its ruins testify. Here Epiphanius, a man of marvellous holiness, was in wondrous wise elected bishop, and here he was buried. Here too S. Katharina was born, and her chapel still is shown. In this city too S. Barnabas the apostle suffered martyrdom, and near it was burned and there buried. S. Epiphanius gave glory to this city and to all the land by his many miracles, but it is now in part destroyed.”

That was the impression of Salamis gained by Ludolph von Suchen, a priest of the Church of Suchen in Westphalia, while he was visiting Cyprus between the years of 1336-1341. This short quotation provides some significant hints about the importance of the city before Famagusta took its importance as a port. First of all, it suggests that during the fourteenth century, the city had been abandoned and its harbour was inactive. By setting this impression of the city against the eleventh-century image of its economic and social importance, one can also deduce that the decline of Salamis and the so-called “rise” to prominence of Famagusta may have changed the existing social, cultural and economic balance of both cities and the surrounding region. Hence, it must be asked how a well-equipped city such as Salamis/Constantia, which had the title of capital, a great reputation, a functional harbour, wealth and a noble class, could have been outstripped by Famagusta. How could Famagusta which allegedly lacked any of them and had shown no signs of developing any attract all of the attributes of a major urban centre to itself by the late thirteenth century?

In analysing the historical background of Salamis we can focus our attention on a complex pattern of settlement, including rural and urban sites which experienced economic and cultural prosperity from antiquity and reached its peak during the late sixth-early seventh century. Salamis is located on the eastern coast of Cyprus, approximately 10 km north of Famagusta. It is known in the Classical tradition as the capital of a kingdom closely related to the Greek world. In fact, Salamis was for long periods the capital of the island until the seventh c. A.D.908

Although several travellers’ notes throughout the centuries revealed the location of the city and highlighted elements of its cosmopolitan life, the first systematic excavation was carried out by the British (J. A. R. Munro and H. A. Tubbs) and their report was subsequently published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (1891) including a site survey and prospection results. During the 1960s, the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus conducted a field survey around the town which only included the surroundings of the city rather than any investigation of the interior of the town. Excavations were carried out by V. Karageorghis, both in the necropolis909 (published as *Necropolis of Salamis, I, II, III*, Nicosia, 1967, 1970, 1973) and in the district of the Imperial Roman public monuments located in the north of the town.910 Some of the most significant excavation results come from the investigations of M. Yon.

The fourth c. A.D. is known from texts for disastrous earthquakes (especially in 342 and 352), which destroyed the town of Salamis. However, according to M. Yon the fourth century also witnessed an unprecedented growth of Christianity on the island. In fact, following quickly after the destruction caused by earthquakes, Salamis regained its status as a

909 The Necropolis is located between the town site and the modern village of Enkomi.
metropolis (re-founded by the Emperor Constantius II) and was re-named as Constantia. Subsequently, the Church of Cyprus separated from the patriarchies of Antioch and Constantinople and became autonomous in 431.\textsuperscript{911} Indeed, the excavations conducted by M. Yon during 1965 shed light on the history of Salamis/Constantia by dating its earliest traces to the eleventh c. B.C. Several large monuments of Constantia (fifth – sixth centuries) from the beginning of the Byzantine era were also discovered.\textsuperscript{912}

It is well known that after the destruction of Salamis, the new city called ‘‘Constantia’’ was not as large as it was before. Indeed, the excavations reveal that the city wall varied throughout the different periods of the city’s history. The surveys reveal that the Byzantine wall is located in the north-west and the ancient city wall, which dates back to the eleventh century B.C., is located on the south-east near the sea.\textsuperscript{913}

What is relevant to the historical understanding of Salamis is some understanding of the importance and role of Cyprus as a whole. From the early to the late medieval ages, Cyprus has always been regarded as a stepping-stone for economic networks and a melting-pot interconnecting eastern and western cultures. It is situated to the east of the Aegean and close to the southern shore of Asia Minor and the coasts of Syria, Palestine and Egypt. As the third largest island in the Mediterranean, it has welcomed several great cultures and always witnessed conflicts of interest within the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{914}

According to some, the Hellenistic, Roman and Late Antique periods saw the political enhancement of this role, when Cyprus was central to the administration of a Mediterranean-
wide imperial network. During the Roman period, the Diocese of the Orient encapsulated the island; part of the wider Prefecture of the Orient taken to include Mesopotamia and Syria among others. Later, after Justinian’s reform movement (c. 535) Cyprus was included in the *quaestura exercitus*, which was established in the Aegean islands and Caria, for the protection of food supplies as well as a military base for the Danubian frontier units. At this time the governor of Cyprus was appointed by Constantinople and called a *hypatikos* or *consularis* until A. D. 649. He exercised almost completely autonomous authority and controlled all local systems including the collection of revenues. The dividing of military and civic command did not affect Cyprus.

As a result of its role as an important Byzantine stronghold, the peaceful character of the local life of Cyprus changed dramatically due to the changing military fortunes of the Empire throughout the sixth and seventh centuries. During the first half of the sixth century, Cyprus provided shelter against the Persian threat which smashed the eastern provinces of Byzantine Empire. It then served as a spring-board for the Heraclian ‘‘reconquista’’ in A.D. 626-629 that came to a close with his defeat of the Persian Empire. Following the defeat of the Sassanian Persian Empire, the seventh century witnessed even greater military upheaval in the form of the Arab conquests, which drove the Byzantines out

---

of Syria and Palestine. This resulted in the partial occupation of Cyprus by the Arabs. This occupation and subsequent developments reflected the relative naval power of the Byzantine Empire and the Ummayad Caliphate in the Eastern Mediterranean, neither of whom could establish a lasting hegemony over the island.\footnote{Zavagno (2011), p. 449; Metcalf, D. ‘Byzantine Cyprus’, pp. 31-2.} \footnote{Condominium=Partition.} A treaty was established, stating that neither the Empire nor the Caliphate could keep troops on the island and that it was not permissible for either to use it as a military base. This treaty was to stand for nearly three centuries during which time the Byzantine and Muslim navies used the island’s harbours only as assembly points for naval campaigns. There were Muslim villages on the island co-habiting with Christian villages during this period. According to the historians, the treaty between the Christians and Muslims created a ‘‘condominium’’\footnote{Zavagno (2011), pp. 449-50; Metcalf, D. ‘Byzantine Cyprus’, pp. 395-423. Alos see Kyrris, C. History of Cyprus (Nicosia, 1985); A. H. S. Megaw, ‘Betwixt Greeks and Saracens’; Christides, V. The Image of Cyprus in the Arabic Sources (Nicosia, 2006).} which lasted three centuries.\footnote{Zavagno, L. “At the Edge of Two Empires: The Economy of Cyprus between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (650s-800s CE)” in Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 65-66 (2011-2012), pp. 121-123.} The period of the ‘‘condominium’’ has a notorious reputation among the above mentioned scholars. It is often regarded as a period of economic, urban, social and demographic decline which resulted with the dislocation of the population as well.\footnote{Hunt, D. Footprints in Cyprus, (London, 1982), pp. 141-147.} However, the pilgrim St. Willibald, who visited the island of Cyprus in 723, remarked upon the condominium there between Greeks and Saracens and he also states that he was able to travel freely through the island where he visited Paphos and Constantia (Salamis), which are situated at opposite ends of the island.\footnote{Hunt, D. Footprints in Cyprus, (London, 1982), pp. 141-147.}

Throughout the early Byzantine period, Salamis/Constantia can be seen to be economically significant – as proved by numismatic evidence – it was an important hub along the Levantine trade route. Furthermore, Cyprus was the shelter for long distance maritime-
routes, in particular for luxury items. It was the stepping-stone used by the traders from both east and west on route to Constantinople and Rome. Excavations, however, remain limited and this seriously affects the possibility for picturing the entire economic history of Salamis in detail. In particular, there is an absence of systematic ceramic analysis of the city and numismatic data remains scarce. Nevertheless, the surviving and discovered evidence is sufficient to reveal some major themes. The role of Salamis and its harbour in Levantine trade is not surprising but is testified to. The multifunctional role of the island as a bridge between different regions of the eastern Mediterranean is obvious from numismatic and ceramic evidence. In this sense, to borrow Zavagnos’ words,

“...one could not overlook the fact that long distance commerce was itself generated as a spin-off, by the intensity and structural coherence of interregional exchange; this led to the appreciation of the location of the island at the intersection of three regional and micro-regional productions, underpinned by the high productive levels of Nilotic agriculture and, with Alexandria as a hub for luxury trade; Syria and Palestine with their localized economies, focused upon continuous demand of urban centres like Jerusalem, Pella, Jerash, Scythopolis, and Aleppo; and, eventually, the Aegean hearth-land of the Byzantine empire where localized and medium-distance exchange systems coexisted, as focused on Constantinople; the latter privileging the major political centres, but also cities where aristocratic wealth remained urban oriented (as Ephesos, Gortyn and Athens).”

---

As will be seen, the economic changes in Salamis/Constantia during the late Byzantine period have been exposed to some extent by numismatic and ceramic evidence procured during the excavations of Salamis examined in this section, however, in order to draw a clearer picture of the political, social, cultural and economic history of the period under discussion, deeper analysis of lead seals and more extensive excavations (especially around the harbour site) are needed.

Numismatic Evidence:

(i) INTERREGNUM (608-610 A.D.):

The seventh century was a very hectic period for the Byzantine Empire. According to some historians the empire was weakened because of the war with Persia in the 620s, then by the continuous Slav raiding into the Balkan provinces and, eventually, by the Arab tribes occupying the Arabian Peninsula and establishing an Islamic caliphate in opposition to Christian Byzantium. The beginning of the seventh century witnessed a series of military failures on both the Persian front and in the Balkans. The Balkans especially were subsequently left to organise their own defences against the attacks of Avars and Slavs.

As a consequence of the political intrigues and military revolts that the empire suffered, the senate of Constantinople was required to appeal to Heraclius (the Exarch of Carthage) for assistance. He rebelled against the reigning emperor, Phocas, and sent his son

---

Heraclius and his nephew Nicetas with a considerable armed force to defeat Phocas. The position of the reigning emperor was further weakened by the defection of Egypt. The incident resulted in the fall of Egypt to Nicetas in A.D. 609, which suppressed the grain supply to Constantinople. At the same time, the rebel fleet under the leadership of Heraclius reached and took Cyprus, which provided military shelter and a naval base for the final assault on Constantinople.

Furthermore, the rebel party minted new coins in the names of Heraclius the elder and his son Heraclius the younger. These coins include large series of gold, silver, and copper coins issued at Carthage in 608-610; at Alexandria of Egypt (gold coins dated from 608-610 and undated copper coins); at Cyprus (copper coins dated back to 610 A.D.) and at Alexandretta in Syria. According to P. Grierson, this was the first time a mint was active in Salamis-Constantia during the Byzantine period. During this period it was the Cypriot mint, along with Carthage and Alexandretta which issued copper coins and Cypriot coinage included different denominations. Although, the Cypriot coinage dates back to the Heraclian period they are less than half a dozen and they all bear the signature ‘Kuprou’ and are comprised of follis and two kinds of decanummia.

The follis had an image of the two Heraclii on the obverse both crowned and wearing consular robes with the title CONSULII. On the reverse, the denomination mark, M, is

---

929 He was the nominal leader of the revolt.
933 Zavagno (2011), pp. 452. The excavations in the Akrotiri peninsula (still unpublished) have yielded two coins belonging to the period under discussion. A five-nummia dated to 610 A.D. (minted at Carthage) and a six nummia dated to 610-611 (Alexandrian mint). See Zavagno (2011), ff. 28; Also two kinds of 'decanummia' minted during the reign of Heraclius and one of them bear the date 23 September 610 and 22 September 611 while another one bear the enigmatic date 3. See Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p. 160.
accompanied by the *officina* letter suggesting that the mint was large enough to sustain more than one workshop. These copper coins also employ a peculiar dating system utilising either the indictional year [ANNO XIII for A.D. 609-610] or the regnal year dated from the beginning of the Heraclian revolt [Anno III]. These coins employed the mint marks KVPRON OR KVPRU or KVPR’ or KVP or CPR. Indeed, despite the similarity between the Cypriot coins and the ones bearing the *Alexand* signature with regard to their design they are different in style.⁹³⁴

The *decanummia* are different in style and again bear two different dating systems: the indictional date (ANNO XIII) or the regnal year (ANNO III). The *decanummia* produced in Salamis-Constantia during the interregnum are divided into two groups on the basis of their mark of value on the reverse, either X or I. Additionally, the recent finding of two-*nummia* piece with busts of Heraclius and his father have expanded the range of known currency produced at the Cypriot mint.⁹³⁵ According to Callot, the excavations at Salamis reveal one specimen struck in Alexandretta (a *follis*), which also creates the problem of the identification of the unparalleled mintmark.⁹³⁶

---

(ii) **REIGN OF HERACLIUS (610-641 A. D.):**

The period of Heraclius is known as a period of raised military importance for Cyprus, which served as an important base monitoring the Levantine naval routes. The Persian occupation of the island indicates how strategically important the island was. The incident of Persian incursion can be found in the *Life of St. John the Almsgiver, Patriarch of Alexandria*, written by Leontios of Neapolis during the mid-seventh century. In his work, a chronicle states that a general called Asparagurius was sent to Constantia yet was not allowed into the town. This increased the tension between the general and the citizens of Constantia, however, the intervention of the Patriarch precluded Constantia and its citizens from possible war. According to Zavagno, the islands strategic positioning as a military hub gave rise to the conquest and the later Byzantine re-conquista (which remains undocumented); this is supported by way of the existence of Heraclius’s copper coinage on the island, thus showing its status as a supplier of coins for Syria.

As it is argued by Zavagno, this role probably enabled the circulation of enormous amounts of copper coins belonging to Heraclius’ reign, as the large quantity of copper coins yielded by the excavations at Paphos-Saranda Kolones, Kourion (basilica) and Salamis-Constantia confirms this idea. Although, several specimens during the mentioned period were discovered, one series of *folles* becomes prominent. This series bears the standing figure of Heraclius, flanked by his son Heraclius Constantine and daughter Epiphania on the obverse and the M denomination mark, accompanied with KVPR on the exergue, on the reverse. They all date to the years A. D. 626-629 of Heraclius’ reign and arguably were

---

938 Ibid, p. 454.
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minted for military use representing the army formed in Cyprus to re-conquer Eastern provinces from Persia.  

It is worth mentioning here that among the other findings a group of seals show a distinctive Heraclian monogram on the obverse and all contain a pair of titles, office, rank or double office, a date suggested by Metcalf to coincide with the same period as the minting of copper coins. However, as Zavagno states, these specimens could be the indication of the redistributive fiscal policy of the Byzantine state. According to him, the fact that military units received their wages in copper coins suggests the lack of gold revenue during the Persian occupation.

Furthermore, the coins minted between the years 626-29 in Cyprus (just before the Byzantine reoccupation) can be classified as ‘‘round and well struck’’ and ‘‘roughly struck on oval flans’’. The latter is identified by Foss as a series of imitations produced in Syria during the period A. D. 638-647, which also include the earliest examples of the Arab-Byzantine coinage. They are also commonly found in the Levant which suggests that these imitations were probably transported from Cyprus to the Levant.

Moreover, the analysis of the locally-struck copper coinage and coins yielded by several excavations in different sites indicates that copper coins belonging to a diverse set of Byzantine mints (such as: Thessalonica, Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Seleucia, Alexandria and Constantinople) reached Cyprus and that they included diverse denominations such as folles, half-folles, thirty nummia, and six nummia. Among these are found, twelve-nummia

---

943 Foss, Arab Byzantine Coins, p. 17.
specimens struck in Alexandria and found in Salamis-Constantia, Kourion and Saranda-Kolones and also the *follis* type bearing the image of Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine flanked by the daughter Epiphania. These show that Cyprus was firmly tied into the economic heart of the Empire.

However, the Heraclian coinage of Cyprus was not solely supplied by the Byzantine heartland. The post-Persian war defensive anxiety and attempts at restoration did not last long. The defeat of the Byzantine forces at the hands of Arab invaders in 634 A.D. resulted in the loss of Palestine and Damascus in 635. The significant victories of the Arabs in the Levant caused a crisis of organization and economic decline in Byzantium. Due to the economic crisis Byzantium was not able to re-establish regular coin circulation. As a result of the administrative disruption the Heraclian coinage of Cyprus reached the island from the Levantine regions as well. Mostly, the small and light *follis* from the final period of Heraclius reached Syria and Palestine from Constantinople and among them were two types of ‘*enigmatic folles’* dated to the years 634-36. The second type bears the inscription of *N* (or *E*) and *M* on the reverse, and *CON* in the exergue. The ‘*military link’* between the Levant and Byzantine Cyprus is represented by another class of copper coins (*folles* and half-*folles*) found at different sites across the island (like NeaPaphos, Kourion and Salamis). This type bear a Syrian countermark with monograms of Heraclius which were struck at Caesarea. Thus it is clear from the numismatic evidence of Heraclius’ reign that Cyprus played an important role within the Byzantine fiscal network and as a strategic hub during the first half of the seventh century.

---

The close links between Salamis-Constantia and Syria, Palestine, Egypt and Constantinople can be interpreted as evidence that Salamis-Constantia regained its economic and political importance during the reign of Heraclius. Also as Zavagno pointed out, the stratigraphical analysis of excavations and epigraphic evidence reveals that Salamis-Constantia was the subject of acute imperial interest. Moreover, it is allegedly claimed that a possible sign of increasing commercial and artisanal significance of the capital could be supported by the rebuilding of aqueducts sponsored by wealthy local clergy and construction of a two-storied complex –revealed by excavation- at the ‘‘Huilerie’’; endowing the Episcopal palace with annexes and a chapel.\textsuperscript{950}

(iii) **REIGN OF CONSTANS II (641-668 A. D.):**

It is well known that from Anastasius’ reign from A. D. 491 until the Arab raids of 649 and 653, Cyprus enjoyed a high level of material prosperity. The three hundred years from 662 onwards were the period of decline for early medieval Cyprus, when its economic vigour waned. It was a sharp decline which was reflected in many administrative changes, and Cyprus lost its political and economic significance until the reign of Alexius I (1081-1118).\textsuperscript{951} According to the Arab sources, Mu’awiya (the Arab governor of Syria) tried to conquer Cyprus by setting out on naval raids against the island for the first time in A. D. 649,

\textsuperscript{951} Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, pp. 31-33.
after having tried twice (in A. D. 643 and 645) to convince the Caliphs (‘Umar and later ‘Uthmaan) about the strategic position and proximity of the island to the coast of Levant.\textsuperscript{952}

Despite scant evidence within the repository of Arabic and Byzantine sources, the Syriac chronicler of 1234 mentions that: “invaders saw the capital Constantia as prosperous and densely populated: Mu’awiya marvelled at its palaces and buildings and made a ceremonial entry to the city and took up his residence in the Episcopal palace”.\textsuperscript{953} This shows the plundering of Salamis/Constantia by Mu’awiya and Syrian and Egyptian naval forces; in the aftermath of Byzantines’ephemeral attack on Alexandria from Cyprus in A.D 646, the position of the island was clearly reversed.\textsuperscript{954}

The numismatic evidence of the reign of Constans II reveals that the island still played an important strategic role. Regarding the Arab threats in the Levant against Byzantines, the island provided a naval base for military operations. However, despite the Arab presence in Cyprus between A. D. 649 and 688, the coins of Constans II continued to circulate on the island together with the copper coins of the mint of Constantinople (there are 11 different types of \textit{folles}, most of them bearing the inscription \textit{EN TOUTO NIKA}).\textsuperscript{955}

Fortunately, the results of the archaeological excavations at Salamis allow us a clearer picture in chronological and typological terms. The \textit{solidus} (highest gold denomination) of Constans II bears on the obverse the bust of Constans II (with a long beard) wearing the \textit{stemma} and clad in the chlamys and, on the reverse, the inscription of \textit{VICTORIA AVG} with the \textit{officia} mark and \textit{CONOB} in the exergue.\textsuperscript{956} In addition to the findings of gold coins, large quantities of \textit{folles} (243 folles identified from the excavations of Salamis attributable to the

\textsuperscript{952} Zavagno (2011), p. 462.  
\textsuperscript{953} Ibid, fn. 78.  
\textsuperscript{954} Ibid, p. 462.  
\textsuperscript{955} Ibid, pp. 464-465. Copper coins bearing the mint of Constantinople were in circulation in the island during the whole regnal period of Constans II.  
\textsuperscript{956} Callot, \textit{O. Salamine de Chypre}, p. 75.
period of Constans II), bear the inscription INPER CONST on the obverse and on the reverse the denominational mark, M. This is accompanied by the officina mark and mint mark in the exergue. According to Callot, however, if one considers the numbers of coins yielded by the excavations of Salamis that are illegible (but must be Byzantine) then this figure could be greatly increased, perhaps even doubled. There are fifteen different types of folles identified by Callot from the excavations at the site, demonstrating the continuous movement of coinage into the island in this period. The most numerous follis type is the one bearing the inscription INPER CONST. Fifty nine examples are identifiable if we do not count illegible examples which may fall into this category. It is striking that none of the fifty-nine examples of this type bear the countermark of Constantine IV. Most types of folles belonging to Constans II’s reign are well represented at Salamis.

The excavations of Salamis also yielded several imitations of bronze coinage from this reign, all belonging to the Umayyad period. It is also possible that, because of their poor state of preservation, some of these imitations have been classified into other groups. The disproportion between the large amounts of coins found belonging to the reign of Constans II has been interpreted by some historians as evidence for the absence of a Mint in Cyprus. Obviously, this is particularly the case for one type among the fifteen which bears the name of the city of Constantia and not that of the emperor, as well as CON on the exergue. However, other types are not supporting this hypothesis. It is also worth mentioning for their rarity the six identifiable half-folles and twelve decanummia pieces found in Salamis-Constantia, though it is not easy to classify them by their type. From the fact that these denominations were regarded as a ‘low modulus’ type they appear rarely in excavations,
quite bad in condition. The *half-folles* type found in the Salamis/Constantia excavations is attributed to the reign of Heraclius by W. Hahn and D. Sear, whereas P. Grierson argues that they belong to the reign of Constans II.\textsuperscript{962}

To sum up, the excavations at Salamis/Constantia reveal that there were more *folles* minted between 651 and 668 than there were between 641 and 650. Bearing this in mind, there is also a clear contrast between the central area of the city, where coin losses are few after 650, and the Campanopetra sector, where they are relatively abundant.\textsuperscript{963} Furthermore, all of Constans’ coins bear the Constantinople mint-mark but the *folles* of Constans II were largely imitated in Syria after it had passed under Arab rule.\textsuperscript{964} In fact, after the Arab conquest, in Syria, the imitation of the Constans II coins was in circulation together with the imitation of the last types of Heraclius. Similarly, the distributive pattern of Constantinople-minted *follis* which was in circulation at Cyprus in A. D. 651-652 (the one bearing the inscription of *INPER CONST*) should be analysed as it is also found in several Syrian excavations like Apamea, Dehes and Hama.\textsuperscript{965} As Zavagno pointed out, the role played by Cyprus in transferring Byzantine money to Syria and Palestine can be explained by the role the island played at the opposite end of the “‘coin sea-route to Syria-Palestine’”.\textsuperscript{966} Moreover, another unique type of Arab-Byzantine coin (called “‘Cyprus imitation’”) was in circulation in the cities and towns of Syria-Palestine (like Apamea, Hama, Dehes, Resafa, Antioch, Bethlehem and Nessana) between the years 638-647 A.D., and these imitative coins can be regarded as the first coins produced under the Caliphal regime. Most probably they were exported to Cyprus, where one countermarked example has been found at Salamis-

\textsuperscript{962} Ibid, pp. 88-89.
\textsuperscript{963} Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{964} Ibid, pp. 152-153.
\textsuperscript{965} Zavagno (2011), p. 466.
\textsuperscript{966} Zavagno (2011), p. 466.
It is argued by Foss, that obscure features show them to be an obvious group coming from a single Syrian mint or workshop. All of the coins mentioned belong to the period A.D. 660-673 and can be classified as a “irregular coinage” circulated in the particular areas of the island occupied by Arabs. In light of the differing types of coinage existing during Constans II’s reign it is useful to provide more detailed analysis of the ‘supposed’ Arab destruction of the city from A.D. 649 to 653. The repairing of the public baths, gymnasium, churches, several houses and the construction of massive defensive walls and new buildings around the “Huilerie” complex after the Arab incursions, mean that it is highly debatable as to whether Salamis/Constantia really did suffer from major structural destruction or not.

(iv) REIGN OF CONSTANTINE IV (668-685 A.D.):

The numismatic evidence from Salamis-Constantia from the reign of Constantine IV reveals the monogram of Constantine IV, which was affixed to coinage on Cyprus during the reign of this emperor, mainly on his father, Constans II’s folles. Excavations at Salamis yielded 234 folles from the period of Constantine IV that can be attributed to Constans II and apart from that the vast majority of the coins bear the denominational mark K (=20), denoting them as half-folles. These countermarks of Constantine IV which were applied to all coins on the reverse, especially on those of the second half of the Constans II’s reign, appear to have been affixed only on folles, but there are a few rare exceptions. Three different countermarks are cited on half-folles of Constans II and apart from that we have a follis of Heraclius
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967 Ibid, p. 467.
belonging to the workshop of Salamis-Constantia which also bears countermarks of Constantine IV.971

Even more interesting are the very rare countermarks which appear on the coins of Constantine IV himself. These are observed on a follis of Carthage and half-follis of Constantinople.972 In this matter, P. Grierson argues973 that Cypriot countermarks were imposed on the light folles of Constans II and that these were introduced as a new coinage of Constantine IV. Indeed, the countermark bearing the large K (=20) was meant to devalue the coin to half-follis value.974 In contrast to Grierson's hypothesis, Callot argues that the coinage of Constantine IV was countermarked in order to change the value of folles of Constans II which were not in use only in Cyprus, but it had been done in other regions as well. And above all, the excavations of Cyprus also yielded heavy coins belonging to the reign of Constantine IV which might suggest that Constantine IV’s ‘large’ follis did reach Cyprus.975 However, according to Callot, the answer to this contradictory finding can be discerned from the political history of the middle seventh century. Callot pointed out that this shows that the workshop of Constantinople, which was the only supplier of coinage to Cyprus, did not supply the currency of this emperor in the island.976

Indeed, as Metcalf pointed out ‘at the end of Constans’ reign, consignments of coins to Cyprus from the (sole) mint in Constantinople ceased abruptly’.977 As was mentioned before, Constans II’s period witnessed several Arab attacks during 647 (or 648?) and the
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973 ‘D.O.C., II, p. 55. However, this interpretation, proposed by Grierson (as based upon the countermark K=20 carved on the face of the coins), has been partially revised due to discovery of some folles bearing the countermark X=10 and pointing to a bigger devaluation (i.e. 75% rather than 50% as previously thought)’ Zavagno (2011), p. 496, fn. 116 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, pp. 173-174.
975 The excavations in Salamis yielded 234 folles that can be attributed to the Constans II. However, 66 of them have countermarks affixed on the reverse. Callot (2004), p. 91.
977 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p.153.
island was occupied by Muawiya. The Arabs re-embarked in 649 with the requirement of an annual tribute of 7200 gold coins which increased the tension between the Caliphate and Byzantium. Indeed, shortly after the requirement was rejected by the Cypriots, Muawiya disembarked again in 653 (or 654?) and again attacked Constantia. He quickly returned to Syria (leaving a garrison in Paphos of approximately 12 000 men) and confirmed the tribute of 649. However, as a result of his failure before the walls of Constantinople in 677, Muawiya was forced to sign a treaty with Constantine IV in 678. In 680-683, the Arab garrison withdrew from Cyprus under the leadership of Caliph Yazid (the son of Muawiya). After that, the peace between Arabs and Byzantines was confirmed in 685 (the beginning of the first reign of Justinian II) and Cyprus became a sort of neutral territory (condominium) whose revenues were shared between Arabs and Byzantines. Finally this peace was renewed in 688-689 between Justinian II and Caliph Abd al-Malik (685-705). It must also be remembered that at that time there was no mint in Cyprus and that the supply of coinage depended entirely on the capital.978 Excavations on Cyprus (Paphos, Kourion, Salamis) reveal that the currency of Constantinople arrived in Cyprus without any difficulty until the death of Constans II in 668. But this supply seems suddenly to stop during the reign of his successor Constantine IV.

The excavations of Salamis-Constantia yielded just one coin (30-nummi) of the emperor Constantine IV, while the decanummia which are so plentiful in the metropolitan area are absent.979 Yet, the coinage belonging to the reign of Constantine IV is apparently absent from the southern part of the island (like Paphos and Kourion) as well. Indeed, there are four coins of this emperor in the Pano Kyrenia hoard, which were possibly carried to Cyprus by private individuals.980 Most probably the reason for this sharp decline in coinage

979 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p. 153.
was the Arab presence on the island. The Arabs were at this time masters of the Eastern Mediterranean and their attacks upon Constantinople might have prevented the supply of cash to Cyprus from the capital. It is not possible to trace evidence of tranquillity and continuity on the island again until the period of Justinian II. After his reign, currency of Constantinople re-appeared in Constantia-Salamis.981

If we happen to analyse the economic dynamics of the period, it can be said that until the end of Constans II’s reign all types and denominations struck in the mint of Constantinople reached Cyprus. Therefore, it can be argued that despite the Arab presence on the island, relations between the island and the capital of the Empire were never ruptured. Most probably for political reasons however, the Byzantine administration in the Cypriot capital, Salamis-Constantia, suddenly disappeared after the death of Constans II in 668. It seems that the local authorities found themselves facing a difficult situation because of the lack of coinage during the reign of Constantine IV. So to overcome this deficiency, the currencies of Constans II were countermarked on behalf of his son Constantine IV. Apparently, these were the folles belonging to the second half of the reign of Constans II (particularly 651 and 668) but there are still exceptions. Indeed, the evidence discovered generally suggests that the folles belonging to Constans II’s reign were countermarked on the reverse but there are a few others which have been countermarked both on the reverse and on the obverse. After the departure of the Arab garrison in 680, the situation on the island appears to have remained the same. The currency of Constantine IV had not arrived on the island on a regular basis and Cyprus had continued to use the countermarked currencies of Constans II. As will be seen, countermarked folles of Constans II continued in circulation later, which suggests that there could have been a particular monetary system on the island. It seems that, despite the departure of the Arabs, the situation in Cyprus remained unstable until

the last year of the reign of Constantine IV. This could be one of the reasons why only the *folles* of Constans II were countermarked on behalf of his son Constantine IV (*folles* or *half-folles* with a few exceptions). We can also add to this number a few imitations of the Syrian coinage of Constans II which were probably countermarked with a different pattern. It was during the reign of Justinian II when the imperial currency re-appeared (in 695), but nevertheless in very limited quantities.\(^{982}\)

(v) **JUSTINIAN II (685-695 A.D.) to BASIL II (976-1025 A.D.):**

Despite the fact that the existing numismatic evidence suggests the monetary economy of Salamis-Constantia reached its peak during the reign of Heraclius and Constans II in comparison with other periods, it is still possible to talk about some degree of continuation during the period from the reign of Justinian II to that of Basil II.\(^{983}\) The excavations in Salamis-Constantia suggest a certain decrease in the economy of the capital (or the disruption of the monetary economy at least), if not a discontinuity. Due to the lack of evidence, the 22 examples of coinage (*folles* and *half-folles*) coming from the reigns of Justinian II, Leontius and Tiberius III represent very important numbers, when we take into consideration the scarcity of bronze coins during the seventh and eighth centuries. The excavations of Cyprus in general also yielded several coins belonging to the period under discussion. For example, in Kourion 3 coins were discovered, one belonging to the period of Justinian II and two from the reign of Tiberius III. In Paphos (Saranda Kolones) two coins of Justinian II and one of Tiberius III have been discovered.\(^{984}\) However, despite the scarcity of
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\(^{982}\) Ibid, pp. 93-94.
\(^{983}\) Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, p. 149.
\(^{984}\) Callot (2004), pp. 93-94.
the coinage from the period between the late seventh and eleventh centuries, twenty-two examples of *folles* and *half-folles* can be regarded as representing some economic continuity. Alongside the mentioned findings, there are also coins belonging to the periods of Constantine V to Leo IV and Basil II. The excavations of Constantia yielded two *solidi* of Constantine V and Leo IV and one *Nomisma Histamenon* belonging to the reign of Basil II.985

The seven *folles* from the first reign of Justinian II (685-695), are dated to the years 685/6 and 687/8. Yet, considering that Justinian II was the one who transplanted a certain number of the Cypriots to the Hellespont (in 690/1), these coins all belong to the period before this exile.986 In this respect, instead of regarding the late seventh century as an absolute cut-off because of the absence of coins of Constantine IV, these seven coins might represent some kind of an economic continuity in the island. In this matter, as Metcalf pointed out,

‘‘...given the virtual absence of coins of Constantine IV, even seven coins seems to represent some sort of new initiative: a measure of financial support for Cyprus in 686-8. This initiative is part of the context in which the decision was taken to recruit skilled ship-builders and mariners to a new city on the Hellespont; it did not come completely out of the blue.’’987

After seven years the transplantation of Cypriots was revoked and Justinian II took power again. The Cypriots returned to Constantia during the year 705 (or 706). The significant amount of coins yielded at excavations probably minted between 690/1 and 705/6 were most probably brought to Constantia by the returning Cypriots in 705/6. However, the *half-folles* can be regarded as something new: four of Leontius (695-8), and nine, plus two
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folles, of Tiberius III (698-705) and they have a very limited occurrence in Cyprus as a whole.988

It has to be mentioned here that despite the limited number of coin finds, numismatic evidence presented above from the reign of Constantine IV to that of Basil II (of whom there is one gold histamenon) suggests a certain level of monetary circulation. However, this reduced scale of monetary circulation may suggest some specific episode in the economic history of Constantia. Indeed, in order to understand the economic and political dynamics of the seventh and eighth centuries, more excavations are definitely needed. Despite the importance of the existing numismatic evidence yielded by the excavations of Salamis conducted by Callot between the years of 1964-1974, these findings are not adequate to reveal an accurate economic picture of the late seventh to early eleventh centuries. In this matter, the analysis of Arab-Byzantine coinage will certainly be helpful in understanding more about the economic realities of the mentioned period.

(vi) ARAB-BYZANTINE COINAGE:

During the first half of the seventh century Arab armies conquered the Syria and Palestine. The Byzantine army was defeated by Arab forces in Syria and Palestine in 634 and 635 and in the following year the Byzantines were defeated in the Yarmuk battle which ended the Byzantine hegemony in Syria.989 The island was regarded as a threat to the Muslim military expansion as it provided a naval base for Byzantium. The Arab army attacked Cyprus in 653 under the leadership of Mu’awiya and plundered much of the island.

989 Browning, R. ‘Byzantium and Islam in Cyprus in the Early Middle Ages’ in Kentron Epistemonikon Ereunon, 9, (Nicosia, 1977-79), p. 102. For more detailed information see above.
According to the Arab sources the Arab occupation of Cyprus went on until 680, however, it is clear that peace negotiations began in 687 and were completed in 688. This resulted in the division of the island into equal parts in terms of tax revenues (the so-called *condominium*) between the Arabs and the Byzantines. One outcome was the transplantation of part of the local population who returned to the island in 699 or 705 A.D. The terms of the agreement are mentioned in the work of the *Chronicle* of Theophanes. According to him, 12,000 Mardaites were seized by the Emperor Justinian II and the Caliph Abd al-Malik agreed to pay 365,000 *nomismata*, 365 slaves and 365 horses. However, Caliph and Emperor agreed to share tribute equally from Cyprus which was 14000 *nomismata*.

In this respect, some historians, like Metcalf, envisage the Arab-Byzantine period as a territorial partition by arguing that the Byzantines movement of their capital to Laptha along the north-coast and the Arabs controlling the southern half of the island signifies genuine territorial partition. Others, like Megaw, Malamut, Dikigoropoulos, Cameron and Browning, give the example of free movement by the local population and resettlement on the mainland as evidence of the island’s role “as a sort of buffer zone”.

The Arab-Byzantine coin evidence, however, can contribute some new insights into (if not fully explain) the economic environment of Salamis-Constantia. In particular, the distribution and circulation patterns of so-called Arab-Byzantine coinage in Cyprus is especially interesting. With regard to this peculiar kind of coinage, a classification of four different types can be used. The simpler one has been proposed by Callot and divides the

---

990 Ibid, pp. 104-105.
specimens into four classes: Byzantine *countermarked* coins, imitations of the coinage of Constans II (*Pseudo-Byzantine*), *Arab-Byzantine* coins and *Ummayad Imperial Image* coins.\(^995\)

The history of countermarked Byzantine coins (*follis*) can be summarized in the following way: Phocas (607/608- unknown workshop), Heraclius (610/613 unknown workshop), Heraclius and Heraclius Constantine (629/631 workshop: Constantinople), Heraclius (two countermarks affixed on the reverse at Antioch about 627/628), and countermarks affixed on the obverse of Arab (*tayyib*) coins in Syria about 636.\(^996\) Most probably these coins arrived in Cyprus during the raid of 647 (648) or during the occupation of the island (653). Moreover, it needs to be remembered that there are also later countermarked coins that will be under the examination in the following pages.

Furthermore, the imitative examples of Constans II (or *Pseudo-Byzantine*) can be divided into two types. The first has a crowned facing bust of the emperor, holding a long sceptre surmounted by a cross and a *globus cruciger* on the obverse. On the reverse this type bears a large *M* (uncial). There may also be an M on the obverse. However, these coins bearing the denominational mark M on the obverse and reverse are very rare. The second type has a crowned facing bust of the emperor bearing armour and a long sceptre and his son crowned and dressed in chlamys holding the *globus cruciger* on the obverse. The reverse bears the large *M* inscription. Currencies belonging to type one, representing the facing bust of the emperor on the obverse and on the reverse an uncial M, are all imitations of the first emissions of Constans II’s reign, dated to the period 641-648.\(^997\)

---

The imitative mints of Heraclius and Constans II are well known and extremely common. They all belong to the series called Pseudo-Byzantine minted in Syria after the Arab conquest when the new authority had not yet established its own currency. Byzantine money still circulated in Syria, and often they are countermarked: Tayyib (=good). However, numismatic evidence suggests that the money supply in circulation was insufficient to meet the needs of the population, so to overcome this lack of currency, they struck large quantities of Pseudo-Byzantine type coins independently without marks. 998 Certainly, some of them were countermarked in Salamis under Constantine IV (668-685). As Callot pointed out, the presence of these imitations in Salamis-Constantia suggests that some of them had already arrived during the first Arab raid in 647 (648). But most of them arrived later after the installation of an Arab garrison on the island between ca. 653 and 680. The hypothesis of Callot that these imitations should also be found at different sites on the island and most probably can be attributed to the reign of Constans II999 seems a viable possibility.

The Arab-Byzantine coinage of Cyprus can be divided into the four classes belonging to the different mints: Damascus, Heliopolis, Emesa/Homs, Tiberias/Tabarriya. In order these were Damascus (on the obverse the emperor clothed, crowned, holding a long cross and globus cruciger, rev. M, +above, ANO and XYII, in exergue ΔAM); Heliopolis-Baalbek (Obv.: two standing figures, holding sceptres and a globus cruciger; cross between heads. Rev.: M, + above; Π below; ΟΑΙ Ι. ΠΙΑ Δ in ex. BALABAΑΚΚ (in arab.)); Emese (on the obverse crowned facing bust, holding a globus cruciger, bearing ΚΑΛ ΟΝ or ΚΑΑΝ. Rev. Large M (uncial); below εMH/CIC, in ex. Tayyib (in arab); Tabarriya (on the obverse three crowned emperors’ busts facing, holding sceptres and globus cruciger. Rev. M (half uncial). Exergue ΛΝ). Indeed, these currencies themselves (Arab-Byzantine) belong to the first regular coinage of the Ummayads in Syria and Palestine, where they were minted in large

998 Ibid, p.102.
999 Ibid, pp. 102-103.
quantities (in several mints) corresponding to different provinces. In style, they are still imitations of Byzantine types and have meaningful legends, but for the first time they appear with legends in Arabic.\footnote{Ibid, p. 103.}

In contrast to Callot, Goodwin prefers to divide the specimens into three classes: Pseudo-Byzantine coins (dated to the 650s-670s copying Byzantine style but sometimes lacking Greek or Latin legends); Ummayad Imperial Image coins (dated to the period 670s-690s usually including mint names) and finally Standing Caliph coins (which bear the new Islamic iconography usually including ‘Abd-al Malik’s name).\footnote{Goodwin, T. Arab-Byzantine coinage (Study in the Khalili Collection, IV), (London, 2004), pp. 14-27; Zavagno (2011), pp. 471-472.} In this respect, Callot argues that to date these coins to the beginning of ca. 660 (considering that Syria remained well-stocked with official Byzantine coins until about 658) misleads the reader since most of these currencies are imitations of Constans II belonging to the period 641-648. Callot argues that the date ca. 643 suggested by C. Morrisson seems more appropriate for the currencies of northern Syria. Moreover, the manufacture of these imitative styles probably ceased around the 680s when the Ummayad authorities were better organized and began to produce the aforementioned Arab-Byzantine coins, striking them in informal mints.\footnote{Callot (2004), pp. 102-103.}

Another type of classification has recently been introduced by Clive Foss\footnote{C. Foss, Arab Byzantine Coins. An Introduction, with a catalogue of the Dumbarton Oaks Collection, Washington D. C., (2008).}, who proposed a different interpretation of the Pseudo-Byzantine types and divided them into two classes: \textit{imitative coins} (where the obverse legend of Byzantine coins is reproduced and reverse legend preserved), and \textit{derivative coins} (with no obverse or reverse legend).
Moreover, Foss also prefers to classify the *Ummayad Imperial Image* coins as a *Standing Caliph* and the *Bilingual Series*.\textsuperscript{1004}

To conclude, the so-called *Imitative* and *Derivative Coins*;\textsuperscript{1005} with the thirteen *folles* recovered at Salamis-Constantia, three specimens (two *folles* and one *20-nummia*) that founded at Saranda Kolones should be included. Foss states that, although these coins are very common in Syria and Palestine, there is not enough reliable evidence to support the notion that they were produced officially or by local, independent sources. It is possible to argue that the large production of these coins started when the importation of Byzantine *folles* decreased towards the end of Constans II’s reign (after 659 A.D.).\textsuperscript{1006} However in Goodwins’s words it is uncertain ‘if the curtailment caused the start of production or whether the realization that requirements for coinage could be met by local production caused them to curtail imports’\textsuperscript{1007}. Moreover, some of the specimens also bear a countermark in Arabic (*tayyib*), which could indicate the validation of coins for fiscal purposes.

It is also necessary to mention some more detailed information about the *Bilingual coins*. Since they bear distinctive mint-marks they allow us to argue about circulation patterns concerning the Arab-Byzantine coinage found at Cyprus. To be more precise, *Bilingual Series* coins have been found at Salamis (4 specimens), Saranda Kolones (one specimen), and Kourion (one specimen). In fact, two coins found at Salamis-Constantia bear the mint marks of the *Jund\textsuperscript{1008}* of Damascus (mint of Damascus and Ba’albeek), one comes from the *Jund* of Jordan (mint of Tiberias) and one comes from the *Jund* of Homs (countermarked as *tayyib*=good). The unique coin yielded from the excavations at Saranda Kolones is

\textsuperscript{1004} Zavagno (2011), pp. 472-473.  
\textsuperscript{1005} According to Foss’ classifications.  
\textsuperscript{1006} Zavagno (2011), p.473; Foss, *‘Arab Byzantine Coins’*.  
\textsuperscript{1007} Ibid, pp. 473. Goodwin, *‘Arab-Byzantine Coinage’*, p. 18.  
\textsuperscript{1008} *Jund*=Administrative-Military districts.
countermarked as *jayyid* = excellent (with a standing emperor different from others issued at Damascus). One coin from Kourion came from Ba’albek.\(^{1009}\) Zavagos’ suggestion, ‘...it seems that the main shipping route of the Levant linked Cyprus (mainly its capital Constantia) with the *Jund* of Damascus, [...] whose territory included the capital of the Caliphate. [Indeed] one should not overlook the fact that two of the six specimens came from Ba’albeek [and this city was] the second most important administrative focus of the Damascene *Jund*, one of the major mints of the Syria and Palestine’ is felicitous.\(^{1010}\) Contradicting the pessimistic approach (‘‘discontinuity’’) this puzzling incongruity is well illustrated by the Callot’s publication of coins yielded at the Salamis/Constantia excavations. The two *Heraclius* (610-41 A.D.) type and 59 *Inper Const* (730-88 A.D.) type accompanied with the 12 imitation of Constant II and another imitation of Constant II are dateable to the years 655/58. Alongside the above mentioned types Arab-Byzantine coins from the mints of Damascus, Heliopolis and Emesa definitely suggest a continuation of the monetary economy if we consider that these findings were yielded from the limited number of excavations in Constantia.\(^{1011}\)

Additionally some stray finds that are essential for the chronology need to be mentioned. There are 32 Islamic coins (*stray finds*) that are classified as Arab-Byzantine in style and published by Metcalf and Pitsillides.\(^{1012}\) In fact, different types of Islamic coins found mainly in Salamis/Constantia, Curium (Kourion), Saranda Kolones, Kormakiti, Paphos, and Polis also reveal the mint place which leads us to examine the economic links of Cyprus during the early middle-ages. If we happen to classify them, the first type has a

\(^{1010}\) Ibid, p. 474.
\(^{1011}\) For the comparative and more detailed table See Foss, *Arab-Byzantine Coins*, p. 174.
\(^{1012}\) Pitsillides, A.G. and Metcalf, D. ‘Islamic and Byzantine Coins in Cyprus during the Condominium Centuries’ in *Kentron Epistemonikon Ereunon*, 21, (Nicosia, 1995); ibid, ‘Some More Finds of Islamic and Byzantine Coins from the Condominium Centuries’ in *Kentron Epistemonikon Ereunon*, 23, (Nicosia, 1997).
crescent symbol on the reverse, probably from the early Abbasid period (after 750 A.D.) and some types appear with neat lettering but no margin. Also, a light weight clipped dirham from the early Abbasid period accompanied by crude epigraphy and another Abbasid dirham with the letters ‘rabbi allah/Muhammad rasul allah/mimma amara bihi ʿabdallah al-amin/Muhammad amir al-muʾminin/al-ʿabbas’, identified as from the Madinat al-Salam mint, dates back to the years 809-12. Probably the coin of Madinat al-Salam reached the island before the ninth century as one of the dirhams from the above mentioned mint is dateable to the year 773 A.D. and another clipped dirham, clearly of early Abbasid style, dates back to the years between 803-9 A.D.\textsuperscript{1013} Lastly, an early Ummayad copper coin and undated fals struck in Ramla reveal that Arab-Byzantine coins were in circulation both in the so-called condominium period and in the ninth century.\textsuperscript{1014}

In the light of the displayed evidence, it is possible to suggest that the Arab-Byzantine coinage found at Salamis/Constantia is dateable to the seventh to ninth centuries. This, however, contradicts the pessimistic point of view which suggests that during the so-called condominium period Cyprus generally witnessed a sort of socio-economic decline. Moreover, contrary to the common belief, a solidus of Constantine V and Leo in the area of two-storey buildings, dateable to 751 onwards, and countermarked coins from the reign of Constantine IV clearly prove that Salamis/Constantia was not abandoned.\textsuperscript{1015} The Alexandria mint (found containing a Byzantine follis), two types of Arab-Byzantine copper folles; an imitation of a coin of Constans II (minted in Syria or Palestine) and the Damascus mint dateable to the late seventh century (countermarked ʿjayyid’), post-reform copper folles from Tabariya mint (mid-eighth century) and the so-called imitative-derivative coins found at several sites such

\textsuperscript{1013} Pitsillides and Metcalf (1995), pp. 9-10.
\textsuperscript{1014} Ibid, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{1015} Ibid, p. 9.
as Salamis/Constantia, Curium (Kourion), Paphos, Saranda Kolones, Kormakiti and Polis\textsuperscript{1016} clearly suggest a continuation of local and urban economy.

\textsuperscript{1016} Ibid, pp. 6-8.
CONCLUSION:

Our knowledge of the economic history of Salamis-Constantia during the Byzantine period has been framed by the surviving numismatic evidence. Nevertheless, the data supplied by numismatic evidence is partly matched by the written sources. However, it is not possible to rely on only written documents or coinage to construct Constantia’s economic and social background. Indeed, relying on the existing numismatic data, we could not even hope to answer some questions with any certainty: eg. when exactly did Salamis/Constantia fade away? How long did it take? What were the absolute reasons for its economic decline?

If we outline the economic history of Constantia based on the numismatic evidence, it can be said that ‘Constantia’s monetary economy was apparently at its most intense during the reigns of Heraclius and Constans II’. After that it is still possible to trace some degree of monetary economy during the reign of Constantine IV. As mentioned before, a part of the existing stock of coins of Constans II still continued to circulate during the reign of Constantine IV. Unfortunately Byzantine numismatic evidence then falls silent until the reign of Basil II. However, the large amounts of Arab-Byzantine coinage also suggest the significant possibility of the maintaining of political, commercial and cultural links of the two empires. Here, indeed, the study of the coinage yielded by the archaeological excavations in Salamis/Constantia should be compared with other urban centres like Paphos-Saranda Kolones and Kourion in order to achieve more certain answers.

Most significantly, the numismatic evidence suggests that the traditional explanation, that Constantia faded away and lost its economic importance after the Muslim raids and the occupation of Syria/Palestine, is not straightforwardly supportable. The evidence suggests

---

1017 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, pp. 149.
that Cyprus and its cities were still populated and witnessed a degree of monetized economic activity during and after this point. It is necessary here to mention the next published coins: the twelfth-century hoard of eighteen French billon deniers from the time of Crusades found at Salamis-Constantia. As Metcalf pointed out, it was brought from the region of Chartres and is dateable to the twelfth century (not earlier than c. 1098). Given the evidence of this hoard, it is reasonable to ask whether Constantia was still inhabited in this period. In order to answer this question ceramic and sigillographic evidence will undergo examination.

Obviously, further archaeological excavations, detailed analysis of the imported or locally made amphorae, and different ceramic types (rural and town-based Cypriot types) are needed to fill the gaps in the history of Salamis-Constantia. However, existing archaeological evidence from the conducted surveys are enough to partly uncover historical alternatives to the established narrative of Salamis/Constantia. Regarding the ceramic evidence found in Salamis/Constantia, the article of Hayes still remains the most influential one focusing on seventh century ceramic specimens. Despite his pessimism about the local production and importation, Hayes’s work provides a chronology of ceramic types yielded by excavations in Salamis.

Apart from identifiable coins to refine the chronology ceramic evidence also provides a reliable date and secure data for historians who are seeking to establish a new chronology and topology regarding the sixth to the tenth centuries. Compared to the earlier periods, the Mediterranean world during the sixth and early seventh centuries witnessed an intense commercial exchange. Certain types of ceramic and commercial amphorae found in the Levant cities (especially Egypt and Palestine), Constantinople and Cyprus indicate a high level of trading activities. Specifically, these African and Asia Minor types of amphorae and

---

1019 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p. 155.
fine pottery are yielded by the excavation of the Gymnasium building in Salamis.\textsuperscript{1021} Moreover, a large amount of ‘Cypriot Red Slip Ware’ dateable from the sixth to the seventh centuries was found in the building called the Huilerie.\textsuperscript{1022} Apart from the Gymnasium and the Huilerie, arguably one of the most important buildings excavated in Salamis/Constantia is the Campanopetra basilica (or harbour basilica). Located on the sea shore the Campanopetra basilica preserved a huge amount of pottery dating from the sixth to the tenth centuries.\textsuperscript{1023}

Although the ‘Cypriot Red Slip’ pottery found at Salamis (Bench deposit) suggests a continuity of the production of local ceramics from the sixth century also present are the Egyptian type of ‘red slip’ vessels dated to the seventh and eighth centuries and the ‘yellow slip’ type identified as an imitation of Africal sigillata and a late Cypriot form are more frequent in Cyprus. The production of the ‘‘Cypriot Red Slip’’ pottery during the seventh century and it’s frequency in the excavated sites (such as Salamis, Kornos Cave, Agios Georgios and Ayios Philon) indicates that one of the vital elements of local production was not precluded by the Arab raids.\textsuperscript{1024} However, Hayes argues that the ceramic evidence found in Cyprus is limited to certain types such as the Late Roman, Phocaean and African Sigillata dating from the years between 600-690 which are rare in Cyprus compared to Carthage and Sarachane (Istanbul) where large amounts of this type were found in the excavations.\textsuperscript{1025}

Nevertheless, the local Cypriot Late Roman ware is abundant in the Byzantine towns and rural sites such as Cape Drepanum, Salamis/Constantia, Kormakiti, Kornos Cave and Dhiorios. The ceramic findings from the Kornos Cave are dateable from the sixth to the eighth centuries and accompanied with the coins of Heraclius (613/4) and Constans II

\textsuperscript{1021} Hayes (1980), p. 376.
\textsuperscript{1025} Hayes (1980), p. 377.
The comparative analysis by Catling and Dikigoropoulos regarding the material found in the Kornos Cave and Salamis/Constantia provides an idea about the circulation of these wares. The findings from the excavations conducted in the bench deposit (Salamis) are illustrated by Catling in order to compare them with the ceramics found in the Kornos Cave. The illustration provided by Catling includes Cyprus Red Slip Bowls, cooking pot fragments and plain ware bases together with a single terracotta lamp dated back to the eighth century. It is also crucial to mention that the material from the bench deposit and Public Bath included coins from the sixth to the eighth centuries. The earlier coinage founded at the bench is dated to the Justinian period (523-38) and latest is from the period of Constans II (A.D. 641-68). Moreover, the coinage of Justinian II (A.D. 685-95 and 705-10) yielded by the excavations in the Public Baths are the latest Byzantine ones. In this sense, the material evidence from the bench deposit is dated to the range of 650-725 by Catling.

The methodology and dates suggested by Catling found some confirmation in the article of Hayes. According to him, several types of ceramics including local productions such as ‘Cyprus Red Slip’ and imported types circulated in the different sites of the island. The cooking pots from the Dhiorios and a vessel of the same type from the Kornos cave dateable to the mid-seventh century represent the best example. In addition to the seventh century examples findings from the Soli represent the later types of ceramics found also in Constantinople and Carthage. Also the island was actively trading with Constantinople where seventh century ‘Constantinopolitan’ types of cooking pots and amphorae are frequently presented at several sites. On the other hand, identical Cypriot pots and the transient type of amphorae associated with the currencies of Heraclius were found in the wreck of Yassi Ada

1026 Catling and Dikigoropoulos, ‘The Kornos Cave’, pp. 46 and 52.
1027 Ibid, fig.7, p. 54.
1028 Ibid, pp. 54-56.
(Bodrum). The close trade links between Constantinople and Cyprus are also confirmed by the identical pans found both in Salamis and Yassi Ada. The excavations at Salamis/Constantia especially in the ‘Campanopetra’ and ‘Huileire’ buildings yielded a considerable amount of ‘Constantinopolitan’ products dateable to the seventh century. Although the imported ‘Constantinopolitan’ type found in Salamis is limited to the seventh and first half of the eighth century, the excavations in Pafos reveal that this product was imported to the island until the ninth century.

Furthermore, the sigillographic evidence from the seventh and eighth centuries enables us to suggest that administrative, military, and bureaucratic machinery functioned normally. Moreover, the presence of local magnates and high court titles such as ‘‘illustrioi’’, ‘spatharioi’, ‘‘stratelatai’’, ‘‘palatini’’, metropolitan and their suffragan bishops indicates that administrative and political authority continued at a local level. Despite the pessimism of Metcalf suggesting that the Arab raids during the seventh century resulted in the de-population of the upper and middle classes, the second half of the seventh and first quarter of the eighth centuries are characterized by an increasing amount of official seals. Another particular example of the continuous administrative activity are the surviving lead seals of the bishops and archbishops of Constantia after the Arab raids. One might mention that during the early eighth century a new style of lead seals of the archbishop of Cyprus introduced with the title of ‘‘Kyprou’’, were frequently found at Salamis/Constantia and Amathous. A special group of lead seals with the Byzantine ‘eagle’ design were also

1032 Ibid, p. 379.
1033 Zavagno, ‘‘At the Edge of Two Empires’’, p. 134; Metcalf, ‘‘Byzantine Cyprus’’, p. 77.
1034 Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, pp. 76-77.
1035 Ibid, pp. 76-90; Metcalf, Byzantine Lead Seals, p. 123. The existence of twelve different varieties and over 50 specimens of the lead seals of the bishops and archbishops of Salamis/Constantia up to 691 are well-known. The lead seals of Arkadios I (625-41), Sergios (c.642-55), Arkadios II (fl.c.680) and Epiphanios II are examined in detail by Metcalf. As Metcalf pointed out, the varieties of lead seals indicates persistence of urban function in Salamis/Constantia until the tenth century.
1036 Zavagno, ‘‘At the Edge of Two Empires’’, p.139; Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p. 455.
used during the late seventh and early eighth centuries. The most important thing about these specimens is that some of them bear an Arabic inscription ‘Bismillah’ which suggests that the Arab officials might have taken part in the administrative services during the so-called condominium periods.\textsuperscript{1037} In fact, the excavations in the Hulierie and St Epiphanius and Companopetra basilicas yielded a large amount of lead seals belongings to the second half of the seventh and early eighth centuries. That the same type of lead seals from Salamis are also found in the different Cypriot cities reveals the continuous networks between Cyprus and Constantinople maintained by local magnates.\textsuperscript{1038}

In addition to the archaeological analysis a surviving eleventh-century manuscript needs to be mentioned here. Unfortunately, we are less well informed about Cypriot cartography during the Middle Ages, which restricts historians in depicting early medieval Famagusta. In this sense, the discovery of an anonymous Arabic manuscript called ‘‘Kitāb Gharāʾib al-funūn wa-mulaḥ al-ʿuyūn’’\textsuperscript{1039} also known as the Book of Curiosities is a copy, dated to the late twelfth or early thirteenth century, of a work compiled in the first half of the eleventh century in Egypt is very important, revealing new data about the Mediterranean Sea and the island of Cyprus. The author provided a separate map of Cyprus and descriptions of its port cities thus indicating their importance and function in the Mediterranean world. In addition the unidentified author of the Kitāb Gharāʾib al-funūn wa-mulaḥ al-ʿuyūn provides a whole map of the Mediterranean and some maps of important commercial centres.

In mapping the Mediterranean and its important commercial centres, the author preferred to divide regions into seven ‘‘climes’’. According to this classification

\textsuperscript{1037} Metcalf, Byzantine Cyprus, p. 86.
\textsuperscript{1038} Metcalf, Byzantine Lead Seals, pp. 55-58; Zavagno, ‘‘At the Edge of Two Empires’’, p. 142.
Diyāmāris\textsuperscript{1040} comes first and it is followed by respectively ‘Byzantine’ (Diyāstānis), Alexandria, Rhodes, Bigulus [Bunṭūs] or (Picolos Pontus),\textsuperscript{1041} Māsūbūntūs\textsuperscript{1042} and Bāristhānīs. The fourth clime, which is the island of Rhodes, divides into several localities. These are [al-Madā’in\textsuperscript{1043}, al-Sawād\textsuperscript{1044}, al-Ubullah\textsuperscript{1045}], al-Jazīrah (Upper Mesopotamia) and Babylon.\textsuperscript{1047} The lands of the fourth clime consist of al-Asfān (Hispania?), the northern part of Ifrīqiyyah, Sicily, the coastal lands of Aqrāṭi (Crete?), Athībās (Thebes) and the Oasis [of Siwah] in the lands of the Greeks, and Cyprus.\textsuperscript{1048}

The detailed map of the Mediterranean provided by the author give us important hints about the locations of the commercial ports of cities and islands. As it mentions ports of Byzantium and Islamic anchorages on the islands especially close to Italy and Anatolia, interestingly Cyprus and Sicily are represented as large rectangles while other islands appear as small circles.\textsuperscript{1049} However, it is difficult to tell, why other islands were not depicted in a detailed way on the map, but considering the detailed information concerning Cyprus and Sicily one can safely conclude that they were important trade centres in the Mediterranean during the eleventh century. Moreover, several fortresses of Cyprus in the coastal cities such as; al-Aqrī [=al-Aqrī], al-D.qūnah [Akrobūna?], Tūlah [Būlah?],\textsuperscript{1050} Dādes, al-

\textsuperscript{1040} Clime of India and far China.
\textsuperscript{1041} It is also called Alisbuntūs (Hellespont) by the Arabic translations of Ptolemy’s geography. As the word Picolos Pontus means ‘the small sea’ this region is specified as Sea of Marmara. For the manuscript and details see, Bodleian Library, MS Arab. Book 2, Ch. 3, fol. 25a.
\textsuperscript{1042} Literally, the middle (mesos) of the Black Sea. Inhabitants of this region are Burjān (Bulghar tribes who mainly settled in Balkans and Danube) and Slavs.
\textsuperscript{1043} “A Sassanid metropolis on the Tigris, about 20 miles southeast of Baghdad”.
\textsuperscript{1044} “Al-Sawād, the alluvial plains of the Euphrates and the Tigris.”
\textsuperscript{1045} “A town of medieval Iraq situated in the delta region of the Tigris-Euphrates. It was the main seaport on the Tigris estuary before the foundation of Basra.”
\textsuperscript{1046} For reference to the aforementioned three places see; MS Arab. Book 2 Ch. 3, fol. 24.b, note 16.
\textsuperscript{1047} MS Arab. Book 2, Ch.3, fol. 24b.
\textsuperscript{1048} Ibid, Ch. 3, fol. 24b.
\textsuperscript{1049} Ibid, Ch. 2.10, fol. 30b-31a (Mediterranean Map).
\textsuperscript{1050} Unidentified anchorage on the eastern or southern coasts of Cyprus.
Gh.r.s (?), Qīus (Kition), Bīsūn (?), al-Mā‘ūdah [al Mākhūah], Nahr al-Malik, Qustantīnah (Salamis), Jurjīs, Ra’s al-‘Abbās (Kourias promontory) are mentioned by the author in the Mediterranean map. Beside the Mediterranean map, also, maps of the Indian Ocean, the Caspian Sea, Sicily, al-Mahdiyah, Tinnis and Cyprus are provided separately by the anonymous author.

1051 Uncertain reading.
1052 Unidentified anchorage
1053 MS Arab. Ch. 2. 15, fol. 36b.
Fig. 8 A sketch of the map of Mediterranean, from the Book of Curiosities.
A separate map of Cyprus includes descriptions of the harbours of the island and their locations. In this square shaped map of the island, 27 harbours and descriptions of their topography and positions are provided by the Arab author. However, only twelve of them are mentioned on the Mediterranean map which are named as follows; Akraia (located at Cape Apostolos Andreas in the north east of Cyprus), Akrobuoni (?), Dades (Cape Kiti), Kitium (or Kition), Ammochostos (Famagusta), Basileus (south east of Cyprus), Konstantia (Salamis), Hagios Georgios, Curias (Kourion), and three other port cities are unidentified. Although, all of these aforementioned ports are mentioned on the map of Cyprus it also includes 15 more port names. These are called al-Gh.r.yās, Lablanās (Larnaka), Qūrah (Kourion), al-Ariūs, Bāliyā Bafus (PalaiPaphos), Bāfus (Paphos or NeaPaphos), Ak.d.būnah [=Akrubūnah], Karfāsiyah (modern Karpas, Ag. Filon), al-Hadi [or al-Khaṣā], al-Afrīs (Aphrodision-modern NW Akanthou), al-B.lāj.rah [= al-Malākharah-modern Akanthou], Lābīs (Lapethos or Lapithos), Sulīs (Soloi -modern Morphou bay), Aqamah (Akamas- modern Cape Arnaoutis), al-T.b.s [or al-B.t.s.]. Considering that only twelve of them are mentioned on the Mediterranean map it can be inferred that these places were the main commercial centres in the Mediterranean trade while the others were smaller and used for internal trade and regional (or local) transportation. Interestingly, below the Cyprus map the author briefly mentions the exports from Cyprus: gum mastic, lādhan

---

1054 Ibid, Ch. 2.15, fol. 36b. (Cyprus map)
1055 MS Arab. (Mediterranean Map)
1056 Unidentified anchorage between Dades Promontory and Citium (south east coast of Cyprus).
1057 South west coast of Cyprus.
1058 Modern Kouklia (Paphos district).
1059 As the editors of the manuscript suggests that the name of the city is an Arabic rendering of the Greek "Akrobuoni" lit. ‘top of the mountain’ they haven’t been able to identify it and described it as an ‘unidentified anchorage on the eastern or southern coasts of Cyprus’. However, as it name suggests it might highly be located around the Karpaz peninsula. The mention of Karpasia just after the port of Akrobuoni supports this hypothesis.
1061 Situated on the north-east of Cyprus between Aphrodosion and Karpasia.
1062 Northern coast of Cyprus.
1063 Unidentified anchorage on the western coasts of Cyprus. For the Cyprus map and description of anchorages see; MS Arab. Ch. 2.15, fol. 36b.
(another resin), dry and fresh storax (another resin), vitriol, blue-green vitriol, white vitriol, and ‘all other provisions imported from Byzantium’. Therefore, it was reasonably suggested by E. S. Smith that Cyprus functioned as a distributor of Byzantine goods to the Islamic lands at that time. This hypothesis is also supported by the Mediterranean map prepared by the Arab author where the bay of Mūrah (Mylai modern Manastir), the main port serving the city of Seleukeia (Silifke: facing northern Cyprus) is mentioned on the map with a brief explanation of its distance to the island of Cyprus. The mention of Cyprus while describing the anchorage facilities of Mylai clearly indicates early commercial links between the Cyprus and Mylai (near Tasucu). Nevertheless, in Byzantine sources the port of Seleukeia is described thus ‘it serviced ships travelling to and from Cyprus’.

A century later, Al-Idrisi (fl. 1154) used the same method of ‘seven climes’ when he composed a geographical compendium for the Norman king of Sicily. However, in the work of Al-Idrisi there is a mention only of Nicosia, Limassol, Kernebia (Kyrenia?) and Kalta. This can be explained by the geographic compendium of Al-Idrisi which looks like a guide book rather than a proper portolan or traveller guide. As can be understood from the title of his book ‘Entertainment for He Who Longs to Travel the World’, the maps and brief information about the places were designed for entertainment. Mostly, the information that exists in his work was gathered from travellers which suggest that Idrisi did not visit those places himself. What is important here is the question of whether the Kitāb Gharāʾ ib al-funūn wa-mulḥ al-ʿuyūn was used by travellers and traders. It is well-known that during the eleventh century in the Western world maps were used as an entertainment rather than

---

nautical guides while it is more possible that inhabitants of the Islamic world consulted them during their travels.\textsuperscript{1069} However, the work of the unknown Arab author is too detailed to be an entertainment book. The eleventh century manuscript provides fourteen maps (Lunar mansion maps, a Rectangular world map, a map of the Indian Ocean, a map of the Mediterranean, a map of the Caspian, a map of Sicily, a map of al-Mahdiyyah, a map of Tinnis, a map of Cyprus, a Nile map, a Euphrates map, a Tigris map, an Indus map and an Oxus map), including diagrams of Aegean bays with detailed information about harbour cities and locations. Considering that the information given in the manuscript includes the distances between port cities and occasionally their functionality (such as al-Ballū, anchorage south of Makre-modern Fethiye, mentioning that it can accommodate 100 ships, and Pafos with the capacity of 950 ships),\textsuperscript{1070} the information for the Arabic manuscript was gathered from merchants. The prominence of the comprehensive maps and detailed information of the ports and their functionalities is widely evident to the purpose of the manuscript. Moreover, reproduction of the manuscript during the late twelfth or early thirteenth century suggest that the information provided by the manuscript (or portolan) was up to date and used by Arab travellers and traders. Therefore, it can be argued that both the Salamis and Famagusta ports, together with mainly Limassol, Kyrenia and Pafos, were active in the Mediterranean trade during the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

To sum up, the numismatic, ceramic and sigillographic evidence, as surveyed in this chapter, indicates that Salamis-Constantia did not totally fade away and that there was not an absolute cut-off in its economic activity. As one can imagine, one of the prime reasons for the gradual abandonment of Salamis-Constantia and the sudden growth of medieval Famagusta, may have been Salamis-Constantia’s silted-up harbour. However, there is no conclusive proof that Salamis/Constantia was totally abandoned before the eleventh century and the

\textsuperscript{1069} Ibid, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{1070} MS Arab, fol. 30b-31a Ch. 2.10 (Mediterranean map) and fol. 36.b Ch. 2.15(Cyprus map).
mention of harbour on the map prepared by the Arab author might suggest that the port was used sporadically if not permanently. When continuing with an analysis of Famagusta in subsequent chapters it is important to consider that Famagusta was a town which made possible a whole range of economic, social, political and cultural activities which were somehow no longer viable (or effectively viable) in Salamis-Constantia. If we consider that the advantages of a harbour town depend on its accessibility, anchorage facilities and security, it is obvious that there were issues of insecurity or inaccessibility during the Middle Byzantine period. The replacement of Salamis with Famagusta definitely suggests that the population of Constantia dramatically decreased. However, in my opinion, existing numismatic evidence suggests that towards the Middle Byzantine period there was a sharp economic decline which can be linked to the existing political and economic situation over the whole island. This section has tried to shed some light on a very difficult topic by analysing the existing numismatic evidence (which is very limited due to the political reasons) and archaeological evidence and is still struggling to find some of the answers relating to the economic transformation during the Middle Byzantine period. In this sense, more archaeological evidence is essential in order to accurately portray the economic (and also social) dynamics of Salamis/Constantia.
Translations of the Selected Notarial Acts
* Die eodem \textsuperscript{1}. Manifestum facio ego Nicolaus Conrado nunc habitator Candide tibi Bontempo Raguseo habitatorì Candide quod si aportaveris alumina facta in Suria cuiuscumque partis Surie in Candidam de hoc presente viaticu quod facere intendis in Roddo, Ciprum et in Suria cum quocumque ligno quo ipsam duxeris in Candidam, debes eam michi dare et ego teneor recipere eam et dare tibi pro qualibet milliario grosso ad pondus insule Crete yperpera \textsuperscript{XX.}, cum ipsam recepero. Et si non inveneris de ipsa alumine de la Ssuria et aportaveris alumina Alexandrie, debes eam michi dare et ego teneor eam recipere et \textsuperscript{2} et dare et solvere tibi pro qualibet milliario a grosso yperpera \textsuperscript{.VIII.}. Sub pena yperperorum \textsuperscript{.CC.}. Et e converso fieri debet suprascripto Bontempo. Testes Petrus de Variente et Andreas Lambardo. Complere et dare.

Non.]

\textsuperscript{1} In p \textit{cancellato}. \textsuperscript{2} s \textit{cancellato}.
30 March, 1300.

I Nicolaus Conrado, nowadays living in Crete make clear to you Bontempo Reguseo, inhabitant of Crete, that if you carry alum made in Syria (and in any part of Syria) to Crete, from this present travel which you intend to make to Rhodes, Cyprus and Syria and in any possible way you bring this alum to Crete, you must give and I must receive and give to you for any milirio grosso of Cretan weight, 20 hyperpera at the moment of its (the alum) reception. And if you cannot find the alum in Syria and you bring alum from Alexandria, you should give me and I am bound to take it and give you and free you (from your obligation to me) for any milirio grosso of Cretan weight 9 hyperpera.

Penalty is 200 hyperpera. And other way around must be made to the said Bontempo.

Witnesses, Petrus de Variente and Andreas Lambardo.

Il notaio dà un'errata indicazione dell'indicazione.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Iohanes de Porta, filius quondam Rubaldi de Porta, habitator Nicosie, confiteor tibi Oberto de Gavio socero meo me habuisse et recepisse a te in accomandacione, ultra aliam accomandacionem de bisanciis duobus millibus centum quadraginta tribus et dimidio quos a te habuisse et recepisse confessus fui in accomandacione, ut constat instrumento scripto publico scripto manu Gabriellis de Predono notarii M^9 CC^9 LXXXVI, die XVI octubris, bisancios albos duomillia sexcentos implicatos in clamelotis ladano. Renuncians exceptioni non habitorum et non receptorum dictorum bisanciorum duorummillium sexcentorum et dicte accomandacionis non habite et non recepte et omni iuri. Cum quibus deo dante causa mercandi ire debeo viaggio non mutato ad Layacium, reddendo in Ciprum, ad quartum proficui inde habendum. Habens potestatem ex ipsis quam partem voluero mittendi ante me, sed non dimittendi ante me et expendingi et faciendi sicut melius et tucius potero. In redditu vero quem Ciprum fecero, capitale cum tribus partibus luci di dicte accomandacionis in tua potestate vel tui certi missi ponere et consignare promitto. Alioquin penam dupli dicte quantitatis, cum restituificacione dampnorum et expensarum propterea factorum sive factarum tibi stipulanti dare et solvere promitto, pro quibus accendendis et observandis universa mea bona habita et habenda tibi pignori obigo. Actum Nicosie, in logia Iauensium, anno dominice nativitatis M^9 CC^9 LXXXXVII, indicione X, die XXV septembris, circa nonam. Testes vocati et rogati: Octolinus de Mari et Gregorius serviens domini potestatis Iauensium in Nicosia.

1 Segue, depennato: nova  2 Segue, depennato: MD
In the name of the Lord, Amen. I, Iohanes de Porta, son of the late Rubaldus of Porta, an inhabitant of Nicosia, acknowledge to you Obertus of Gavio, that I have accepted and received from you in accomendation 2600 white besants involved in camlets and ladanum (resin), beside another accomendation of 2143.5 besants that I had acknowledged to have accepted and received from you in accomendation, as has been established by a public [instrumentum scriptum] written by the hand of the notary Gabriellis of Predono on 16 October 1296. I renounce the exception of the aforementioned 2600 besants and the accomendation that have not been accepted and received, as well as all right[s]. With these, God having given [them], I have to without change of course to Ayas to do trade, and [then] return to Cyprus to have a quarter of the profits [to accrue] there from. From these I have the authority to send before me whichever part I would like, but not to have any sent after me, and to pay and act just as best and as cautiously I can. In paying back, which I shall indeed do in Cyprus, I promise to place and consign the capital in your or your trusted envoy’s power, along with three parts of the profits of the aforementioned accomendation. Otherwise, I promise to give and ay back to you on your stipulation a compensation of double the aforementioned quantity, with the restitution of the losses and expenses incurred on that account. To attend to and observe these [promises], I pledge to you, as security, all the properties I have and shall have.

Drawn up in Nicosia, in the Genoese loggia, on 25 September 1297. The witnesses called and asked are Octolinus of Mari and Gregorius, servant of the Genoese podesta in Nicosia.

1071 Scribe error. It should be ‘post’ instead of ‘ante’. [Habens potestatem ex ipsis quam partem voluero mittendi ante me, sed non dimittendi ante me [...].]
1072 Scribe error. It should be actendendis (or attendendis) instead of accendendis. [...], pro quibus ascendendis et observandis universa mea bona habita [...].
1302, gennaio 11, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Georgius Manescalchus de Accon, filius Iohanis Maneschalchi de Accon, confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Fulchoni de Sex Furnis de Marssilia me habuisse et recepisse, in accomandacione, in una parte, capscias quatuor coralli grossi, in quibus sunt centanaria novem coralli grossi, computato quolibet dicto centanario predicto in libris octuaginta de coronatis de Provincia; item, in alia, barrille unum de toretis de corallo, quod est libre subtilles unum centum et duodecem, computata qualibet dicta libra in solidis quinque de dicta moneta, et, in alia parte, duas ballas telle de bordas albas, abrenuncians exceptioni non habite et non recepte tocius dicte accomandacionis, doli, in factum, condicioni sine causa et confessionis non facte et omni <iuri>. Quas vero ballas duas predictas vendere debeo in Cipro et ipsas portare non debeo extra Ciprum et cum dicto corallo toto, una tecum, ire debeo causa mercandi in Layacio et deinde reddire in Marssilia viaggio nun mutato, ad quartum proficui michi dicte accomandacionis habendum, habens potestatem ex ipsis quam partem voluero mittendi ante me tantum, sed dimittere non possin aliquid post me, emendi, vendendi, cambiendi, implicandi, expendendi et omnia faciendi ut supra. Sicut michi melius videbitur, et, in Marssilia vel ubi placuerit tibi, de capitale et lucro dicte tocius accomandacionis promitto et convenio tibi bene et legaliter facere integram racionem, solucionem et satisfacionem, alicui et cetera et proinde et cetera, abrenuncians in predictis privilegio fori ita quod ego dictus Georgius et mea possint ubique, sub quolibet magistratu, conveniri, eunte vero dicta accomandacine ad risicum et fortunam tuam. Actum Famagost, iuxta stacionem Berthozii Latini, speciarii, die XI Ianuarii. Testes vocati et rogati Petrus Guascus, balistarius, habitator Famagostae, Ricardus censarius, Beltramis Guternus de Marssilia et Olerius de Lamar, iuvenes.
3-Translation:

11 January 1302, Famagusta.

I Georgius Manescalchus of Acre, son of Iohanes of Acre, confess and publicly recognize you Fulcho de Sex Furnis of Marseille, that I accepted and received from you, in accomendation, on the first hand, four cases of large coral, in which are contained nine cantars of large coral, with [the value of] each said cantar being computed as 80 pounds in the crown of Province. On the second hand, two bales of canvas with white edges (or borders). I renounce the exception of the entire aforementioned accomendation that has not been accepted and received, as well as of the confession that not been made and indeed [any] fraud, and [likewise I renounce any] condition without cause as well as all rights. I have to sell the aforementioned two bales in Cyprus, and I should not carry them beyond the island. And together with you I have to go with all the said coral to Ayas to do trade, and to return thence to Marseille without change of route. I am to have a quarter of the said accomendation. From these I have the authority to send before me whichever part I would like -while I may not have anything after me- and to buy, sell, exchange, spend, pay and do everything as above, just as it should seem best to me. In Marseille or anywhere you would like, I promise and agree to give you a whole account, payment and satisfaction concerning the capital and profits of the entire aforementioned accomendation; otherwise etc. and likewise etc. In what has been said above I renounce the market privilege. So that I, the said Georgius, and my properties can be summoned to any place and before any magistrate, since the said accomendation depends indeed on [literally: goes to] your risk and fortune.

Drawn up in Famagusta, in the stacione of Berthozius Latinus, spice dealer. The witnesses called and asked are Petrus Guascus, crossbowman, an inhabitant of Famagusta, Ricardus tax-farmer, Beltramis Guibernus of Marseille and Oglerius of Lamar, youth.
1302, gennaio 13, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Guiduzius de Ficu de Florencia confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Venozio Latino de Florencia me habuisse et recepisse a te darem vos veteres de Ermenia trescentos, estimato quolibet centanario predicto in bisanctis viginti octo albis, abrenuncians exceptioni non habitorum et non receptorum dictorum daremorum et confessionis non facte et omni iuri; quare, ante solucionem michi factam a te, tibi do, cedo, mando omnia iura, raciones et actiones, reales et personales, utiles, directas et mixtas et reiperexecutorias, que et quas habeo et michi competunt vel competere possunt, seu unquam competierunt, contra Ugolinum de Bononia, habitatorem de Tersso¹, quantum pro dictis daremis trescentis, quos dico dictum Ugolinum mutuo accipisse a me²; ita ut ipsis iuribus, racionibus et actionibus uti possis, agere, petere, defendere, transsigere, replicare, opponere, excipere et pacisci et omnia demom facere que unquam facere potui seu possen, constituens inde te procuratorem et deffe<n>ssorem ut in rem tuam propriam; quam vero cessionem et omnia et singula supradicta promitto tibi de cetero habere ratam et firmam seu rata et firma et contra in aliquo de supradictis non venire, alioquin et cetera³ et proinde et cetera⁴. Actum ad dictam stacionem, die XIII ianuarii, circa vespertas. Testes vocati et rogati Chiriacus de Ancona, Petrus Guaschus, balistarius, et Martinus de Roma.
4-Translation:

13 January 1302, Famagusta.

In the name of Lord, amen. I, Guiduzius de Ficu of Florence, confess and publicly recognize you, Venoious Latino of Florence, that I have accepted and received 300 old Armenian dirhems from you, with the value of each aforementioned cantar being estimated as 28 white besants. I renounce the exception of the said dirhems that have not been accepted and received as well as of the confession that has not been made, and all rights. Therefore, against the payment made to me by you, I give, cede and commit to you all the real and personal, direct and mixed, and reiperexecutorias (executorship?) rights, accounts and actions which I hold and which belong, can belong or at any time have belonged to me, against Ugolinus of Bononia, an inhabitant of Tarsus, for as much as the said 300 dirhems, which I say that the aforementioned Ugolinus has received from me in loan. [I hand over to you] these rights, accounts and actions in such a way that you may use, do with, ask for, defend settle, replace, oppose, exempt or barter them and do [with them] exactly all things that I can or have been able to do at any time. I establish you as their manager and defender as if they were your own affair. Finally, I promise to you indeed to ratify and fix this cession, as well as each and every item mentioned above, and not to contravene any of the aforementioned [terms and conditions]; otherwise etc. and likewise etc.

Drawn up in stacione on 13 January, around vespers. The witnesses called and asked are Chiriacus of Ancona, Peter Guaschus, crossbowman, and Martinus of Rome.
1302, febbraio 2, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego magister Iacobus cirurgicus, Ianiuensis, confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Ugoni Bellamure, Venetico, me habuisse et recepisse a te, in accomendacione, bisancios abos quingentos triginta, implicatos in mercibus, abrenunciants et cetera, cum quibus, Deo dante, causa mercandi ire debeo in Constantinopoli et in Mare Maiori et deinde reddire Ciprum, ad quartum luci michi inde habendum, habens potestatem ex ipsis quam partem voluero mittendi ante me tantum et aliquid non possin dimittere post me, emendi, vendendi, cambiendi, implicandi, expendendi et omnia faciendi sicut michi ut supra melius [XVI a/122 a] videbitur; in redditu vero quem Ciprum fecero, de capitale et lucro dicte accomendacionis promitto et convenio tibi facere tibi sive tuo certo nuncio integram rationem, solucionem et satisfacionem, alioquin et cetera et proinde et cetera, abrenunciants in predictis privilegio fori ta quod ego dictus magister Iacobus et mea possint ubique conveniri sub qualibet magistratu. Actum Famagoste, ante domum dicti Ugonis, die secunda februarii. Testes vocati et rogati Luchinus de Levanto, Ianiuensis, Guillielmus Mensor, Ianiuensis, macellarius, et Salvonus, magister axie, habitatores omnes Famagoste.
5-Translation:

2 February 1302, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, master surgeon Iacobus the Genoese, confess and publicly acknowledge you, Ugo Bellamure of Venice, that I have accepted and received 530 white besants from you in accomendation involved in merchandise –renouncing etc. etc.- with which, God having given [them], I have to go to Constantinople and Great Sea [Mare Maiori] (Mediterranean?) to do trade and thence to return to Cyprus. I am to receive a quarter of the profits [to accrue] therefrom, and I have the authority to send before me whichever part I would like –while I may not have anything sent after me- and to buy, sell, exchange, spend, pay and do everything as above just as it should seem best to me. In paying back, which I shall indeed do in Cyprus, I promise and agree to give to you or your trusted envoy a full account, payment and satisfaction concerning the capital and profits of the said accomendation. Otherwise etc. and likewise etc. In what has been said above I renounce the privilege of market, in such a way that I, the said master Iacobus and my [properties] can be summoned before any magistrate.

Drawn up at Famagusta, before the house of the aforementioned Ugo, on 2 February. The witnesses called and asked are Luchinus de Levanto, Genoese, Guillielmus Menssor, a Genoese, butcher, and Salvonus, master ship carpenter, all inhabitants of Famagusta.
1302, febraio 15, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Nos Iohaninus de Vignali et Benedictus Guascus de Guasco de Naulo, nomine nostro et nomine Iohanini Pinelli, pro quo promittimus de rato habendo, facimus, constituimus et ordinamus nostrum et dicti Iohanini certum nuncium et procuratorem Obertum Mingo zum de Placencia, absentem tanquam presentem, ad naulizandum, pro nobis et nostro nomine et dicti Iohanini, galeam nostram, nominatam « Sancta Crux », existentem in portu Famagoste, pro Ia num et Provinciam eundo, sive altero dictor um locorum, usque in cantariis CCC Ianue, videlicet, si in Ianua, ad rationem de solidis XXVIII ianu inorum pro quolibet dicto cantario, ad accipiendum onus in Layacio, et, si in Provincia, ad rationem de solidis XXX ianu inorum, et ad nos et nostra super predictis obli gandum et demon ad omnia et singula faciendum in predictis et circa predicta que fuerint neccessaria faciendi, dantes et concedentes dicto procuratori nostro liberum mandatum et generale administracionem et cetera, promittentes et cetera. Actum Famagoste, iuxta dictam stacionem, die XV februii. Testes vocati et rogati Anthonius canzellerius et An sal dus de Sexto, Ianuensis, burgenssis Famagoste.
6-Translation:

15 February, 1302. Famagusta.

We Iohaninus de Vignali and Benedictus Guascus, from Guascus of Naulus, in our name and on behalf of Iohananinus Pinellus —whose approval we promise to receive— make, establish and appoint Obertus Mingozius of Placentia, in his absence [but] as if in his presence, our trusted envoy and agent, in order to charter, in our and the said Iohananus’s name and on our behalf, our galley called ‘Sancta Crux’, now in the port of Famagusta, to go to Genoa and Province, or to another of the said places, with [literally: in] up to 300 cantars of Genoa. Namely, if in Genoa, [he will charter the ship] at a rate of 28 Genoese soldi (or shillings) for each said canter, to receive the load in Ayas. If in Province, [he will charter] at a rate of 35 Genoese soldi for each said cantar of Genoa. Moreover, if merchants should put [on board] merchandise at Famagusta, they can and may charter at a rate of 32 Genoese soldi. We have to pledge our properties on what has been said above and to do precisely each and everything in and about the aforementioned [terms and conditions] that may prove necessary. We give and concede to our said agent free mandate and general administration etc.; promising etc.

Drawn up at Famagusta, in the said stacione, on 15 February. The witnesses called and asked Anthonius, consul, and Ansaldus de Sexto, a Genoese and burgess of Famagusta.
1302, marzo 14, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Georgius Cores, Ianiuensis, habitator Famagoste, confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Oddoni de Sexto, Ianiuensi, burgessi Famagoste, me habuisse et receptisse a te, in accommodacione, bisancios albos quingentos nonaginta unum\(^1\), implicatos in furmento, cum quibus, Deo dante, causa mercandi ire debeo ad Tersso\(^2\) et deinde redire Ciprum, ad quartum proficui michi inde habendum, viaggio nun mutato, habens potestatem ante tantum et non post, emendi, vendendi, cambiendi, implicandi et omnia faciendi sicut michi melius videbitur ut supra et expendendi symiliter; in redditu vero quem primo Ciprum fecero, de capitale et lucro dicte accommodacionis promitto et convenio tibi facere tibi sive tuo certo nuncio integram rationem, solucionem et satisfacionem, alioquin et cetera et proinde et cetera, abrenuncians in predictis privillegio fori ita quod ego dictus Georgius et mea possint ubique, sub quolibet magistratu, <conveniri>. Actum Famagoste, ad dictam stacionem, die XLI marci. Testes vocati et rogati Iohaninus de Musso, Ianiuensis, et Domenzius Plumbus, filius quondam Iohannis Plumbi, habitatoris Famagoste.

\(^1\) Segue, ripetuto: albos \(^2\) ad Tersso: cost nel ms.
7-Translation:

14 March 1302, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, Gorgius Cores of Genoa, an inhabitant of Famagusta, confess
and publicly acknowledge you, Oddo de Sexto, Genoese and burgess of Famagusta, that I
have accepted and received from you wheat worth 591 white besants in accomendation. With
these, God having given [them], I have to go to Tarsus to do trade, and to return thence to
Cyprus. I am to have a quarter of the profits [to accrue] therefrom, and without any change of
course on the way, I have the authority [to send a part of the goods] before and not after [me],
and to buy, sell, exchange, spend and do everything as above, as it should seem best to me,
and similarly to make payments. In paying back, which I shall indeed do in the first place in
Cyprus, I promise and agree to give a full account, payment and satisfaction to you or your
trusted envoy. Otherwise etc. and likewise etc. In what has been said above, I renounce the
market privilege, so that I, the aforementioned Georgius, and my properties can [be
summoned] to any place and before any magistrate.

Drawn up at Famagusta, in stacione, in 14 March. The witnesses called and asked Iohaninus
Musso, a Genoese, and Domenzius Plumbus, son of the late Iohanus Plumbi, inhabitants of
Famagusta.
1302, aprile 30, Famagosta.

* In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Benaia Balbus de Pisis confiteor tibi Linardo Gaytano, censario, habitatori Famagoste, me habuisse et recepissee a te, in accomendacione, bisancios albos septuaginta quinque, implicatos in mea comuni implicita, cum quibus, Deo dante, causa mercandi ire debeo in Satalia et deinde reddire, viagio nun mutato, in Cipro, ad medietatem luceri michi inde habendum et similiter ad medietatem damnii, si damnun accideret in dictis bisanciis, per me tibi dendum et restituum, habens potestatem ante tantum et non post, emendi, vendendi, expendendi et omnia faciendo et cetera. In redditu vero quem primo fecero Ciprum, de capitale et lucro dicte accomendacionis promitto et convenio tibi facere tibi et cetera. Testes vocati et rogati Iohanes de Belgrante, sartor, et Lanfrancus de Murtedo, Iauensis, habitatores Famagoste, die ultima aprilis. Actum Famagoste, ad dictam stacionem dicti speciarii.

Segue, ripetuto: testes vocati et rogati et cetera
**8-Translation:**

30 April 1302, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, Benaia Balbus of Pisa, confess to you, Linardus Gaytano, tax-farmer and resident of Famagusta, that I have accepted and received from you 75 white besants, in accomendation, involved in my common investment. With these, God having given [them], I have to go to Adalia to do trade and return from there, without change of course, to Cyprus. I am to receive half of the profits [to accrue] therefrom, and similarly half of the losses, if any loss should occur from the said besants, and that loss is to be given and restored by me to you, I have the authority [to send a part of the goods] before and not after [me], and to buy, sell, pay and do everything etc. In paying back, which I shall indeed do in the first place in Cyprus, I promise and assent to make you etc. concerning the said capital and profits.

The witnesses called and asked Iohanes de Belgrante, tailor, and Lanfrancus de Murtedo, a Genoese, inhabitants of Famagusta. Drawn up at Famagusta, in the stacione of said spice dealer.
In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Leonardellus de Ripparolia, civis Ianue, confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Burgensi Basso, Ianuensi, commoranti ad Magdalenam, me habuisse et recepisse a te tot de tuis bisanciis albis, bonis et iusti ponderis, de Cipro, abrenuncianti exceptioni non habitorum et non receptorum dictorum bisanciorum et confessionis non "facte, doli, in factum, condicioni sine causa et omni iuri. Unde et pro quibus, nomine cambii, promitto et convenio tibi dare et solvere tibi sive tuo certo nuncio, seu dari aut solvi facere per meum certum nuncium, uncias auri, boni et iusti ponderis, viginti sex, in Sicilia, ubi lignum meum vocatum "Sanctus Dominicus" exonerabitur ex toto mercionio, sive maiore parte mercionii in eo existentis, et hoc infra mensem unum tunc proximum venturum postquam dictum lignum ibi nuper averti, et ante, si ante vendidero dictum mercionium, et, si forte ivero in Barbaria, videlice de Tripoli vel usque Tunesi<m>, promitto et convenio tibi dare et solvere tibi sive tuo certo nuncio, per pactum, integraliter, dobras auri meri nonaginta nem, ibi, infra mensem unum et ante, modò et formà et pacto ut supra est denotatum in dicto loco Sicilia. Que, omnia et singula, supradicta promitto et convenio tibi actendere, complere et observare et cumtra in aliquo de predictis non actentare vel venire, aliquin penam dupli dictae quantitatis, cum restitutione omnium damnnorum et expensarum propterea factorum sive factarum, tibi stipulandi dare et solvere promitto, ratis manentibus omnibus et singulis supradictis; pro quibus actendendis et observandis univerta mea bona, habita et habenda, coperta et dis corperta, obique existentia, tibi pignori obligo, abre nuncians in predictis privillegio fori ita quod possis me et mea convenire sub quolibet magistratru, eun te vero dicta pecunia ad risicum et fortunam dicti ligni vel maioris partis rerum eius. Actum Famagoste, \(<>_{\text{uixa}}\) stacionem Barthozii Latini, die XXII Augusti, circa tertiam. Testes vocati et rogati Lanfrancus Longus, Ianuensis, et Alegrus Fateinanti.
22 August 1301, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, Leonardellus of Ripparolia, citizen of Genoa, confess and publicly certify to you, Burgenssi Bassus, a Genoan dwelling in Magdalena, that I have accepted and received from you so many of your white besants [of Cyprus], of good quality and proper weight. I renounce the exception of the said besants that have not been accepted and received and of the confession that has not been made, as well as of [any] fraud indeed, and [renounce any] condition without cause and all rights. For this reason and for which [the besants], in the name of exchange, I promise and agree to give and pay to you or your trusted envoy, or to have it given and paid by my own trusted envoy, 26 ounces of goldm of good quality and proper weight. [This will take place in] Sicily, where my ship called ‘Sanctus Dominicus’ will be unloaded of all its merchandise, or of the major part of the merchandise present on it. This [term] will apply within one month after the arrival of the said ship in Sicily or before that date if I sell the said merchandise previously. And if perhaps I go to Barbary, namely from Tripoli to Tunis, I promise and assent to give and pay to you or your trusted servant by an agreement 99 doblas of pure gold in all, within one month or before that in the said place of Sicily, in the mode, form and agreement as denoted above. I promise and agree to you to attend to, fulfil and observe each and everything mentioned above, and not to attempt anything against them or contravene them at any point. Otherwise I promise to give and pay to you on your stipulation a satisfaction of double the aforementioned amount, with the restitution of all the losses and expenses incurred on that account. Each and every remaining term mentioned above has been ratified. To attend to and observe them, I pledge to you as security all the properties that I have and shall have, unknown [literally: covered] and disclosed, existing everywhere. In what has been said above I renounce the market privilege,
so that you may summon me and my properties before any magistrate, as the said money
depends indeed on [literally: goes on] the risk and fortune of the aforementioned ship or the
major part of its wares.

Drawn up at Famagusta, by the stacione of Berthozius Latinus, on 22 August around the third
hour. The witnesses called and asked are Lanfrancus Longus, a Genoese, and Alegrus
Fateinanti.
1301 settembre 7, Famagosta.

[CCLVIII b] In nomine Domini, amen. Ego Iohanes de Vignali, civis Ianue, confiteor tibi Guillelmo Randino de Naulo, Ianuensi, me habuisse et recepisse a te, in mea custodia et reccomendatione, in bisanciis, bisancios albos, bonos et iusti ponderis, de Cipro, mille quadringentos quinquaginta quinque, pecias duas scarleti virmilii in grana tinctas, extimatias iperperos auri ad saium Constantinopolis decen- tos viginti sex; item scarpefronos pannorum extimatios, ex dictis iperperis, iperperos triginta; abrenunciis excepcioni non habitorum et non receptorum dictorum bisanciorum et dictarum rerum non habitarum et non receptarum et in dicta peccunia non extimatarum et confessionis non facte et omni iuri, habens potentiali ex ipsa reccomendatione vendendi, implicantid, cambiendi et omnia faciendi secundum quod michi videbitur pro meliori et saniori. De qua vero recce- mendatione promitto et convenio tibi facere tibi si- ve tuo certo nuncio, sive Oberto Pellavillanu sive eius dicti Oberti certo nuncio, tuo nomine et pro- te, infra menses decem proximos venturos, integram racionem, solucionem et satisfacionem, et ante, ad voluntatem tuam sive dicti Oberti Pellavil- lani vel eius certi nuncii. Que, omnia et singula, su- pradicta promitto et convenio tibi actedere, comple- re et observare et cuntra in aliquo de predictis non venire, alioquin penam dupli dicte quantitatris, cum refectione omnium damphorum et expensarum properterea factorum sive factorum, tibi stipulanti dare et sol- vere promitto, ratis manentibus omnibus et singulis supradictis; pro quibus actendendis et observandis u- niversa mea bona, habita et habenda, tibi pignori o- bligo, ubique existentia, abrenunciis in predictis privilegio fori ita quod possis sive dictus Obertus Pillavillanus possit me et mea convenire sub qualibet magistratu, eunte, stante et redeunte dicta rec- commendatione ad risicum et fortunam maris et gen- tium. Actum Famagoste, iuxta stacionem Barthozii La- tini, die VII septembris, inter nonam et vesperas. Testes vocati et rogati Benedictus Guascus, Ianuen- sis, de Naulo, et Daniel de Daniele de Naulo.
10-Translation:

7 September 1301, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, Johanes de Vignalis, citizen of Genoa, confess to you, Guillelmo Randino de Naulo, that I have accepted and received from you, in my custody and trust, 1455 white besants of good quality and proper weight and two pieces of cloth dyed in grain with red dye, [with their value] estimated at 126 hyperperi [Byznantine solidi] of gold according to the assay [assay of metals-their value] of Constantinople. [I have also received] (scarperronos?) of pieces of cloth, [with their value] estimated, in the aforementioned currency, at thirty hyperperi. I renounce the exception of the aforementioned besants and others that have not been accepted and received and whose values have not been estimated at the aforementioned sums, and the confession that has not been made as well as all rights. From this entrustment I have the authority to sell, spend, exchange and do everything, according to what should seem best and most sensible to me. Concerning the entrustment indeed, I promise and agree to give to you, your entrusted envoy, Obertus Pellavillano or his trusted envoy, in your name and on your behalf, within the ten months to come, a full account, payment and satisfaction, or before [that date], according to your wish or the wish of the said Obertus or is trusted envoy. I promise and agree to you to attend to, fulfil and observe each and everything mentioned above, and not to contravene them at any point. Otherwise I promise to give and pay to you on your stipulation a satisfaction of double the said quantity, with the restoration of all the losses and expenses incurred on that account. All the rest of what has been said above has been ratified. To attend to and observe [these terms and conditions], I pledge to you as security all the properties what I have or shall have, existing everywhere. In what has been said above I renounce the market privilege, so that you
or the said Obertus Pillavillanus may summon me and my goods before any magistrate, since
the said entrustment depends on [literally: goes, stands and returns to] the risk and fortune of
the sea and peoples.

Drawn up at Famagusta, by the stacione of Barthozius Latinus, on 7 September. The
witnesses called and asked are Benedictus Guascus, a Genoese from Naulo, and Daniel de
Daniele of Naulo.
1801<ottobre 7>, Famagosta.

In nomine Domini, amen. Ego dictus Iacobus speciarus confiteor et publice recognosco tibi Georgio de Lezia me habuisse et recepisse a te, in accommodacione, bisancios sarracinales centum [CCCII a] decem et septem, implicatos in cotono, computato quolibet dicto bisancio sarracinali in bisanciis tribus et dimido albis, abreunncias et cetera, cum quibus, Deo dante, causa mercandi ire debeo, in dictis navibus predictorum, in Venecias et deinde quò Deus michi melius administraverit, ad quartum proficui michi in de habendum, habens potestatem ex ipsis quam partem voluero mittendi ante me tantum, sed dimittere non possin aliquid post me, emendi, vendendi, cambiendi, expendendi et omnia faciendi sicut michi melius videbitur ut supra. In reddito vero quem Ciprum fecero, de capitale et lucro dicte accommodacionis promitto et convenio tibi facere tibi sive tuo certo nuncio integram rationem, solutionem et satisfacionem, alio quin et cetera et proinde et cetera', abreunncias privlegio fori et cetera₂. Actum ad dictam stacionem. Testes Thomas Coffinus et Thomas de Rogerio de Ancona et Symon Iosepe de Lezia et Cosmo predictus.
11-Translation:

7 October 1301, Famagusta.

In the name of God, Amen. I, the said druggist Iacobus, confess and publicly recognize you, Georgius of Lezia, that I have accepted and received from you in accomendation 117 Saracen besants, involved in cotton, with the value of each Saracen besant computed as 3.5 white besants –renouncing etc.- with which, God having given [them], I have to go with the aforementioned ships of the said people to do trade in Venice and come back, with God guiding me best. I am to have a quarter of the profits [to accrue] therefrom. From these I have the authority to send before me whichever part I would like – while I cannot have anything sent after me – and to buy, sell, exchange, pay and do everything as above just as it should seem best to me. In paying back, which I shall indeed do in Cyprus, I promise and agree to give you or your trusted servant a full account, payment and satisfaction concerning the aforementioned capital and profits. Otherwise etc. and likewise etc. I renounce the market privilege.

Drawn up in the said stacione. Witnesses called and asked are Thomas Coffinus and Thomas de Rogerio of Ancona and Symeon Iosepe de Lezia and Cosmos.
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