

# IX

## VENICE AND THE CRUSADES

---

The growth of Venice depended upon the profits to be gained from sailing the seas. Aware of its dependence upon Byzantium, Venice at first extended its seaborne trade under the protective mantle of the Greek navy. Beginning in the eleventh century, however, Venetian maritime strength became great enough to assist, to challenge, and finally to supplant the Greeks in the waters of the eastern Mediterranean. Venice gradually gained marketing privileges from local rulers, next received small enclaves in these cities, then took possession of entire towns, and finally conquered the hinterland of several of these ports. Venetian trade and colonies were concentrated in Romania, those lands bordering the Aegean Sea and the approaches to Constantinople which were under Byzantine political control before 1204. To trade successfully in Romania, Venice had to protect its shipping on outbound and homeward voyages on the Adriatic and Ionian seas.

Since the emphasis in this chapter is on Venice, this bibliography will be limited to significant works relating to Venetian affairs. The early narrative sources include John the Deacon, *Chronicon venetum et gradense* (MGH, SS., VII, 1-47); Geoffroi de Villehardouin, *La Conquête de Constantinople*, ed. and tr. Edmond Faral, 2nd ed. (Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen-âge; 2 vols., Paris, 1961); *Chronicon venetum quod vulgo dicunt Altinate* (MGH, SS., XIV, 1-97); Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, ed. Ester Pastorello (RISS, XII-1, new ed., Bologna, 1938-1958); and Martin da Canal, *Les Estoires de Venise*, ed. and tr. Alberto Limentani (Fondazione Cini, Civiltà veneziana, fonti e testi, XII; Florence, 1972). This excellent new edition supplants the older *La Cronique des Venéciens de Maistre Martin da Canal*, ed. Filippo L. Polidori, *Archivio storico italiano*, VIII (1845), 229-798. The greatest collection of documents is the old and accurate *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit besonderer Beziehung auf Byzanz und die Levante*, ed. Gottlieb L. F. Tafel and Georg M. Thomas (Fontes rerum austriacarum, Diplomataria et acta, XII-XIV; 3 vols., Vienna, 1856-1857; repr. Amsterdam, 1964).

Venetian law codes from this period include *Gli Statuti veneziani di Jacopo Tiepolo del 1242 e le loro glosse*, ed. Roberto Cessi (Memorie del R. Istituto di scienze, lettere ed arti, XXX-2; Venice, 1938); and *Gli Statuti marittimi veneziani fino al 1255*, ed. Riccardo Predelli and Adolfo Sacerdoti (Venice, 1903).

For commercial documents see *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI-XIII*, ed. Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca and Antonino Lombardo (Documenti e studi per la storia del commercio e del diritto commerciale italiano, XIX, XX; 2 vols., Rome and Turin, 1940); *Nuovi documenti del commercio veneto dei sec. XI-XIII*, ed. Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca (Monumenti storici: Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, n.s., VII; Venice, 1953).

During the crusading centuries two additional trading areas attracted Venetians: the shores of Syria and Palestine, where the crusaders established Latin states at the beginning of the twelfth century, and Moslem Egypt. Other Italian seafaring peoples — the Pisans, the Genoese, the men of Amalfi and Gaeta — similarly extended their influence into the eastern Mediterranean during the Middle Ages. The military expeditions of the crusades provided a stimulus for these developments. This chapter is a summary of the Venetian commercial colonization in Romania, in Syria-Palestine, and in Egypt during the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries.

For several centuries after its founding, Venice recognized the political superiority of the Byzantine emperors and gave constant but distant allegiance to the Greek world, rather than to the Latin world in the Italian peninsula. As part of the Greek world, Venetian seafarers

---

Of particular significance for this chapter are the following volumes of private notarial documents: *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, III, ed. Luigi Lanfranchi (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, II; Archivi ecclesiastici: Diocesi Castellana; Venice, 1968); *Famiglia Zusto*, ed. Lanfranchi (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, IV; Archivi privati; Venice, 1955), *S. Lorenzo di Ammiana*, ed. Lanfranchi (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, II; Archivi ecclesiastici: Diocesi Torcellana; Venice, 1947; repr. 1969). Also very significant is the oldest collection of documents issuing from the Venetian Council, but the published edition should be used with caution: *Deliberazioni del Maggiore Consiglio di Venezia*, I, *Liber communis qui vulgo nuncupatur Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi (Accademia dei Lincei: Atti delle Assemblee costituzionale italiane; Bologna, 1950).

For modern studies of general relevance see Jean J. M. Armingaud, "Venise et le bas-empire," *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, ser. 2, IV (1867), 299–443; Guido Astuti, "L'Organizzazione giuridica del sistema coloniale e della navigazione mercantile delle città italiane nel medio evo," *Mediterraneo e Oceano Indiano: Atti del VI colloquio di storia marittima* (Fondazione G. Cini, Civiltà veneziana, studi, XXIII; Florence, 1970), pp. 57–90; Horatio F. Brown, *The Venetian Republic* (London, 1902); *idem*, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the Close of the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XL (1920), 68–88; Rinaldo Caddeo, M. Nani Mocenigo, *et al.*, *Storia marittima dell'Italia dall'evo antico ai nostri giorni*, I (Milan, 1942), to be used with discretion; Cessi, *Le Colonie medioevali italiane in Oriente*, I, *La Conquista* (Bologna, 1942); Giorgio Cracco, *Società e stato nel medioevo veneziano* (Florence, 1967); René Grousset, *Histoire des croisades*, vols. I, II (Paris, 1934–1935); Michael F. Hendy, "Byzantium, 1081–1204: An Economic Reappraisal," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. 5, XX (1970), 31–52; Wilhelm Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen-âge*, tr. Furcy Raynaud (2 vols., Leipzig, 1885–1886; repr. Leipzig, 1936, and Amsterdam, 1967); Heinrich Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig* (3 vols., Gotha, 1905–1934; repr. Stuttgart, 1964); Frederic C. Lane, *Venice, a Maritime Republic* (Baltimore, 1973); *idem*, *Venice and History* (Baltimore, 1966); Archibald Lewis, *Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean, A.D. 500–1100* (Princeton, 1951); Jean Longnon, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949); Camillo Manfroni, *I Colonizzatori italiani durante il medio evo e il rinascimento*, vols. I, II, (Rome, 1933), to be used with caution; *idem*, *Storia della marina italiana dalle invasioni barbariche al trattato di Ninfteo* (Leghorn, 1899); Joshua Prawer, *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: European Colonialism in The Middle Ages* (London, 1972, publ. in New York, 1972, as *The Crusaders' Kingdom*); *idem*, "Étude de quelques problèmes agraires et sociaux d'une seigneurie croisée au XIIIe siècle," *Byzantion*, XXII (1952), 5–61; *idem*, *Histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem* (2 vols., Paris, 1969–1970); Louise Buenger Robbert, "The Venetian Money Market, 1150–1229," *Studi veneziani*, XIII (1971), 1–94; Samuele Romanin, *Storia documentata di Venezia*, 2nd ed. (Venice, 1912; repr. 1925); Adolf Schaube,

accepted the protection of the Byzantine fleet and of Byzantine laws, and Venice grew increasingly strong as a western Byzantine outpost. When Byzantium was no longer able to protect the Adriatic, the growing Venetian navy gradually assumed the defense of these waters. The Greeks, hoping to continue their domination there, relied more and more upon Venetian assistance against the Saracens and, later, the Norman kings of Sicily.

Venice, like the other Italian sea republics of Amalfi, Pisa, and Genoa, fought against Saracen sea power two centuries before the crusading epoch. In the ninth century Pisa and Genoa fought independently against Moslem sea powers in the western Mediterranean and the Tyrrhenian Sea, while Venetian fleets in collaboration with the Byzantines fought against Saracen encroachments in the Adriatic. Expeditions are recorded for the years 827, 829, 840, 842, and

---

*Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Munich and Berlin, 1906); Vsevolod Slessarev, "Ecclesiae mercatorum and the Rise of Merchant Colonies," *Business History Review*, XLI (1967), 181-197; Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1959); and *idem*, "Les Chroniques vénitienes de la Marcianne," *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, LXXIV (1954), 241-292.

Studies which illustrate the growth and organization of Venetian colonial enterprise to 1200 are Enrico Besta, "La Cattura dei Veneziani in Oriente per ordine dell' imperatore Emmanuele Comneno," *Antologia veneta*, I (1900), 35-46, 111-123; Charles M. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West 1180-1204* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); Cessi, "Politica, Economica, Religione," *Storia di Venezia*, II (Venice, 1958), 67-476; *idem*, *Venezia ducale*, II-1: *Commune venetiarum* (Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie; Venice, 1965); John Danstrip, "Manual P's Coup against Genoa and Venice in the Light of Byzantine Commercial Policy," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, X (1948), 204-212, to be used cautiously; Carlo Errara, "I Crociati veneziani in Terra Santa," *Archivio veneto*, XXXVIII (1889), 237-277; Philip Grierson, "From Solidus to Hyperperon: The Names of Byzantine Gold Coins," *Spink & Son Ltd.: The Numismatic Circular*, LXXIV, 5 (May 1966), 123-124; Reinhard Heynen, *Zur Entstehung des Kapitalismus in Venedig* (Stuttgart, 1905; repr. New York, 1971); Lane, "Investment and Usury," *Venice and History* (Baltimore, 1966), pp. 56-68; Robert S. Lopez, *The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971); Lopez and Irving W. Raymond, *Medieval Trade in the Mediterranean World* (London, 1955); Lopez, "The Trade of Medieval Europe: The South," *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe*, ed. Moisi Postan and Edwin E. Rich, II (Cambridge, Eng., 1952), 257-354; Gino Luzzatto, *Studi di storia economica veneziana* (Padua, 1954); *idem*, *Storia economica di Venezia dall' XI al XVI secolo* (Venice, 1961); Margarete Mereros, "Der venezianische Adel," *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, XIX (1926), 193-237; *I Prestiti della Repubblica di Venezia (Secoli XIII-XV): Introduzione storica e documenti*, ed. Luzzatto, *Documenti finanziari della Repubblica di Venezia*, ser. 3, vol. I-1 (Padua, 1929); John H. Pryor, "The Origins of the Commenda Contract," *Speculum*, LII (1977), 5-37; Paolo Sarpi, *Il Dominio de Mare Adriatico*, ed. with introduction by Cessi (Padua, 1945); Giorgio Zordan, "I Vari aspetti della Comunione familiare di Beni nella Venezia dei secoli XI-XIII," *Studi veneziani*, VIII (1966), 127-194.

Studies which refer particularly to the Venetian colonial empire during and after the Fourth Crusade include Silvano Borsari, "Il Commercio veneziano nell' impero bizantino nel XII secolo," *Rivista storica italiana*, LXXXVI (1964), 982-1011; *idem*, *Il Dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1963); *idem*, "Per la Storia del commercio veneziano col mondo bizantino nel XII secolo," *Rivista storica italiana*, LXXXVIII (1976), 104-126; *idem*, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1966); John B. Bury, "The Lombards and

846.<sup>1</sup> A powerful Venetian fleet of sixty ships was destroyed in 840 as it attempted to drive the Saracens from Taranto. Consequently, Moslems operated farther north in the Adriatic. Although Venice won a naval victory over the Saracens based on Taranto in 871, Saracen corsairs continued to raid Adriatic shipping.

During these early centuries of its existence, Venice tried to regulate its commerce in conformity with Byzantine law. In 876 and 960 Venetian doges promulgated decrees prohibiting their citizens from engaging in the slave trade.<sup>2</sup> The Byzantine emperor Leo V (813–820) prohibited his subjects from visiting Moslem ports, and, in response to an official request presented by legates of the Greek emperor, doge

Venetians in Euboea," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, VII (1886), 309–352; VIII (1887), 194–213; IX (1888), 91–117; Antonio Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romania," *Studi veneziani*, VII (1965), 125–305; Cessi, "Venezia e la Quarta Crociata," *Archivio veneto*, ser. 5, XLVIII–XLIX (1915), 1–52; Julian Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi," *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 267–356; John K. Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo, Conqueror of the Archipelago* (Oxford, 1915); Deno J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959); Ernst Gerland, *Histoire de la noblesse crétoise au moyen-âge* (Paris, 1907); David Jacoby, "The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade," *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (1973), 873–906; *idem*, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale: Les "Assises de Romanie": sources, application et diffusion* (Paris, 1971); *idem*, "Mémoires et documents: Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine," *Byzantion*, XXXVII (1967), 167–227; Donald E. Queller, ed., *The Latin Conquest of Constantinople* (New York, 1971); Raymond J. Loenertz, *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca* (Rome, 1970); *idem*, "Généalogie des Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel, 1207–1390," *Orientalia Christiana periodica*, XXVIII (1962), 121–172, 322–335; *idem*, "Les Seigneurs terriers de Négropont de 1205 à 1280," *Byzantion*, XXXV (1965), 235–276; Stephen B. Luce, "Modon—a Venetian Station in Medieval Greece," *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward K. Rand*, ed. Leslie W. Jones (New York, 1938), pp. 195–208; Manfroni, "Relazioni di Genova con Venezia dal 1270 al 1290," *Giornale storico e letterario della Liguria*, II (1901), 361–401; Louis de Mas Latrie, "Les Ducs de l'Archipel ou des Cyclades," *Monumenti storici* (Miscellanea della Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie; Venice, 1887), pp. 4–15; William Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient* (Cambridge, Eng., 1921; repr. Chicago, 1967); *idem*, *The Latins in the Levant* (London, 1908; repr. 1964); *Nel VII Centenario della nascita di Marco Polo* (Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere, ed arti; Venice, 1955); Queller, "L'Évolution du rôle de l'ambassadeur: Les pleins pouvoirs et le traité de 1201 entre les croisés et les Vénitiens," *Le Moyen-âge*, XVI (1961), 479–501; Queller, Thomas K. Compton, and Donald A. Campbell, "The Fourth Crusade: The Neglected Majority," *Speculum*, XLIX (1974), 441–465; Queller and Joseph Gill, "Franks, Venetians and Pope Innocent III," *Studi veneziani*, XII (1970), 85–105; Kenneth M. Setton, "The Latins in Greece and the Aegean," *Cambridge Medieval History*, 2nd ed., IV-1 (Cambridge, Eng., 1966), 389–430; *Venezia e il levante fino al secolo XV*, ed. Agostino Pertusi, vol. I (Civiltà veneziana, Studi, 27; Florence, 1973); Robert L. Wolff, "Mortgage and Redemption of an Emperor's Son: Castile and the Latin Empire of Constantinople," *Speculum*, XXIX (1954), 45–84; *idem*, "The Oath of the Venetian Podestà: A New Document from the Period of the Latin Empire of Constantinople," *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, XII (1952; *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, IV), 539–573; and *idem*, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, VIII (1954), 225–303.

1. Cessi, "Politica, Economica, Religione," pp. 152–155; John the Deacon, in *MGH*, SS., VII, 16–19.

2. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 158–159; Tafel and Thomas, I, 17–25.



Peter IV Candiano in 971 decreed that Venetians should not take lumber or weapons to Saracen lands—Barbary, Egypt, Crete, parts of Anatolia, and Sicily.<sup>3</sup>

With the decline of Byzantine maritime strength, Venice, for its own protection, began to force the seaports on the Adriatic to submit to its authority. The Venetian doges Peter II Candiano (932–939) and Peter III Candiano (942–959) reduced the upper Adriatic (Ravenna to Pola on the Istrian peninsula) to dependence on Venice. Their navies destroyed Comacchio and defeated the Istrian cities by enforcing an economic blockade. However, pirates in the middle Adriatic successfully challenged the Venetian navy before 1000, indicating the weakening of Byzantine naval power.

At the end of the tenth century, the Byzantine emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII asked Venice to supply transport ships to carry a Byzantine military force to southern Italy. In return for this assistance, the emperors in this bull of March 992 granted special commercial favors to their Venetian subjects.<sup>4</sup> These included a reduction to 2 solidi in the taxes paid at Abydus by each Venetian ship bringing cargo to Byzantium and a reduction to 15 solidi for each departing Venetian ship, the difference being because the Venetian ships brought cargoes of low value to the east and took away cargoes of high value. Ships of other nationalities paid more. The Venetian merchants were expected to abide by Byzantine law and were placed under the jurisdiction of a Byzantine official, the *logothete de dromo*.

The recipient of these privileges from the Greeks, doge Peter II Orseolo (992–1009), also received an extension of Venetian commercial rights and privileges on the mainland of Italy from the German kings Otto III, in July 992, and Henry II, in November 1002.

Having gained international recognition, Peter prepared to wage what would be his most successful campaign against the Dalmatian pirates, especially those from the Narenta river and nearby on the Dalmatian islands of Curzola and Lagosta. His victory won for Venice the undisputed dominance over the area and for himself the title duke of Dalmatia.<sup>5</sup> Thus by 1000 Venice had reduced the Dalmatian pirates and had begun to police the Adriatic.

Peter also led the Venetians in a successful military venture against the Saracens. The Apulian city of Bari, nominally under Byzantine

3. Tafel and Thomas, I, 25–30; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 34.

4. Tafel and Thomas, I, 36–39: the text is corrupt; consult Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter," pp. 68–70; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 34, note 2; Cessi, *Venezia ducale*, II, 158–172; cf. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 193.

5. Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter," p. 70. Both the eastern emperors and the Salian emperor Henry II recognized Venetian rights there.

control, was besieged by the Moslems. A fleet from Venice, probably acting on behalf of Constantinople, assisted the local Christians and saved not only the city but the surrounding countryside from the Moslems in 1002–1003. The mouth of the Adriatic Sea, Venice's threshold, was again freed. The Byzantine emperor Basil II, in gratitude for these Venetian naval victories, betrothed his niece Maria to John, the son of the doge.

During the eleventh century the Venetians assumed further control of the Adriatic by pacts with the German emperors, with the Dalmatian cities, and with Slavic princes, and by tacit recognition from the Croats. Later eleventh-century Venetian treaties with the port towns along the Adriatic coast of Italy, especially Fano, show a nominal respect by Venice for the sovereignty of these cities, but their terms, which included heavy military duties and an oath of *fidelitas*, indicate that Venice was the actual sovereign.

That the Venetians were cooperating with the Greek emperors in policing the Adriatic is further attested by their naval activity against the Normans. Venice sent ships to assist the Byzantines against Robert Guiscard's invasion of the Balkans from 1081 to 1085. Venetian fleets were especially active in the siege of Durazzo from 1081 to 1082 and in curtailing the Norman advances in the lower Adriatic in 1083 and 1084. After Robert Guiscard's death, his Balkan conquests reverted to Byzantine rule, and the entire Dalmatian coast north of Durazzo entered the Venetian sphere of dominance.

As a direct result of this Venetian naval assistance against the Normans, emperor Alexius I Comnenus granted Venice more commercial privileges. These privileges, enumerated in the chrysobull of May 1082,<sup>6</sup> included freedom for Venetians to trade in the Byzantine empire without paying any duties whatsoever. The Greeks also granted annual revenues to the Venetian churches, revenues to Domenico Cervoni, the patriarch of Grado, and a title<sup>7</sup> and revenues to the Venetian doge,

6. Tafel and Thomas, I, 50–54; Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter," pp. 70–72; Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 178–179. For another description of the Venetian quarter see S. Giorgio Maggiore, ed. Lanfranchi, II, no. 69. Recently Chrysostomides, "Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi," p. 268, defined the Venetian commercial privileges thus: "Venetians were given the right to buy and sell, import and export any commodity and to arrive by land or by sea with or without merchandise without paying any of the customary taxes, such as the *teloneum*, *diabaticum*, *commercium* or *scalaticum*." Exceptions were prohibitions of the export of home-grown wheat and the requirement to report goods belonging to non-Venetians on Venetian ships. These privileges were renewed in 1124, 1148, later under the Angeli, and also in 1268 and 1277.

7. The title was either *protoproedus* or *protosebastos* or *dux Dalmacie et Chroacie*: Tafel and Thomas, I, 52; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 217; Besta, "La Cattura," p. 35, note 5; Cessi, *Venezia ducale*, II, 120, note 1.

Domenico Selvo. In addition, the citizens of Amalfi in the empire were required to pay annual tribute to Venice. The emperor also awarded Venice a quarter in Constantinople itself, on the west bank of the Golden Horn between the Gate of Vigla and the Porta Peramatis; it was about one third of a mile long and averaged one hundred seventy yards in width. Drungary Street ran the length of the Venetian quarter and was flanked by houses on each side. Crossroads led down to three wharves. The great Venetian warehouse and market stood just inside the Porta Peramatis. According to the text of 1082, the quarter included the church of St. Akindynos, rededicated by the Venetians to St. Mark, its adjacent bakery ovens, the church of St. Mary of the Latins that had formerly belonged to Amalfi, and the monastery of St. George. There was another religious establishment dedicated to St. Nicholas.<sup>8</sup>

In addition to gaining a quarter in the Byzantine capital, the Venetians obtained the right to trade freely at the following Byzantine ports and inland cities: Latakia, Antioch, Mamistra, Adana, Tarsus, Adalia, Strobilo, Ephesus (Theologo), Phocaea, Abydus, Scutari, Selymbria, Heraclea, Rodosto, Apros, Adrianople, Peritheorium, Thessalonica, Demetrias, Negroponte, Thebes, Athens, Nauplia, Coron, Modon, Corinth, Vonitsa, Corfu, Avlona, and Durazzo. The only Aegean island open to them was Chios.<sup>9</sup> The Black Sea was closed to them, but on the Adriatic the Byzantine emperor ceded to the Venetians, as his faithful subjects, the church of St. Andrew in Durazzo and its revenues. Neither the other Italian merchants nor the Greeks had such privileges as the free trade and the annual Byzantine subsidies. The city of Amalfi lost its privileges in Constantinople because it had become part of the Norman kingdom.

Venice applied in 1119 to Alexius's successor, John II Comnenus, for a renewal of these privileges,<sup>10</sup> but they were not renewed until 1126, and then only after it made warning attacks on the Byzantine islands of Corfu in the Ionian Sea, on Samos, Lesbos, and Rhodes in the Aegean, on Cyprus and Cephalonia, and on the Byzantine port of Modon in the Morea. Obviously the Greeks could not defend their outlying possessions against the Venetians, so John renewed the Venetian subsidies and titles. Venice's other commercial privileges were renewed and the special privileges of the Venetian quarter in Constantinople were reconfirmed; a later act of John

8. Tafel and Thomas, I, 55-63; Raymond Janin, *La Géographie ecclésiastique*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1969), p. 573.

9. Tafel and Thomas, I, 52-53.

10. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 232; Tafel and Thomas, I, 78.

Comnenus extended the Venetian trading privileges to include Cyprus and Crete.<sup>11</sup>

Not only were the Greeks unable to defend their empire from attacks, such as the Venetians had made in 1124–1125, but they were unable to protect their citizens against attempts by the Sicilian Normans to conquer them. The Byzantine empire continued to need Venetian naval assistance. During the Second Crusade, while the fleets of Genoa and Pisa were supporting the crusade in Spain, the Norman king Roger II, like his father sixty-five years earlier, seized the opportunity to expand his growing kingdom into the Adriatic at Byzantine expense. While the Norman fleet raided the Morea and Attica, the Venetian ambassadors in Constantinople, in return for more privileges, promised naval aid to the Greeks. In a chrysobull of March 1148 emperor Manuel I Comnenus defined in great detail the boundaries of the Venetian quarter in Constantinople.<sup>12</sup> In October 1148 the emperor issued a second bull which permitted the Venetians to trade freely, for the first time, in Rhodes. For his part, doge Peter Polani prohibited all commercial voyages for that season, called Venetian ships home, and organized an armada to assist the Greeks. It was an uneasy alliance, marked by growing tension and quarrels. When, however, the Norman fleet under George of Antioch demonstrated against the Byzantines by threatening the city of Constantinople and its commerce, the Venetians once more cooperated with the Byzantines. The Venetian fleet defeated the returning Normans off the coast of the Morea in 1149.<sup>13</sup>

By mid-century the Venetians had gained the most liberal commercial privileges of any group of merchants in Byzantine waters, and Venetian commerce flourished. They now had complete freedom to trade in the Byzantine empire and complete exemption from all tolls, even those paid by the Greeks themselves. However, Venetian galleys still served in the Byzantine navy; there were thirteen in Byzantine service in 1150.<sup>14</sup> The Greeks had also granted similar, but not as extensive, privileges to the Pisans in 1111 and to the Genoese in 1155. No Italians were permitted to trade on the Black Sea. Byzantine ships probably continued to carry cargoes between ports within the empire.<sup>15</sup>

11. Tafel and Thomas, I, 95–98, 124; Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter," p. 73; Borsari, "Il Commercio veneziano," p. 997.

12. Tafel and Thomas, I, 109–113.

13. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 243; *Historia ducum veneticorum*, in *MGH, SS.*, XIV, 75; cf. Manfroni, *Colonizzatori*, I, 150–152.

14. *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, no. 240. On flourishing commerce under doge Domenico Morosini (1148–1154) see Martin da Canal, *Les Estoires de Venise*, I, 26 (pp. 38–39).

15. Hendy, "Byzantium, 1081–1204," pp. 40–41.

In addition to the Venetian secular interest in the Greek east, Venetian churches possessed certain areas in Constantinople. As early as 1090 the Venetian doge Vitale Falier donated all the ducal properties in the Venetian quarter of Constantinople to the great Venetian Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore. Seventeen years later another Venetian doge, Ordelafo Falier, gave St. Mark (the former St. Akindynos), the main Venetian church in Constantinople, to John Gradenigo, patriarch of Grado, the principal ecclesiastical official in Venice.<sup>16</sup> This church and its possessions, including treasury, ovens, taverns, weights, and measures, were given to repay a debt Venice had incurred under the previous doge, Domenico Selvo. It is possible that these eleventh-century doges donated these state properties to the church in return for money to finance their government, as did their successor, doge Enrico Dandolo, one hundred years later.<sup>17</sup>

Venetian ecclesiastical authorities also owned property on the Byzantine island of Lemnos, in Byzantine Rodosto on the north shore of the Sea of Marmara, and at Halmyros, the Byzantine port in Thessaly. These three ports often served Venetian merchants in the twelfth century. In July 1136 Peter, prior of the Venetian monastery of St. Mark in Constantinople, subject to the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore, received the oratory of St. Blasius on Lemnos, with its dependencies, from Michael, Orthodox archbishop of Lemnos.<sup>18</sup> In return, the Venetians promised to build a church in honor of St. George the Martyr and to give oil annually to the Greek archbishop.

In 1145 doge Peter Polani granted jurisdiction over the Venetian church of St. Mary in Rodosto to the Venetian monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore. In 1151 San Giorgio's control over St. Mary in Rodosto was declared sovereign, as neither patriarch nor doge nor the commune of Venice had the right to intervene. These privileges in Rodosto were the subject of a special embassy sent in 1147 by Venice to the emperor Manuel. The jurisdiction of San Giorgio Maggiore in Rodosto was further defined in October 1157, when Hugo, the abbot of St. Mary in Adrianople, granted to San Giorgio Maggiore the church of St. Mary in Rodosto, together with "its buildings, hospital, gardens, and all charters new and old, Greek and Latin."<sup>19</sup>

16. Tafel and Thomas, I, 55-63; *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, no. 69. For St. Akindynos, now St. Mark, see Tafel and Thomas, I, 67-74.

17. Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, no. 46. Doge Enrico Dandolo in 1198 received 2,871 Venetian pounds from the Opera ecclesiae B. Marci in *oportunitatibus nostri comuni*.

18. Tafel and Thomas, I, 98-101; *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, no. 181.

19. On Rodosto see Tafel and Thomas, I, 103-105, 107-109, 137-139; Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, no. 12.

The Venetian monastery of St. Mark in Constantinople, dependent on San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice, also acquired land with buildings in Halmyros, some of which had belonged to a private Venetian citizen who had pledged it to the monastery as security for a loan. When the sum was not repaid, he ceded his property to the monastery with the privilege of living there for life.<sup>20</sup>

Thus during the first crusading century the Venetians accumulated trading privileges in the Byzantine empire, achieved freedom from Byzantine taxation, acquired a quarter in Constantinople and property on Lemnos and in Rodosto and Halmyros. Numbers of Venetians came to reside in the Greek world, where they made their living as merchants. It is clear from the documents that control of the real estate was passing into the hands of the Venetian church. The great Venetian Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore had the most responsibility, exercised through its representative, the monk who was also prior of St. Mark's in Constantinople. In addition to the Latin title of prior, he also bore the Greek title of "most precious."<sup>21</sup> Also important were the holdings of the patriarch of Grado. In his church of St. Mark (St. Akindynos) in Constantinople were kept the weights and measures of Venice. All surviving legal documents of the Venetians in Constantinople are connected to these two Venetian ecclesiastical institutions—the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore and the patriarchate of Grado. Their representatives in the Greek east controlled the transfer of real estate, the registration and drawing up of notarial contracts, and the regulation of standards of measurement. This control by ecclesiastical officials would not have seemed at all unusual to the Greeks. A secular agent of the doge assumed charge of Venetian affairs in Romania only on those rare occasions when the doge sent special legates to Constantinople.<sup>22</sup>

It would seem that, at least until 1187, Venetians in the Greek world were considered Greek subjects under Greek law, and that their affairs in Constantinople were directed by church officials.<sup>23</sup> Apparently any legal disputes between Venetians and Greeks were settled

20. Tafel and Thomas, I, 125–133, 136–137; *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, nos. 231, 232, 233, 271.

21. *S. Giorgio Maggiore*, II, no. 240.

22. See also Slessarev, "Ecclesiae mercatorum and the Rise of Merchant Colonies." Names of the known legates are listed in Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 35; cf. Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, no. 8; Tafel and Thomas, I, 107–109; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 95.

23. Wolff, "The Oath of the Venetian Podestà," p. 540; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 46; Heyd, tr. Raynaud, *Histoire du commerce*, I, 255–258; Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 202–203; Tafel and Thomas, I, 273–278; Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, nos. 33–35.



in the Byzantine courts. Cases in civil law concerning Venetians only were settled before the Venetian elders in Constantinople.<sup>24</sup> Not until the chrysobull of 1187 did the Byzantine state recognize Venice as independent and equal. Only after the chrysobull of 1198 issued by Alexius III Angelus were Venetians in Constantinople governed by a legate sent from the Venetian doge. This legate could apply Venetian civil law in his court when the defendant was a Venetian. If the defendant was a Greek, the crime or dispute was adjudicated according to Byzantine law. But this Byzantine recognition of Venetian law came barely five years before the fall of Constantinople to the Latins.

The position of Venetian merchants in Syria and Palestine was considerably different. In these lands the Genoese and the Pisans assisted the crusading effort several years before the Venetians, and these western Italian maritime republics gained greater rights and colonial privileges than did the Venetians. Certain cities in the crusader principalities such as Antioch, Jubail, Tyre, and Acre came to be the center of the Genoese colonial empire. The Pisan strength lay in Tyre and Jaffa, with some grants also in Sidon, Acre, and Caesarea. The Venetian colonies in the crusader states were never as large or as profitable as their counterparts in the Byzantine empire. The Venetians, however, like the Genoese and the Pisans, profited from the dependency of the Latin inhabitants of the crusader states upon Italian sea power. Venetian colonies in Syria and Palestine were centers of Venetian law and custom, unlike the Byzantine areas where Venetians were subject not to their own but to Byzantine law. The Venetians in the Holy Land, like the citizens of other Italian cities, gained fractions of ports and also parts of the adjacent countryside.

Whereas during the First Crusade Genoa transported the crusaders to the Levant and assisted them in their battles, and Pisa sent its archbishop, Daimbert, and a powerful fleet, Venice participated only later and unofficially. A private Venetian fleet of only thirty ships commanded by John Michiel, the son of doge Vitale I Michiel, sailed from Venice in July 1099. It stopped at Zara and along the Dalmatian coast, wintered at Rhodes from October 28, 1099, to May 27, 1100, where it defeated a numerically superior Pisan fleet, and finally arrived in Jaffa on the coast of Palestine. In July 1100 the Venetians in Palestine

24. Borsari, "Il Commercio veneziano," p. 997 and note 57, draws a distinction between Venetians resident in Constantinople outside the Venetian quarter and those who tarried in Constantinople for brief periods in the Venetian quarter, the former being subject to Byzantine law and obligations, the latter enjoying all the privileges granted to Venetians. It is difficult to accept such a distinction.

received from Godfrey of Bouillon generous promises of privileges in the kingdom of Jerusalem; after his death, they supported the Christian forces besieging Haifa in the fall of 1100 before returning home.

Godfrey's promises included special rights in all cities, inland and coastal, to be conquered by the Franks, comprising in each city a church and a marketplace and exemption from all tribute. The Venetians were to have all rights of recovery in case of shipwreck, especially near Jaffa and Haifa. However, these generous promises were probably not implemented with specific grants in particular cities.<sup>25</sup> The general rights were renewed by Baldwin I, king of Jerusalem, sometime between 1101 and 1104.<sup>26</sup> Evidence of specific Venetian territorial and commercial grants appears later. The Venetians gained a street in Acre as reward for their help in the conquest of Sidon, where they had sent a large force of 100 vessels in 1110.<sup>27</sup>

A decade elapsed before the Venetians participated again in the crusades or received any additional territorial grants in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. At the request of legates sent in 1119 by king Baldwin II, doge Domenico Michiel sent a Venetian fleet to Syria.<sup>28</sup> This fleet won a great battle with the Egyptian fleet off Ascalon in 1123 and assisted the Frankish knights in the siege of Tyre until its capitulation July 7, 1124. Venetian money also assisted the crusaders at Tyre; 100,000 bezants were lent to the patriarch and the king.

The specific Venetian privileges promised before these battles are described in detail in a document issued to the Venetians by Gormond ("Warmundus"), patriarch of Jerusalem, the actual ruler of the kingdom while Baldwin II was held captive by Belek, lord of Aleppo.<sup>29</sup> This grant, known as the *pactum Warmundi*, promised Venice one third of the still-to-be-conquered cities of Tyre and Ascalon. Also the Venetians received as much real estate on the Piazza San Marco in Jerusalem as the king had. With their land in Acre they received a mill, an oven, a bath, exemption from tribute, and, unless buying from non-Venetians, the right to use their own weights and measures. In other cities of the kingdom which had been mentioned in earlier

25. Tafel and Thomas, I, 64–65; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 221–223. See also Errara, "I Crociati veneziani," p. 266; Cessi, *Storia di Venezia*, II, 338–342; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 124–125; Heyd, tr. Raynaud, *Histoire du commerce*, I, 148.

26. Tafel and Thomas, I, 66.

27. Errara, "I Crociati veneziani," pp. 271–275; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 130.

28. Tafel and Thomas, I, 78. Variant MS. readings give the fleet at 200 galleys and warships, or at 4 heavily armed *navi* carrying pilgrims, knights, and horses, along with 40 galleys.

29. *Ibid.*, I, 79–81. See also Praver, "I Veneziani e le colonie veneziane nel regno latino di Gerusalemme," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-2, 633–636.

treaties, the *pactum Warmundi* again promised them a street, a bath, an oven, and full right of personal inheritance, even if the Venetian died intestate. The Venetians were given their own law courts for suits between themselves or whenever a Venetian was sued or accused by a non-Venetian. If, however, a Venetian sued a non-Venetian the case was to be tried in the royal courts. The property of a deceased Venetian would remain in Venetian hands. The Venetian loan to the crusaders at Tyre was to be repaid to Venice by a grant each June of 300 "Saracen bezants" (dinars) from the revenues of Tyre. These privileges, when considered as a whole, signified that Venetians in Acre and Tyre were to enjoy complete extraterritorial rights. In addition to these extraordinary legal rights, the Venetians in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, as in the Byzantine empire, had astonishing tax exemptions. They needed to pay no taxes or tributes, in contrast to other local inhabitants, Latin or native. These grants to the Venetians were confirmed by Baldwin II after his release in May 1125. In return, for the future defense of Tyre, Baldwin II forced the Venetians to agree to furnish defenders in proportion to their one-third share of the city. These grants and special privileges were confirmed even in the thirteenth century.

These basic grants of the *pactum Warmundi* were made to the doge Domenico Michiel, to his successors, and to the people of Venice. Tyre became the principal Venetian port in the kingdom of Jerusalem, and the cathedral of St. Mark in Tyre, subject to St. Mark in Venice, became the principal Venetian church in Syria. The doge continued to enjoy these revenues from property in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem until 1164 when another Michiel doge, Vitale II, needed money to finance his state. He mortgaged his revenues in the Latin kingdom to the *Opera Sancti Marci*, the quasi-public institution in Venice which directed work on the construction of the basilica of St. Mark, and whose chief officer, appointed by the doge in the twelfth century, was called the Procurator of St. Mark. The Tyrian property which the doge thus alienated from his private purse comprised the street in Tyre and the Venetian wharf, the cathedral of St. Mark in Tyre, and the revenue of 300 bezants collected from the customs at the port of Acre. In the spring of 1165 he also alienated title to a street and an oven in Tripoli.<sup>30</sup> The next doge, Sebastian Ziani, in 1176 mortgaged the ducal revenues in Tyre to the *Opera Sancti Marci* for five years in order to repay Romano Mairano the 600 pounds

30. Tafel and Thomas, I, 140-147.

of Venetian pennies he had spent in 1172 to rescue Venetians from Constantinople.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, the Venetian citizens in Tyre and Acre continued to enjoy the protection of Venetian law, although after 1164 it was administered not by civil magistrates but by the procurator of the cathedral church of St. Mark in Tyre.

An example of Venetian law functioning in Tyre occurs in a document dated April 1157, after a Venetian citizen, Vitale Pantaleone Malvicinus, died in Tyre. When his nephew John Pantaleone arrived from Romania to claim the inheritance, he called together all the Venetians living in Tyre to meet in the church of St. Mark. There, after much discussion, it was unanimously decided that John should inherit his uncle's house and goods, as well as the case (*saccatellum*) containing the certificate of fief and deeds of land which he had owned. However, Peter Morosini, rector of St. Mark in Tyre, disputed the award, since he had possession of the *saccatellum* and claimed that the deceased had bequeathed the deeds to him.<sup>32</sup> This example of Venetian justice in Tyre illustrates the unusual judicial freedom granted the Venetians in the *pactum Warmundi*. It also illustrates the strength of the great noble land-holding Venetian family of Pantaleone in twelfth-century Tyre.

During the Third Crusade, after the Venetians had sent a fleet to assist the crusaders in the siege of Acre, the Venetian privileges in the Holy Land were reconfirmed in May 1190 by Conrad of Montferat on behalf of king Philip Augustus. The Venetians also received papal guarantees that their church of St. Mark in Tyre would continue to enjoy its special privileges.

The Venetian state, in separate treaties with the Latin princes of Antioch and Tripoli, had its particular privileges in these principalities confirmed. The first surviving treaty with Antioch is dated May 1140, but a treaty of 1153 refers to grants made by the Antiochene princes to Venice at the beginning of the century. The Venetian privileges granted in May 1140 by Raymond of Poitiers included the right to enter, to depart, and to remain in Antioch. In Seleucia two sacks in each camel-load of merchandise were to be free from tax. The Venetians also gained freedom of the seas and the right to recover ships and merchandise in case of shipwreck, as well as the right to be judged by their own laws in their own courts and the grant of a *fondaco*, a garden, and a house.<sup>33</sup>

31. *Ibid.*, I, 167-171.

32. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 126. For the Pantaleoni see Praver, "Étude de quelques problèmes agraires," pp. 14-15.

33. Tafel and Thomas, I, 102-103. The addition of Seleucia to this treaty suggests that Ray-

These Venetian privileges in Antioch were again detailed in 1153 by Reginald of Châtillon, his wife Constance, and her son Bohemond (III). This enumeration, however, appears to be merely a repetition of the grants made by earlier princes of Antioch, Bohemond I (1099–1111), Tancred (regent 1104–1112), and Bohemond II (1126–1130). It was witnessed by all of Reginald's vassals in the principality of Antioch. By the terms of the grant, the Venetians could come and go freely and, subject to certain taxes, could trade throughout the principality. The Venetians were to pay a sales tax at a lower rate than that paid by other merchants. For transactions in silk and linen cloth the rate was reduced from five percent to four percent, and for other transactions, from seven percent to five percent. The departure tax was also reduced, from 1 bezant 8 denarii to 1 bezant for each ass-load of merchandise, and from 2½ bezants to 2 bezants for each camel-load. They were granted the right to recover their ships and goods should they be shipwrecked on the coasts of the principality of Antioch or of its dependencies. They were also permitted to hold a court in their *fondaco* in Antioch, where Venetian law and legal procedure would prevail, including the right of appeal to Venice itself.<sup>34</sup> Although these princely grants did not mention any Venetian lands in the principality of Antioch, other documents do. Pons, count of Tripoli (1127–1137), gave the usufruct of a house in Tripoli to the church of St. Mark in Venice.<sup>35</sup> In 1167, the Venetian legate to the court of the prince of Antioch received exemption for Venice of one half the commercial tribute, and later Bohemond II exempted Venice from all tribute except a one percent sales tax.<sup>36</sup>

The Venetian privileges in Tyre, Antioch, and Tripoli also were included in the mortgage executed by Vitale II Michiel to the *Opera Sancti Marci* in 1164, and confirmed in a bull of pope Alexander III in the spring of 1165, and renewed in 1176.<sup>37</sup>

This catalogue of privileges enjoyed by Venetians living in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem and in the principalities of Antioch and Tripoli demonstrates a continuing Venetian mercantile interest in these ports. Here the Venetians could live under Venetian law, which they could not do in the Byzantine empire. As long as Christian Latin rulers held control of the coastal cities in Syria and Palestine

---

mond of Antioch claimed the seaport of the disappearing kingdom of Cilician Armenia. See volume II of the present work, pp. 635–637, 650.

34. Tafel and Thomas, I, 133–135; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 125, 137.

35. Tafel and Thomas, I, 76–77.

36. *Ibid.*, I, 148–150, 175–177; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 138.

37. Tafel and Thomas, I, 145–147.

in the twelfth century, the Venetians sought to maintain their interests there.

The conditions of Venetian trade with Moslem Egypt were different, because from time to time both popes and Byzantine emperors prohibited Christians from trading with Moslems. Since traces of this trade survive from the earliest years of Venetian overseas commerce, however, Venetians must have found it quite profitable.

The Venetians began commercial relations with Saracen Egypt at an early date, but their commercial and legal privileges there are not well documented until the thirteenth century. In the seventh century, Venetians were already feuding in Egypt with the Byzantine family of Prasini. During the reign of doge Giustiniano Partecipazio (827–829) two Venetian merchants, Bonus, tribune of Malamocco, and Rusticus of Torcello, sailed to Alexandria with ten merchant vessels. The voyage was illegal, because doge Angelo Partecipazio had agreed in 819 to support emperor Leo's prohibition of all trade with Egypt and Syria. When they arrived in Alexandria, Greek monks, who were custodians of the shrine of St. Mark and feared the Moslem Egyptian rulers, assisted the two Venetians in removing the body of St. Mark from its accustomed place and hiding it in a barrel of pickled pork. Here the relic would be safe from search by Egyptian port officials because pork was an abomination to Moslems. After they carried the barrel with its sacred relic on board a Venetian vessel, it was stored directly under the mast. They returned safely to Venice, protected from storms or Egyptian attack by the relics of the saint, or so the chronicles relate.<sup>38</sup> Such clandestine voyages to Egypt continued.

During the century before the crusades, the Venetian fleet was more powerful than the Byzantine navy and operated independently of it. In the marketplaces of Egypt, Venetians exchanged Dalmatian slaves, ship lumber, and weapons for luxury products. The great Venetian doge between 991 and 1009, Peter II Orseolo, legitimized the Venetian trade with Egypt by concluding a commercial treaty with the Fāṭimid imams.<sup>39</sup>

During the later eleventh and twelfth centuries Venetians voyaged to Alexandria in every generation, but with varying frequency. Products carried to the Egyptian ports included oil, horsehair, lumber, and

38. For the Prasini affair see Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 89. For the episode of the relic of St. Mark see *ibid.*, pp. 146–147; John the Deacon, in *MGH, SS.*, VII, 16; Martin da Canal, *Les Estoires*, ed. Limentani, pp. 18–23; cf. Manfroni, *I Colonizzatori*, I, 7; Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 61.

39. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 76, 139, 177.



copper. Goods brought out of Egypt by Venetians included pepper, alum, and linen.<sup>40</sup> Venetian legal business while in Alexandria was handled by Venetian priests and notaries, who apparently traveled with the ships.<sup>41</sup> No evidence suggests that Venice had any permanent commercial settlements in Egypt before the thirteenth century.

The intermittent nature of these ventures can be explained by Venice's occasional naval assistance to the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. A Venetian war fleet in Palestine always resulted in a rupture with Egypt, because Moslem Egypt attempted to dominate these waters with its fleet. Early in the twelfth century, when the crusaders were trying to conquer the seaports of Palestine from Egypt and Damascus, the king of Jerusalem and the pope requested Venetian naval assistance. Doge Domenico Michiel led a large Venetian fleet to Palestine and, on May 30, 1123, won a great victory over the Egyptian fleet near the port of Ascalon. The Venetian chronicler reports that so much Saracen blood stained the sea that more blood than water could be seen.<sup>42</sup> After the victory the Venetian ships captured ten Egyptian vessels loaded with rich spices, silks, tapestries, and precious stones. Thereafter, the Venetian fleet participated in the conquest of Tyre. These victories secured for the Venetians important commercial rights in Palestine, as noted above, but Venetian trade with Egypt is not documented again until 1135.

Venetians engaged in vigorous trade with the Egyptian ports of Alexandria and Damietta between 1135 and 1147 and again between 1161 and 1168. The greatest number of Venetian voyages to Egypt cluster in those years when Venetian trade to Constantinople was unsafe or prohibited.<sup>43</sup> Venetian commercial voyages to Egypt abruptly ceased

40. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 11, 65, 149, 248, 345, 368. The cargo of one Venetian ship in 1182 included linen cloth, armor, soap, wax, raisins, almonds, grain, and olives: *ibid.*, no. 331.

41. The priest and notary Peter Mayrano, possibly related to the Venetian merchant Romano Mairano, figured prominently as the notary who drew up most Venetian commercial contracts in Alexandria. He did not live there, however, but traveled with the Venetian fleet. He also drew up contracts at Zara and Acre. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 248–262, 291, 293, 309, 310, 312, 322, 323, 331.

42. *Historia ducum veneticorum*, in *MGH, SS.*, XIV, 74. See also Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 225–226; Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 603.

43. For voyages to Egypt before the Byzantine renewal of Venetian trading privileges in 1148 see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 65 and 74, and Zusto, ed. Lanfranchi, pp. 16, 19. For voyages to Egypt again when Venice prohibited trade with Byzantium in 1167–1168 after Greek violence against Latin merchants, see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 179, 183, 187, 191, 193–198, 201, 203, 207. For voyages to Egypt from 1173 to 1184, when Venetians were expelled from the Venetian quarter in Constantinople, see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 247, 248, 258, 345, 347, 351, and Zusto, ed. Lanfranchi, no. 27.

in March 1168, when the winter voyages between Constantinople and Alexandria of that year were paid off. Because Byzantine and Pisan ships in 1168 and 1169 supported the invasion of Egypt by king Amalric of Jerusalem,<sup>44</sup> it was not safe for any Latin merchants, including the Venetians, in Moslem Egypt.

Between 1173 and 1184 Venetian commercial voyages to Egypt greatly increased. The only twelfth-century evidence of Venetian trade with the North African cities of Ceuta and Bugia comes in these years also. An official peace treaty was drawn up between the government of Saladin in Egypt and doge Sebastian Ziani of Venice about 1175. By its terms Venetians could buy and sell their wares and also travel in safety in Egypt. Simultaneously Venice made peace with the Moslem rulers of Tunisia.<sup>45</sup> These treaties were negotiated to compensate the Venetian merchants for their loss of trading rights in Constantinople after the great Byzantine raid on the Venetian quarter in 1171.

In the last quarter of the century, the Egyptian destination seems to have been an alternative or extra port-of-call for Venetian merchants. In 1182 a Venetian fleet sailing to Constantinople was met by another Venetian fleet fleeing from the Greek attack on the Latins in Constantinople. Warned by their compatriots, the outgoing Venetian fleet redirected its voyage to Egypt.<sup>46</sup> For the next two years, prudent Venetian merchants scheduled their voyages either to Constantinople or to Alexandria.<sup>47</sup> After the Venetians returned to their quarter in Constantinople in 1183, Venetian voyages were often planned to both Constantinople and Alexandria.<sup>48</sup> In 1183 a Christian war fleet, including Venetian ships, sailed against Saladin in Egypt.<sup>49</sup> Nonetheless, Venetian voyages of trade to Egypt continued until 1188, when doge Orto Mastropiero stopped all overseas voyages in response to Venice's preparation for the Third Crusade. A large Venetian war fleet challenged Egyptian naval supremacy in 1189 by landing in Tyre and assisting Richard I of England in recovering Acre.<sup>50</sup> Venetians hesitated to trade in Egypt in the last decade of the century. These rup-

44. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 249; Grousset, *Histoire*, II, 514-531, 542-551.

45. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 219; Grousset, *Histoire*, I, 81.

46. "Dixerunt nobis: Quid statis hic, si non fugitis omnes mortui estis, quia nos et omnes Latini de Constantinopoli sunt discomissi." Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 331.

47. *Ibid.*, I, nos. 345, 347; Zusto, ed. Lanfranchi, no. 27.

48. For such contracts between 1161 and 1168 see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 148, 149, 155, 159, 179, 183, 187-191, 193-207. From 1183 to 1190 see *ibid.*, I, nos. 345, 347, 368, 375; and Zusto, ed. Lanfranchi, no. 29.

49. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 219.

50. *Annales venetici breves*, in *MGH, SS.*, XIV, 72; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 270.

tures explain the intermittent character of Venetian commercial contracts with Egypt, in comparison with Byzantium or the crusader states.

In summary, Venetian privileges in the Near East during the first century of the crusades consisted of the right to trade freely in specific ports, to exercise special customs privileges, and to have *fondachi* in certain major centers. These rights were different in the Byzantine empire, in the crusader states, and in Moslem Egypt. The Greek emperors carefully designated which ports were open to Venetian merchants, excluding the Black Sea and most of the islands of the Aegean Sea. They allowed the Venetians to pay lower duties than Byzantine or other Latin merchants, and allowed them their own quarter in Constantinople.

In the Frankish principalities in Syria, Venice received grants even more generous. The absolute dependence by the Latin kings of Jerusalem upon Venetian, Genoese, and Pisan sea power forced them to promise larger trading areas in their seaports than Venice held in Byzantine ports. Often these promises were made even before the Christians had conquered these ports. In addition, the crusader princes regarded Venice as an independent state, permitted it to exercise its own law and justice, and exempted it from most or all taxes in the Syrian and Palestinian cities. Venetians also had the right of recovery in case of shipwreck. Their envoys received these grants not only from the Latin kings of Jerusalem but also from certain princes of Antioch and from Pons, count of Tripoli.

Venetian commercial arrangements with the rulers of Egypt before the Fourth Crusade are not well documented, but certainly such agreements existed as early as the year 1000. When such treaties were in force, Venetian merchants in Egypt could freely buy and sell, come and go. They probably did not settle permanently in Egypt. They sent their vessels to Egypt at irregular intervals, depending on the political situation, the safety of the seas, and the availability of other markets.

We may now turn from the privileges which Venetians enjoyed to the manner in which they profited from trade in the Near East. The city of Constantinople was the most frequently recorded destination of Venetian voyages. For the period 1150 to 1183, there survive sixty-seven contracts to go to Constantinople, forty-three to go to Romania. In contrast there are only twenty-five for the crusader states, of which eighteen specify Acre. There also survive twenty contracts for voyages to Egypt, nineteen for Alexandria and one for Damietta.

As the political situation in the eastern Mediterranean became in-

creasingly muddled after 1183, these proportions changed. Constantinople remained the destination in forty-two of the surviving contracts dated between 1184 and 1205. Other parts of Romania are mentioned in eighteen.<sup>51</sup> In contrast, Venetian trade with the crusader states during the same period slackened; we have records of only twenty-two contracts. Trade with Egypt also diminished, with only ten contracts surviving, nine of these to Alexandria. As the above numbers suggest, Venice carried on more trade with areas under Byzantine control than with other distant ports in the half century before the fall of Constantinople.

The Genoese trade with the Levant, at least during the period 1154–1164, was divided differently, to judge from the cartularies of the notary John Scriba. During this decade, he records fifty-eight commercial agreements concerning Alexandria, thirty-four Syria, and twenty Byzantium. The Genoese sent 9,031 Genoese pounds to Alexandria, 10,075 to Syria, but only 2,007 to Byzantium.<sup>52</sup> Later in the century, Genoa's major trading interest lay in the crusading states; when comparisons can be made, only one-fourth of the annual Genoese investments in Levantine trade had to do with Byzantium. Pisan commercial interests centered on Egypt.<sup>53</sup>

The strength of the Venetian commercial interests in the Byzantine empire in the twelfth century was the result of political ties. Venice had been subject to Byzantium since its founding. Even though the Venetians considered themselves an independent and autonomous state, the emperor Alexius I Comnenus treated them as his own subjects in the chrysobull of 1082. This helps explain why they received such extraordinary commercial privileges in Constantinople and certain other ports, assuring them of the largest share of the carrying trade in the Aegean. Genoa and Pisa, not being subject to Constantinople, received no such commercial privileges at that time. It is significant that most of the surviving Venetian commercial contracts specify Constantinople as a destination. Few documents bear witness to Venetian trade between one Aegean port and another, excluding the capital, or between Venice and an Aegean port only.<sup>54</sup> Perhaps the lack of

51. Other seaports and towns in the Byzantine empire named in commercial contracts from 1150 to 1204 include Abydos, Anido (Anydros), Armiro (Halmyros), Arta, Catodica, Corfu, Corinth, Cotrone, Crete, Kitro (Citrum), LoDromiti (Adramyttium), Smyrna, Sparta, Thebes, and Thessalonica.

52. Praver, *The Crusaders' Kingdom*, p. 399.

53. Cessi, *Le Colonie medioevali*, I, 61–64. The author is indebted to the late Vsevolod Slessarev for precise information on Genoese trade.

54. For example, Venice to Thebes: Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 418; Venice to Corinth: *ibid.*, no. 369; Venice to Thebes, Catodica, and the Morea: *ibid.*,

evidence of commerce between the Aegean ports results from the accident that many of the surviving documents were drawn up in Venice rather than in the Aegean ports. Later thirteenth-century documents from Crete suggest that Venetians engaged in a flourishing Aegean carrying trade. The Genoese also pursued the carrying trade between various points in the Greek empire, as revealed by lists of Genoese losses in Byzantine waters.

The monies used by the Venetians in the Byzantine east were the gold hyperperon of the old weight (*perperi auri veteres pensantes* or the *perperi auri paleoskenurgios bonos pensantes*) and occasionally the good gold hyperperon of the new weight (*perperi auri boni novi pensantes*). After 1184 the Venetians also found their own pounds of Venetian pennies (*libra denariorum venetialium*) increasingly acceptable in Byzantine ports.<sup>55</sup>

During the fifty years before the Fourth Crusade Venetian commercial interest in the crusader states remained at a constant level. They regularly sent trading expeditions to Acre and to Tyre, and less frequently to Antioch, Beirut, and Jaffa. Often investments in voyages to the crusader states specified that the business should be carried on in more than one Syrian port, and several contracts mention as a destination Tyre or Acre and Constantinople, or a Syrian port and Alexandria. The money in circulation in Acre and Tyre was called, by the Venetians, gold Saracen bezants (*bicanci auri saracenates*) or Saracen bezants of the new weight (*bicanci saracenati novi pensantes*). Occasionally the documents added the identifying clause "of the coins of the king of Jerusalem" (*de moneta regis Ierusalem*).<sup>56</sup>

Venetian trade with Egypt took third place among distant areas specified in destinations for overseas investment in the twelfth century. As the century drew to a close, the Venetian contracts for commercial investment in Alexandria stipulated that business investments were to be made not only in Egypt but also in Romania or in the ports of Messina, Acre, Constantinople, or Crete. The money in circulation in Alexandria was called old Saracen gold bezants (*bicanci auri saracenates veteres*).

To these markets on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Venetian ships brought western goods, including copper, lumber, iron, inexpensive textiles, and some gold. Slaves had also been an important commodity for the Venetian economy for centuries. In the eighth cen-

no. 235; Venice to Thebes, Catodica, the Morea, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Constantinople: *ibid.*, no. 353; Venice to Durazzo, Corfu, and Thessalonica: *ibid.*, no. 400.

55. Robbert, "The Venetian Money Market," pp. 13-14, 19, 65-66, 76-78, 85-88.

56. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

ture pope Zacharias (741–752), pope Hadrian I (772–795), and Charlemagne prohibited Venetian or other Italian slavers from going to Moslem lands and placed severe penalties upon such traffic.<sup>57</sup> Several ninth- and tenth-century Venetian doges prohibited, under severe penalties, the sale of Christian slaves, yet Venice continued to be a market for slaves in these pre-crusading centuries. In the ninth century slaves from Bulgaria were sold in Venice by Jewish merchants.<sup>58</sup> Venetian merchants during the twelfth and thirteenth century owned and traded in pagan slaves. For example, in Tyre in 1192–1194, three Venetians and a citizen of Acre shared in the profit from owning a Saracen slave named Cotoble, whom they had obtained through a loan from Conrad of Montferrat.<sup>59</sup> In 1199 a slave from Slavonia was sold in Venice to bishop Dominic of Chioggia, a fishing village near Venice.<sup>60</sup>

Household slaves were often freed by their Venetian owners in their wills.<sup>61</sup> In two of these, freedom was conditioned on serving the testator's children until they reached maturity. A Croatian slave named Dobramiro took his master's surname Sten (Stagnario) and traveled as a merchant for over a decade from Venice to Sparta, Corinth, Constantinople, and Alexandria. His son Pancrazio and grandsons Giovanni, Domenico, and Zaccaria followed in his footsteps with increasing profit.<sup>62</sup> Zaccaria held office as councillor of the Venetian podestà in Constantinople in 1207. Five household slaves of the chaplain-priest of the basilica of St. Mark in Venice were freed and given personal possessions by his will, dated 1151.<sup>63</sup> The trade in human merchandise thus must have continued during the crusading centuries, but recent studies of the Venetian slave trade have concerned the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, beyond the scope of this chapter.<sup>64</sup>

Other articles of trade which the Italian merchants exported from Italy to the Levant are revealed by the Genoese cartularies.<sup>65</sup> In the

57. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 175.

58. Lopez, in *Cambridge Economic History*, II, 287.

59. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 441, 412, 425.

60. *Ibid.*, I, no. 442.

61. *Ibid.*, I, nos. 49, 133, 246; II, nos. 535, 661; Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, nos. 79, 92; Archivio di Stato di Venezia, San Zaccaria, B. 24, 1168, Sept.

62. Borsari, "Il Commercio veneziano," pp. 992–995.

63. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 100.

64. Luzzatto, *Storia economica di Venezia*, pp. 63–64, 148, 176, 184. Charles Verlinden, "Venezia e il commercio degli schiavi provenienti dalle coste orientali del Mediterraneo," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-2, 911–929.

65. The late Vsevolod Slessarev, unable to complete his study on Genoa and the crusades for this volume, graciously permitted me to draw on his unpublished results. The following two paragraphs are in part taken from his manuscript.



second half of the twelfth century, the exports "from Genoa to Constantinople . . . consisted mainly of textiles, hauberks, and occasionally of quicksilver and slaves." In the thirteenth century, cargoes from Genoa "consisted mostly of manufactured goods made locally or transhipped from France, the Low Countries, or Lombardy. Textiles of various kinds were most prominent; also, gold thread, silver vases, wooden bowls, and goblets. Iron implements and armor made up the rest of the cargoes; only rarely do the documents mention precious metals. Virtually every branch of Genoa's artisan class took the opportunity to export its wares to Syria. To give but one example, a surprising number of swords, shields, hauberks, daggers, and crossbows found their way to the land of almost perpetual war."

In Syria and Romania, the Venetians and Genoese merchants purchased precious goods and grain. Certain of their purchases were produced locally and others came to Levantine ports from collecting points farther east. Arab sailors on the Indian Ocean brought galingale, nutmeg, camphor, and cloves to Aden. From there, these goods were sent by camel caravans through Arabia to the seaports of Syria. By another route, the silks from China reached the Levant by way of the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. Baghdad, one of the principal inland markets of western Asia, collected merchandise coming overland from the Far East, as well as musk and rhubarb from Central Asia and muslins from Mosul. Baghdad was also a principal market for pearls from the Persian Gulf. Aleppo was the great silk market. Damascus, another terminus of caravan routes from Asia, itself produced silks, gold brocades, fine light cloths, and lamé. The goods purchased in these inland markets were brought by camel and donkey caravan routes directly to the Syrian seaports controlled by the Christians of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Italian merchants did not go to the interior until the next century. In the twelfth century, Genoa imported silk garments, dyestuffs, and grain from Constantinople. In the next century, return shipments to Genoa from the Levant did not consist exclusively of spices and colorants, but included such raw products as cotton and wood.

The crusader states were not oblivious to the profits to be gained from taxing the caravans which criss-crossed their lands. Linen carried from Egypt to Damascus and Baghdad was among the products so taxed. The Assises of Jerusalem reveal that in Acre a merchant could buy rhubarb from the Far East, musk from Tibet, pepper, cinnamon, nutmeg, cloves, aloes, camphor, and other eastern products. There he might also find ivory from India and Africa, or incense and dates from Arabia. Beirut, another port along the Syrian coast fre-

quented by the Genoese but not by Venetians, contained shops selling incense, indigo, brazilwood, and pearls, all from Central Asia.

In addition to purchasing luxury items such as drugs, spices, dyes, and silk in the ports of Syria, Italian merchants also acquired local foods and textiles for export. The land of Syria-Palestine was extremely fertile and produced lemons, oranges, figs, almonds, grapes to be made into fine wine, and olives from which oil could be extracted. The country estates held by the Venetians around the city of Tyre in 1243 included fields, orchards, and vineyards. These were cultivated by native agricultural workers, organized under their own leaders. But a portion of their crops went to their Venetian landlords, including also rents or manorial dues paid in chickens, eggs, and cheese. Of these local products, sugarcane, unknown to Europeans until the First Crusade, was both cultivated and refined for export from Syria during the years of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. In addition to the linen and silk products brought to the Syrian ports from Egypt and from the Moslem cities inland, Syria itself also produced cotton and silk for sale to western merchants either as raw fiber, as unfinished cloth, or as fine fabric. Another fine finished textile produced in Syria was camels'-hair cloth. Syrian fabrics received special acclaim in western Europe because they were fabulously dyed in shades of indigo, Tyrian purple, and red. All these dyestuffs likewise were produced in Syria. Very fine, transparent glass from Tyre was also in great demand.

From the lands under Byzantine control the Venetians exported many products. They found grain at Rodosto on the Sea of Marmara, a port where they had special privileges, and furs and salt fish in Thessalonica. They purchased much fine silk at Thebes, other fine woven goods in Boeotia, and silks from Negroponte. Cheese and cotton came from Thebes and Corinth. From Chios they acquired a resin from the mastic tree that was used in tanning and in varnishes. Halmyros, the port of Thessaly, exported grain. In the markets of Sparta and Modon in the Morea (Peloponnesus) the Venetians purchased oil.<sup>66</sup>

To organize these business ventures, Venetian merchants employed several types of business contracts: loans, the *colleganza*, the unilateral *commenda*, and the fraternal company.<sup>67</sup> The loan contract had

66. Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, p. 204; Borsari, "Commercio veneziano," p. 996.

67. See Luzzatto, "Capitale e lavoro nel commercio veneziano dei secoli XI e XII," in *Studi di storia*, pp. 99-108; *idem*, "La Commenda nella vita economico dei secoli XII e XIV con particolare riguardo a Venezia," *ibid.*, pp. 59-79; see also Astuti, *Origine e svolgimento storico della commenda fino al secolo XIII* (Documenti e studi per la storia del commercio e del diritto

two variations—the sea loan and the simple loan. The sea loan (*nauticum foenus*), the most common twelfth-century commercial contract in Venice, would be initiated by a man who was departing on a trading voyage. He borrowed from another more affluent merchant, agreeing to repay a specified sum (which included fixed interest) only after returning to the home port or some other specified destination, and only twenty or thirty days after docking. The traveling business man assumed all the expenses of his voyage. This contract did not limit the borrower in his commercial ventures in any way except to specify the place and time of repayment. In these contracts, the risk of the sea voyage and of piracy was born by the lender. Because the risk was stated, these interest-bearing contracts could avoid the charge of usury. For extremely dangerous voyages, the borrower paid high interest rates, sometimes up to fifty percent.<sup>68</sup>

A second type of sea loan (*cambio marittimo*) connected the loan with the exchange of one money for another. It was drawn up in one city and repayable in another, after the voyage, in another type of money. The amount of interest was disguised in the exchange rate. A variation of this sea-loan-exchange contract, called “dry” exchange, contained another clause in which the borrower was allowed to repay in the city of origin at a designated exchange rate. It was a “dry” exchange, because when the borrower exercised this option no sea voyage took place. The contract was a fiction used to avoid the charge of usury.

Simple business loans (*mutuo*) were repayable in the city of origin. Sometimes these loans were repaid in the same money as was borrowed, sometimes the loan involved an exchange rate. In either case the customary Venetian interest rate was twenty percent (*de quinque sex per annum*).

The second category of business contract used by the medieval Venetian merchants was the partnership or *commenda*. The subject of much scholarly controversy,<sup>69</sup> it appeared in two forms in twelfth- and thirteenth-century Venice. Essentially the partnership agreement was a legal contract between two parties, and their investment is de-

---

commerciale italiano, III; Casale Monferrato, 1933); Alfred E. Lieber, “Eastern Business Practices and Medieval European Commerce,” *Economic History Review*, ser. 2, XXI (1968), 230–243; Lopez, *The Commercial Revolution*, pp. 73–77; and John H. Pryor, “The Origins of the *Commenda* Contract,” pp. 5–37.

68. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 183, 223, 228, etc.

69. See above, note 67, and Lane, “Investment and Usury,” pp. 58–68; his *Venice, a Maritime Republic*, pp. 52–53, 138–140; Lopez and Raymond, *Medieval Trade*, pp. 174–184. Examples of this *colleganza* are in Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 141, 142, 207, 234, 236, 239, 334, 380, 404, 405, 409, 410, 413.

financed as an enterprise or business venture. One of the parties was the sedentary investor (*commendator*) and the other was the traveling partner (*tractator*) whose voyage and destination were sometimes stated. The profits were divided at the termination of the voyage. In the earliest form of Venetian partnership, known in Venice as *colleganza*, in Genoa as the *societas maris*, and termed the bilateral *commenda* in modern scholarship,<sup>70</sup> both parties invested capital. The investor contributed twice as much capital as the traveling partner. At the safe and successful completion of the business venture, usually a voyage, the two agreed to divide the profits in half. With three exceptions,<sup>71</sup> it is the only variety of partnership known to have been used by the Venetians before the Fourth Crusade.

Beginning in 1205, however, the Venetians, like other Italian merchants, began using another type of partnership known as the unilateral *commenda*. According to its terms, the sedentary investor contributed all the capital and assumed all the risk, while the other partner did the traveling for the business venture. They agreed that, at the conclusion of the voyage, three fourths of the profits should accrue to the sedentary investor and one fourth to the traveling partner. In these Venetian unilateral *commenda* contracts (with the exception of two quittances given by Oderico Belli in 1243 and 1253)<sup>72</sup> the notary did not identify the type of contract, as he commonly did in the first form of partnership, the bilateral *commenda*. The feature which distinguishes the *colleganza* (bilateral *commenda*) from the unilateral *commenda* is the shared risk; only the sedentary investor assumed the risk in the unilateral *commenda*. It has been observed that the sedentary investor received the same return on his investment in the unilateral *commenda* as he received when he contributed two thirds of the capital and received one half of the profit. The unilateral *commenda* appeared for the first time among Venetian commercial documents in August 1199, and then not again until 1205. After 1205 it completely replaced the older bilateral *commenda*, becoming even more common than the sea loan.<sup>73</sup> A useful, flexible business agreement, it continued to be used by Venetian merchants as late as the four-

70. The Venetian spelling is *colleganza* or *collegancia*. For examples see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 141, 234, 334, 337, 424. For the bilateral *commenda* see Pryor, "The Origins of the *Commenda* Contract," pp. 7-13.

71. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 343, 353, 444.

72. *Ibid.*, II, nos. 757, 816. The documents record repayment of a partnership, but the text uses the term *collegantia*. Compare Oderico Belli's earlier unilateral *commenda* with different partners in which he does not use the term *colleganza*, *ibid.*, nos. 749, 750.

73. The disappearance of the *colleganza* (bilateral *commenda*) in 1205 resulted from a legal ban against it, found in the statutes issued by Renier Dandolo, vice-doge for his father, Enrico

teenth century for trading ventures where the risk was great and where the Venetians did not regularly use their agents as resident employees in foreign ports.<sup>74</sup>

Venetians in the twelfth century also used a third type of contract, called the *compagnia* (the fraternal company contract). Originally used for apportioning the expense of ship construction between brothers, it developed into a widely used and very flexible type of business agreement. The partners, related by blood ties, combined their resources, of which each partner stated his share, then agreed to work for their common interest, to travel together to named or unnamed destinations, and to divide the profits in proportion to their respective investments. Liability of all partners was joint and unlimited. This agreement, originally made for a single voyage, could be prolonged with the consent of both parties and was used primarily where the investments of a deceased father were continued jointly by his heirs.<sup>75</sup>

These types of business contracts, the loans (especially the sea loan), the *colleganza* or bilateral *commenda*, the unilateral *commenda*, and the fraternal company, formed the bases for profitable investment by the Venetians in the Levant. A Venetian investor in foreign commerce, to minimize the risks, usually concluded several contracts in a single shipping season.

The often-discussed career of Romano Mairano demonstrates these elements of Venetian commerce.<sup>76</sup> Mairano actively participated first in commercial voyages to Halmyros in Thessaly and to Citrum (Kitro) near Thessalonica, but later and more often to Constantinople, to Alexandria, and to Acre. One year he went to Ceuta and Bugia in North Africa. Not only did his credibility and reliability as well as his good fortune rise, but the sums entrusted to him also increased steadily in value from an average of slightly over 30 perperi per contract before 1158 until 1167 when he took 1,106 perperi auri in eight sea loans to Alexandria. He usually sailed in his own ships, whose construction in Venice he had supervised and whose raw materials he had bought. He financed the shipbuilding by selling shares in the ships. Mairano, who frequently was mate (*nauclerius*) of his own ship,

Dandolo, absent from Venice on the Fourth Crusade: Pryor, "The Origins of the *Commenda* Contract," p. 13, note 28.

74. For examples after 1205 see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, nos. 467, 468, 469, 475, 478, 479, 483, 494, 495, etc.

75. *Ibid.*, I, nos. 70, 74, 96, 131, 156, 181, 253, 254, 271. See also Lopez and Raymond, *Medieval Trade*, p. 74, and Giorgio Zordan, "I Vari aspetti della Comunione familiare di Beni," pp. 127-194.

76. Heynen, *Zur Entstehung des Kapitalismus*, pp. 86-120; Luzzatto, "Capitale e lavoro," pp. 108-116.

not only purchased pepper and alum from Alexandria for his Venetian partners, but also sold iron, copper, and lumber at distant ports for other partners. His success was so phenomenal that the wealthiest citizen of Venice, Sebastian Ziani, even before he became doge in 1172, entrusted sums to Mairano for commercial voyages. The patriarch of Grado, Enrico Dandolo (uncle of the doge of the same name) appointed Mairano as his agent to collect the revenues from all the patriarchal possessions in Constantinople and granted him the privilege of enjoying there the special rights of the patriarchate. In return for these business opportunities, Mairano was to bring back to the patriarch each year 50 pounds of Venetian pennies in the best ship of the first annual convoy. For this responsibility in 1171 he carried a cargo of copper and a number of sea loans (including two from Sebastian Ziani) to Constantinople in a large new ship. This time he did not have his usual good fortune. A quarrel between the Venetians and the Greeks in Constantinople led to a major Byzantine raid upon the Venetian quarter. Greek hatred for the Venetians had been building up ever since the Venetians had disturbed the peace of the capital city in 1162 by ravaging the Genoese quarter. Aggravated by commercial jealousy and religious rivalry, and not in the least calmed by a succession of embassies between Venice and Constantinople, this hatred led the imperial government in 1171 to imprison the Venetians and confiscate all Venetian assets in Constantinople.

At the time of the raid Romano Mairano succeeded in carrying a number of Venetians to safety in Acre. His own losses, however, were so considerable that twelve years later he had still not repaid all his debts. In June 1175 doge Sebastian Ziani directed the procurator of St. Mark to pay Mairano 600 Venetian pounds from the revenues of the Venetian quarter in Tyre (which Mairano mortgaged to the procurator) because he had expended money amounting to 1,500 bezants in negotiating the escape of Venetian citizens.<sup>77</sup> A month later doge Sebastian Ziani, judge Peter Foscarini, and Romano Mairano's brother Samuel declared that Mairano had repaid the investments they had placed in his hands in 1170. In August of that year, the Mairano brothers, Romano and Samuel, had formed a fraternal company to build a ship for a voyage to Acre. According to its terms, Samuel was to pay off his indebtedness for the ship in Acre with 1500 Saracen bezants and after one year whatever profit they made was to be divided between them.

Even before being repaid through the revenues of the Venetian quar-

77. Tafel and Thomas, I, 167-171.



ter in Tyre, Mairano made a considerable profit from a voyage to Alexandria in 1173. Another of his business ventures was a voyage in 1177–1179 to the Barbary coast of Africa, the only recorded Venetian twelfth-century voyage into these Genoese and Pisan waters of the western Mediterranean. Although the expedition was profitable, Venetian commercial voyages to the west were not repeated until 1245.<sup>78</sup> Mairano continued his commercial activity for many years, traveling as mate on his own ships to Alexandria, Romania, and Tyre, with stops at Abydus and Citrum. Later, in 1192 and again in 1199, when Mairano must have been over sixty, his son carried the business investments for him to Apulia and Alexandria.

During the last quarter of the twelfth century, events occurred in the Byzantine empire, in the crusader states, and in Venice itself which anticipated the Fourth Crusade and the changing Venetian commercial interests in the Levant. The Byzantine empire declined in the second half of the twelfth century. Hatred and jealousy had been growing between the Greeks and the Latin merchants for a century or more, and this resulted in several outbursts of violence in Constantinople.<sup>79</sup> In 1162 the Pisans, assisted by the Venetians and the Greeks, attacked and sacked the Genoese merchant colony in Constantinople, causing the Genoese to flee the city. The Byzantines then exiled the Pisans from the capital city, leaving only the Venetians undisturbed. But Venetian relations with Constantinople soon deteriorated. The emperor Manuel, who wished to strengthen his hold on the Dalmatian provinces against king Stephen III of Hungary and against the Norman king William of Sicily, induced the Dalmatian cities of Spalato, Traù, and Ragusa to recognize Byzantine sovereignty once again. The pro-Greek sentiments of Ancona, the principal twelfth-century port on the Adriatic coast of Apulia, were encouraged when Byzantium, in 1167, gave commercial privileges to the Anconitans. The Venetian doge, Vitale II Michiel, in retaliation for these Byzantine acts, reassumed his title of *dux Dalmatiae* and refused to furnish military assistance to Byzantium against the Normans. The Greeks might have considered both the assumption of the title and the refusal of naval aid as acts of war by the Venetians. Possibly the Venetian doge placed an embargo on Venetian shipping to Constantinople about 1167–1170,

78. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 284, 285, 293, 294, 297; II, nos. 776, 777.

79. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 249–251; *Historia ducum veneticorum*, in *MGH, SS.*, XIV, 77–78. See also Besta, “La Cattura,” pp. 38–41, Brown, “The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter,” pp. 83–86, and Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 195–206.

but commercial documents continue to stipulate Venetian voyages into Greek waters.

Byzantine leaders, however, needed the commerce of the Italian cities. Late in 1169 Genoa began negotiations for renewal of its privileges in Constantinople, which were reestablished by a treaty of May 1170. Similarly, the Pisan quarter in Constantinople was reestablished by July 1170. Later that year a Venetian raid on the Genoese colony in Constantinople irritated the emperor Manuel. To alleviate relations with the emperor, Venice sent a strong embassy composed of two of its richest citizens, Sebastian Ziani and Orio Mastropiero, both of whom would later be doges. A promise of renewal of Venetian privileges seems to have been made, and Venetian merchants again began to send their merchant fleets to Constantinople, among them the ship of Romano Mairano. More than twenty thousand Venetians arrived in Constantinople carrying cash for purchases—arms and other merchandise. Hearing rumors of the emperor's bad faith, the doge sent Orio Mastropiero again and Enrico Dandolo, the future doge, to the Byzantine court to receive assurances that no harm was intended. Although the Venetians saw with alarm the concentration of Greek troops pouring into Constantinople, the emperor Manuel assured them of his good intentions. Then, suddenly, on March 12, 1171, the Greeks struck. Ten thousand Venetians in Constantinople were arrested and held in prisons or monasteries and their goods confiscated. Some were fortunate enough to escape, including those who boarded the great ship of Romano Mairano. Possibly this was the *Totus Mundus*, the largest ship ever seen by the Greeks, protected from their flaming projectiles by hides soaked in vinegar. "This was the greatest disaster to the city and so universal that there was not a single family in Venice that did not suffer some loss."<sup>80</sup>

The Venetian colony in Constantinople did not recover from this attack for more than a decade. In contrast, the Genoese and the Pisan colonies there began to prosper until the death of the pro-Latin emperor Manuel in 1180. His youthful son Alexius II Comnenus was deposed three years later by a distant relative, Andronicus Comnenus, whose partisans hated the Latin supporters of the unfortunate young emperor. Just before Andronicus entered Constantinople, he permitted the city mob to attack the Latin colonies. The bloody outrages, known as the Latin massacre, were directed mainly against the Pisans and the Genoese. As a result these colonies became extinct, and Pisan

80. Translated from the sixteenth-century chronicle of Daniel Barbaro, as quoted by Thiriet, "Les Chroniques vénitiennes de la Marcianne," p. 248.

and Genoese corsairs plagued the eastern seas until after the Fourth Crusade. Venetian sources make no mention of anti-Latin violence in 1182 because the Venetians had not yet returned to the city after the violence of 1171.<sup>81</sup> Similarly, the Genoese sources do not mention the anti-Venetian actions in Constantinople of 1171 because in that year no Genoese were there.

While the new emperor Andronicus was completing his assumption of power, he perceived his need for maritime allies. Hopes began to rise in Venice where, as early as February 1182, peace with the new emperor was expected.<sup>82</sup> After Andronicus's coronation in September 1183 a peace treaty was signed in which he promised to release the remaining Venetian captives and to reimburse the Venetians for some of their losses of 1171. By 1184 the Venetians again were sending merchant ships to Constantinople. Enrico Dandolo and other prominent Venetians represented the Venetian state in Constantinople in 1184 and 1185, during the brief reign of Andronicus Comnenus, when property lines were redrawn and correct title to real estate was established in the Venetian quarter.<sup>83</sup>

After the Normans of Sicily in 1185 attacked and sacked Thessalonica, the second city of the Byzantine empire, the Greeks in Constantinople rose up and killed Andronicus, the last Comnenus emperor. The new emperor, Isaac II Angelus, did not at first readmit the Genoese and Pisans to Constantinople, but did restore the full Venetian rights and privileges in return for their naval support. After receiving the three Venetian legates of doge Orto Mastropiero, Isaac in February 1187 granted three chrysobulls to the Venetians, who were formerly his subjects, but whom he now called his allies and friends.<sup>84</sup> By reissuing the chrysobulls of 1126 and 1148, he restored to the Venetians their quarter, their exemptions from tolls, and freedom of trade. In addition, the Greeks concluded a defensive alliance with Venice, whereby Venice promised on six months' notice in wartime to furnish between forty and one hundred war galleys under Venetian commanders. The Venetians were exempted from fighting Venice's allies, the German emperor or the Normans in Sicily.<sup>85</sup> Byzantium needed naval assistance because of the Turkish advances after the decisive Byzan-

81. See especially the quotation from the chronicle (1366) of Nicholas Trevisan, *ibid.*, p. 261.

82. Just before his death in 1179, Manuel released some Venetians, and certain Venetian credits in Constantinople were made available about the same time: Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 313, 308, 311, 315, 316, 319, 348.

83. *Ibid.*, I, nos. 344, 345, 347, 348, 349, 351, etc.; Tafel and Thomas, I, 175, 177-178.

84. Brown, "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter," p. 87; Tafel and Thomas, I, 179-203; Brand, *Byzantium Confronts the West*, pp. 197-199.

85. Tafel and Thomas, I, 179-189, 195-203.

tine defeat at Myriokephalon in 1176, because of the threats from the Norman kings of Sicily and their Hohenstaufen heirs, and because of the menace of the newly formed Second Bulgarian kingdom. In addition to the three chrysobulls of 1187, the Venetians also demanded restitution of damages from the raid of 1171. Finally, after two years of negotiations, and threatened by Frederick Barbarossa's preparations for the Third Crusade, Isaac promised Venice an annual subsidy and a token restitution of about one and one-half percent.<sup>86</sup>

These newly reconfirmed Venetian privileges and possessions in Constantinople were again jeopardized after 1195 when Alexius Angelus deposed and blinded his brother Isaac and assumed the imperial title as Alexius III. The new emperor at first distrusted the Venetians and favored their rivals, Genoa and Pisa, who had returned to Constantinople with privileges granted them by Isaac II in 1192. After Alexius III was threatened in 1196 by a Venetian fleet in Abydos, he renewed the Venetian commercial privileges in a chrysobull of November 1198, regranteeing the Venetian quarter in Constantinople, confirming Venetian commercial privileges, and renewing the naval alliance with Venice.<sup>87</sup> However, he granted no subsidies and no reimbursement to Venice during his reign (1195–1203), and in addition taxed Venetian property.

In summary, Venetian-Byzantine relations during the first century of the crusades reflected two needs. First, Venetian merchants needed legal confirmation from the Greeks of their right to trade and reside in the Byzantine empire. Whenever these privileges were jeopardized the Venetians made haste to negotiate a new agreement, as in 1148, in 1187, and in 1198. When peaceful negotiations had no result, Venice attacked Byzantine lands (1119–1126) or threatened to do so (1196). Second, the Byzantines needed Italian naval power and commercial experience. The Venetians provided these in a satisfactory manner until about 1150, when the Greek emperor Manuel began to play Genoa, Pisa, and Venice against each other. When one Italian state was privileged, the others were excluded. For example, in 1162 the Greeks exiled the Pisans and the Genoese. The Venetians remained until the destruction of their quarter in 1171. In 1169 the Greeks began negotiations with the Pisans and the Genoese, who shortly returned. Ten years later rioting and revolution destroyed the Genoese and Pisan

86. *Ibid.*, I, 206–211; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 369, 378, 379, 380, 396, 403–418.

87. Tafel and Thomas, I, 246–280. See also *Archivio di Stato di Venezia*, Arch. Proc. di S. Marco di Supra, Sal. Ducale B. VI, c.7, 1198, Sept. Rialto. The author is indebted to Prof. Luigi Lanfranchi for correcting the date of the published document.

colonies, after which the new emperor, Andronicus, permitted the Venetians to return about 1183. The Venetians remained the favored Latin merchants to the end of the century, although the Genoese and Pisans returned in 1192. From 1199 to the Fourth Crusade, Pisa was the most favored Italian city in Byzantium. Neither the Greeks nor the Latin cities could do without each other.

The Latin kingdom of Jerusalem experienced dramatic reverses in the last quarter of the twelfth century. As these developments have received extended treatment elsewhere in these volumes, only brief mention will be made here.<sup>88</sup>

The fall of Jerusalem to Saladin in 1187 shocked western Europe, where Richard the Lionhearted, Philip Augustus of France, and Frederick Barbarossa started to prepare the Third Crusade. With crusading fervor the Venetian doge, Orto Mastropiero, in November 1188 organized a Venetian fleet to provision the crusaders and to transport the crusading army, among whom was a contingent from Bologna. Leaving Venice immediately after Easter 1189, this fleet sailed first to Tyre and then, in September 1189, to the siege of Acre.<sup>89</sup> Through intrigue, battle, and negotiation, the crusaders did reconquer Acre from Saladin, while Richard arranged privileges for the Christians in the principalities of Saladin. The churches and other real estate held by Venice in Acre since 1124 were reconfirmed to it by Conrad of Montferrat, king-elect of Jerusalem. From April to July 1190 the Venetian fleet sailed from Tyre via Abydos to Constantinople. Some Venetians remained in Tyre, however, as two documents of November 1192 attest.<sup>90</sup>

Later in the decade, the Venetian state organized another fleet to go to Syria. In 1197 one large sailing ship was constructed in the northern lagoons near Aquileia and its knightly, non-Venetian shareholders contracted with the great men of Venice, doge Enrico Dandolo and Sebastian Ziani of Caorle, son of the late doge. In April 1198 it was agreed that this ship and other Venetian vessels would go to Syria.<sup>91</sup> Perhaps this fleet should be identified with the ships which, one chron-

88. See volume I of the present work, chapters XVIII, XIX, and volume II, chapters II, XV.

89. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 272; Tafel and Thomas, I, 204-206; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 381, 383-386, 425; Prawer, *Histoire du royaume latin*, II, 33 ff.

90. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 411, 412. The Venetians are not mentioned in chronicles of the Holy Land in this decade: Prawer, *Histoire du royaume latin*, II, 110, note 13.

91. The author is indebted to Prof. Luigi Lanfranchi for calling her attention to these documents: *Civico Museo Correr*, MSS. Cicogna 2835/2 (1198, Sept., Rialto), and Archivio

icler records, carried French crusaders inspired by Fulk of Neuilly from Venice to an ineffective military venture in the Holy Land.<sup>92</sup>

Between the Third and the Fourth Crusades piracy increased on the Mediterranean. Not only did the Venetians prey on the ships of Ancona and of Pisa, but the Genoese, Moslems, Normans, and Byzantines joined in corsair activity. The most formidable Venetian rivals were the Pisans.<sup>93</sup> Perhaps the general maritime insecurity in March 1196 persuaded the noblemen of a large Venetian fleet in Abydus to agree to remain on the Sea of Marmara notwithstanding the fatigue of the men.<sup>94</sup> Everyone contributed to pay for the continuation of the expedition. At least two other Venetian fleets are recorded for the decade; both set out to fight the Pisans. In 1195 Venice defeated its Pisan commercial rivals at Modon and in 1199 destroyed the Pisan naval base of Brindisi.<sup>95</sup>

After the Third Crusade crusaders still held several seaports on the Palestinian coast, the city and environs of Antioch, and the island of Cyprus. Pisa had the greatest privileges in the remaining cities of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem; Genoa profited most in the northern Antiochene principalities. Because Venetian privileges remained in Tyre, Acre, Antioch, and Tripoli, Venetians continued to trade there. They dealt with local merchants, content to leave to others the transport and collection of goods from the interior.

These changes in the last quarter of the century in the Byzantine empire and the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem stimulated political change in Venice itself. The great loss of Venetian business and prestige in the 1171 raid on the Venetian quarter in Constantinople aroused the Venetians to send a punitive expedition under doge Vitale II Michiel. When this unsuccessful fleet, wasted by pestilence and storms in the Aegean Sea, returned home in 1172, the maddened starving mob murdered the doge near the ducal palace. Venetians of the old families and those enriched by business took steps to pacify the city and to institute political changes which would prevent a repetition of such domestic violence. They created a new electoral college to name the doge; no longer would the assembled citizenry elect their doge in pub-

di Stato di Venezia, Cancelleria Inferiore, B.I. Notai più antichi diversi (1198, April 3, Aquileia). See also Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, no. 436, and their *Nuovi documenti*, no. 45.

92. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 275.

93. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 272-276; Cessi, *Le Colonie medioevali*, I, 83-85.

94. Tafel and Thomas, I, 217-225.

95. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 273, 276, 367; *Historia ducum veneticorum*, in *MGH*, SS., XIV, 91-92; *Annales venetici breves*, in *MGH*, SS., XIV, 72.



lic meeting. Because the newly elected doge, Sebastian Ziani, was the wealthiest man in Venice and thus a member of the oligarchy, he ruled Venice as a leader coöperating with other leaders, rather than in absolute and solitary splendor. Ziani administered Venice with the assistance of ducal councillors and a larger council whose members were drawn from the Venetian aristocracy. He established a system of price controls and market regulations to ameliorate the problem of food shortages, and encouraged a convoy system for Venetian merchant fleets. He also stabilized the coinage by issuing a new penny designed to be exactly equal to 1/240 of the Venetian pound. In 1177 he helped to negotiate peace between the warring factions of Guelfs and Ghibelines in Italy. This Peace of Venice reconciled the German emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, and pope Alexander III and was sealed with the traditional kiss of peace in the narthex of the basilica of St. Mark.

Ziani's immediate successor, Orio Mastropiero (1178–1192), also possessed great personal wealth. He and the next doge, Enrico Dandolo (1192–1205), governed Venice with the assistance of the Venetian oligarchy and with the intent to increase Venetian commercial and political strength. They made treaties to extend Venetian maritime control on the upper Adriatic, and to restore Venetian commercial privileges and reimbursement in Constantinople. Each of these last three doges of the twelfth century, Sebastian Ziani, Orio Mastropiero, and Enrico Dandolo, had represented Venice as a special envoy to Constantinople at least once between 1169 and 1185.

These changes in the Venetian government and its strong, dynamic solutions to its problems prepared the city for the challenges of the Fourth Crusade. The capture of Constantinople during the Fourth Crusade was the culmination of Venetian commercial interests there; it was also the apogee of Venetian participation in the crusading movement.

The Fourth Crusade provided a unique opportunity for Venice to expand its commerce and colonial establishments in the eastern Mediterranean. The details of the Latin conquest of Constantinople have been given elsewhere in these volumes; others have studied its political, religious, diplomatic, and feudal aspects, as well as the long-argued question of the diversion of the Crusade.<sup>96</sup> Here it will be sufficient to point out that the businessmen of Venice organized the

96. See Edgar H. McNeal and Robert L. Wolff, "The Fourth Crusade," in volume II of the present work, pp. 153–186, and its extensive bibliography, pp. 153–154. For the diversion of the crusade, see *ibid.*, pp. 168–176; also Queller, *The Latin Conquest of Constantinople*, and Queller and Gill, "Franks, Venetians and Pope Innocent III," pp. 85–105.

affair as carefully as possible. They prepared the enterprise—its ships, its provisions, its route, its contractual safeguards, and its men—so that it might achieve the greatest possible measure of success given the known risks and the unknown opportunities. Since the magnitude of the enterprise surpassed any previous Venetian venture, it was fortunate for Venice that it was a success.

In the spring of 1201 the Venetians received a proposal from envoys of the north French crusaders, that Venice provide sea transportation, warships, and provisions for the crusaders. Doge Enrico Dandolo offered a typical Venetian partnership for the crusading enterprise.<sup>97</sup> The Frankish crusaders would furnish the land forces, and the Venetians, fifty war galleys. The contract was drawn up for one year, to begin in June 1202, and, at its conclusion, any profits were to be divided in half. In addition, the crusader land forces would be transported and provisioned by the Venetians for a fee of 94,000 marks. Although the precise destination was not stated, as in many Venetian commercial partnership contracts of this era, it was decided to direct the crusade to Egypt. The Frankish envoys accepted the contract after bargaining to reduce the transportation bill from 94,000 to 85,000 marks.<sup>98</sup> The Venetian ratification was accomplished by the doge, who confirmed it with his Council of Forty, with his Great Council, and finally with the Venetian citizenry as a whole, 10,000 strong, before the basilica of St. Mark. These agreements of 1201 were respected, renewed, and amplified in later contracts between the Venetians and the Frankish crusaders until, after the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, the transportation bill was paid from the spoils, and the remaining profits were divided in half.

The Frankish crusaders in the summer of 1202 could not fulfill their promise to prepay part of the transportation bill, although the Venetians scrupulously carried out their part of the agreement.<sup>99</sup> The latter, not wishing to jeopardize the enterprise with such an unhappy beginning, suggested that the crusaders might postpone payment and meanwhile assist them to subdue the upper Dalmatian coast.<sup>100</sup> After

97. Only the clause assigning the risk, which was legally necessary to identify a *commenda*, was absent from the proposal reported by Villehardouin; otherwise this would be a model bilateral *commenda*.

98. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 276; Villehardouin, ed. Faral, I, 27. Cf. Queller, "Évolution du rôle," pp. 490–491, nos. 28, 29, and Cessi, "Quarta Crociata," pp. 10–11.

99. Baldwin of Flanders, one of the French leaders, borrowed 118 marks and 3 ounces from Venetians in October 1202, promising to repay at the Fairs of Champagne: Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 462.

100. For 200 years Venice had attempted to control the upper Dalmatian coast. Zara, its principal seaport, had rebelled against Venice five times since 1045. The latest rebellion began

considerable controversy, the crusaders agreed. At this point, and not before, doge Enrico Dandolo and many Venetians also took the cross.<sup>101</sup> The fleet sailed October 1, 1202.

After the north Adriatic coast near Venice was subdued by a demonstration of the fleet near Pola and Muggia in the Istrian peninsula, and by the capture of Zara, the crusading host and the Venetians wintered in Zara.

During the winter a new opportunity was placed before the crusaders by envoys from the young Alexius, pretender to the Byzantine throne, and from Philip of Swabia, his brother-in-law. If the Frankish crusaders and the Venetians would proceed to Constantinople to enthrone Alexius, the Greek claimant offered to pay them 200,000 silver marks and assist their crusading expedition to Egypt for one year by provisioning the entire host and increasing it, at his own expense, by an additional 10,000 men. This sudden offer to strengthen the expedition was hotly argued by the Frankish crusaders and the Venetians. Finally, a new contract was made whereby Alexius's offer was accepted. The text has not survived, but narrative sources report its contents.<sup>102</sup> New business opportunities had required that the original compact signed in Venice be thus renegotiated.

The expedition left Zara early in April 1203, the time of the usual Venetian spring voyages to Constantinople. They traveled the usual Venetian route, via Durazzo and Corfu, around the Morea, past Negroponte, Andros, and finally Abydos on the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles. They arrived before Constantinople on June 24, and took the city of Constantinople, unseated the usurper, and named Alexius IV and his imprisoned father, Isaac Angelus, coemperors.<sup>103</sup> However, when Greek hatred for Latins excluded the crusaders from the city, sparked a civil war, and toppled Isaac Angelus and Alexius from the throne, the enterprise seemed on the verge of collapse.

By March 1204 the entire crusading venture had to be reëvaluated. The original contract for Frankish and Venetian coöperation for one year had expired. Its renewal with the additional participation of the

---

in 1193 when the Venetian-Hungarian treaty expired and Zara accepted the lordship of king Emeric I of Hungary: Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 211, 228, 230, 250, 267-271, 273.

101. It may be inferred that these Venetians formed a local association under the leadership of the doge, which remained together until after the conquest of Constantinople: Wolff, "The Oath of the Venetian Podestà," pp. 540-541, 546. For parallel Venetian expeditions see Tafel and Thomas, I, 216-225; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 51-55; Merores, "Der venezianische Adel," pp. 234-235.

102. Villehardouin, ed. Faral, I, 92-95; Tafel and Thomas, I, 304-305, 407; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 277; volume II of the present work, p. 174.

103. See McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 178-179.

pretender Alexius had been nullified with his death. Now the Venetians and the Franks put into writing a third contract to govern their venture.<sup>104</sup> They agreed to cooperate for one year to recapture the city of Constantinople and to establish their rule over it. The Franks' debt for transportation would be considered paid when the Venetians received three quarters of the spoils, while the remaining booty was to be divided equally. A new emperor would be chosen by six Venetian and six Frankish electors, and he was to possess the imperial palaces of Blachernae and Boukoleon and one fourth of the empire. The patriarchate of Constantinople, with the great church of Hagia Sophia, would be awarded to that party, Frankish or Venetian, which lost the imperial election. All rights which either party had possessed previously under the Byzantines would be respected, which meant earlier Venetian commercial property and both Venetian and Montferatine privileges in the Byzantine empire. The remaining three fourths of the empire was to be divided equally between Franks and Venetians by a twenty-four-man commission, twelve from each party. Thus, one fourth of the empire was allotted to the new emperor, three eighths to the Franks, and three eighths to the Venetians.<sup>105</sup> Everyone holding a fief or honor in the empire, except the doge of Venice, was to do feudal homage to the new emperor. This contract ratified by the Franks and Venetians in 1204 before the second capture of Constantinople repeated the original terms of the agreement of 1201. The Venetians would be reimbursed for transporting the Frankish crusaders and the remainder of their conquests would be divided in half—movable property as well as real estate, civil as well as ecclesiastical power. This contract continued to be couched in the form of a Venetian partnership agreement for a commercial enterprise.

Following this agreement, the Latin forces besieged and took the city on April 13, 1204, and put it to sack for three days. The horrors of the sack, its barbarity and cruelty to the Greeks, and the enormous theft and destruction of property have been described elsewhere.<sup>106</sup> The vengeful Venetian chronicler comments, "the wretched sinful deeds of the emperor Manuel against the Venetians were now punished in full."<sup>107</sup>

The victors then divided their conquests. First, the booty was col-

104. Tafel and Thomas, I, 444-452; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 279; Villehardouin, ed. Faral, II, 34-37. Recent discussions of the third contract include Carile, "Partitio terrarum imperii Romania," and Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane*, pp. 15-21.

105. Or, in the language of 1204, one fourth and one half to each party.

106. See McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 184-185.

107. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 279.

lected and, as agreed, three fourths was given to the Venetians. In the city of Constantinople, marquis Boniface of Montferrat, the leader of the crusade, occupied the royal palace of Boukoleon; Henry of Flanders, the future Latin emperor, took the palace of Blachernae, and doge Enrico Dandolo, another palace. The rank and file of Franks took lodging in the conquered city, and the Venetians returned to their quarter.

Twelve electors proceeded, according to the third contract of March 1204, to elect a Latin emperor for Constantinople. They met in Dandolo's palace and, on the second ballot, chose Baldwin, count of Flanders and Hainault, who began his difficult reign May 16, 1204.<sup>108</sup> According to contract, the Venetians then nominated the clerics for the cathedral chapter of Hagia Sophia, who chose the Venetian Thomas Morosini as Latin patriarch of Constantinople. When he heard of this, pope Innocent III criticized their uncanonical act; nevertheless, he confirmed Morosini. Notwithstanding papal interference in succeeding patriarchal elections, Venetians continued to occupy the office and thus dominate the Latin church to 1261.<sup>109</sup>

The division of the spoils of the sack, of the urban real estate, and of political and religious titles between Franks and Venetians was thus accomplished. Considerably more difficult was the division of the Byzantine lands outside Constantinople. As stipulated in the third contract, a commission of twelve Venetians and twelve Franks began to allocate these vast Byzantine territories according to the agreed formula: one fourth to the emperor Baldwin I, three eighths to the Franks, and three eighths to the Venetians. The commission divided up all the territory in the former Byzantine empire excepting Thessalonica and Crete, claimed as his rightful property by Boniface of Montferrat, and Constantinople, divided previously. During the commission's deliberations, most of the lands to be divided were still in the hands of the Greeks (or the Bulgarians). Basing their conclusions on Byzantine tax returns, the commission reached agreement in September and issued the Treaty of Partition in October 1204.<sup>110</sup> It must

108. See Wolff, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople," in volume II of the present work, pp. 187-233. A fourteenth-century Venetian chronicler, Nicholas Trevisan, states that Enrico Dandolo did not win the election because certain Venetian electors, among them Octavian Querini, believed that if Dandolo were elected emperor, the Frankish crusaders would leave Constantinople and the Latin empire would collapse: Thiriet, "Les Chroniques vénitiennes de la Marcianne," p. 265.

109. For a full discussion see Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople," and McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 195-199.

110. Tafel and Thomas, I, 452-501; volume II of the present work, pp. 190-193, 235-238;

be emphasized that the Treaty of Partition only named the territories promised to each party—the emperor, the Venetians, or the Franks. The lands remained to be conquered. Never did the Latins conquer all the former Byzantine territory from the Greeks. Nor did the Venetians or the Franks ever establish themselves over all the lands awarded them by the commissioners. The Treaty of Partition was a working list, and many localities in the Aegean experienced a development different from that proposed in the Treaty of Partition.

Although details of the Treaty of Partition are given in an earlier chapter,<sup>111</sup> the list of lands promised Venice will be repeated here. Most of the areas promised Venice were coastal, such as would give them control of the sea routes. Close to Constantinople, Venice was promised the Thracian coast, including the seaports of Rodosto and Heraclea near Gallipoli. Also it was to receive inland Thrace as far as Adrianople. Among the Aegean islands, Venice was promised Andros, Aegina, Salamis, and the two extremities of Negroponte (Euboea). On the Greek mainland, the Treaty of Partition awarded Venice the entire Morea except the Argolid and Corinth. To give Venice domination over the Adriatic and Ionian seas, the commissioners promised it the Dalmatian coast and its islands, the Ionian islands, and interior territories of central Greece in Epirus and Albania. Of these vast paper grants, the Republic ultimately conquered and ruled only a few. On the other hand, the island of Crete and the port city of Negroponte were not granted to Venice by the Treaty of Partition, and yet these became two key points of the thirteenth-century Venetian empire.

Venice and Venetian citizens acquired control over parts of the Greek east after the Fourth Crusade in several different ways.<sup>112</sup> In some cases, territory was acquired when official expeditions of conquest were sent out by the government. Other acquisitions were made when the Venetian state purchased rights to lands. In other cases, wealthy Venetians outfitted their own private expeditions to acquire personal real estate. For these latter the Venetian rulers, while remaining citizens of Venice on the lagoons, became feudal vassals of the Latin empire of Constantinople for their Aegean lands. In still other cases, private Venetian citizens acquired former Greek territory through marriage to a Frankish heir. The definition of ultimate sovereignty over

Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie*, pp. 22–25; Carile, “Partitio,” pp. 125–305; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 36–38; Longnon, *L’Empire latin*, pp. 61–62.

111. More scholarly debate has centered on which Aegean islands were promised the Venetians than on any other clause in the Treaty of Partition; see McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 191–192.

112. Loenertz, “Marino Sanudo, seigneur d’Andros,” *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 400–402.



former Greek lands remained fluid and ill-defined, a typically medieval situation. However sovereignty was defined, the Venetian control of Greek lands endured longer than any other result of the Fourth Crusade.

In the first of these acquisitions, Venice purchased a free hand in Crete and rights in Thessalonica and Negroponte from Boniface of Montferrat, who was paid 1,000 marks of silver, by the Treaty of Adrianople, August 12, 1204.<sup>113</sup> They concluded the treaty two months before the Treaty of Partition because Boniface claimed that he and his family had held these lands before the fall of Constantinople. He claimed that the emperor Manuel had granted Thessalonica in fief to his father, William III of Montferrat, and that he, Boniface, had inherited it. Boniface also claimed that the young Alexius had granted him Crete in 1202. When Boniface of Montferrat needed cash and Venetian support in the summer of 1204, he sold them Crete and all other Montferratine holdings in the empire; the Treaty of Adrianople records this sale. This meant that Boniface would hold Thessalonica and its dependency Negroponte in fief from the Venetians. In addition, he would protect all Venetian rights on the mainland of the empire, while Venice would protect the Montferrat holdings with its sea power. The agreements concerning Thessalonica were never implemented, but this treaty gave Venice the legal right to intervene in Negroponte and to occupy Crete.

The Treaty of Partition signed in October promised Venice control over the northernmost and the southernmost cities of Negroponte, Oreus and Carystus. Since it assigned the principal and central city of Negroponte to Boniface of Montferrat, he occupied the island in the spring of 1205, by alleged right of inheritance and of the treaty. He established his vassal James II of Avesnes on Negroponte until his disappearance in August. Then Boniface divided the island into three fiefs, giving them to the "terciers," the three gentlemen of Verona, Ravano dalle Carceri, Gilberto of Verona, and Pecoraro da Mercanuovo.<sup>114</sup> Boniface of Montferrat died in 1207, and of the terciers only Ravano dalle Carceri, who had represented Venice at the Treaty of Adrianople in 1204, remained as sole lord in Negroponte.

113. Tafel and Thomas, I, 512-515; Borsari, *Creta*, pp. 11-13, 21; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 33-34, 48. See also McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 190-191.

114. The recent authoritative work of Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs terciers de Négropont de 1205 à 1280," corrects many mistakes in the earlier work of Karl Hopf, *Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginne des Mittelalters bis auf unsere Zeit*, in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, eds., *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, LXXXV, 67-465; LXXXVI, 1-190 (Leipzig, 1867-1868).

In 1211 he gained the protection of Venice for himself and his heirs by swearing homage to the doge and by granting Venice certain rights and privileges.<sup>115</sup> It gained a church and *fondaco* in the capital city of Negroponte and in the other episcopal cities, and its citizens were granted extraterritorial rights in Negroponte. Venetians received the promise of security and the rights of free trade on the island. Both Latin and Greek magnates on Negroponte, under Ravano dalle Carceri, would continue to have the legal status they held previously and would also be loyal to Venice. Ravano would pay to Venice an annual tribute of 2,100 gold pieces and two pieces of cloth of gold. By these terms the Venetians gained economic and judicial privileges from which they profited. A Venetian bailie represented its interests in Negroponte.

But while Venice and the dalle Carceri were negotiating this treaty, Henry, now the Latin emperor of Constantinople, was taking steps to strengthen his authority over the Latin lords of former Greek territory. He held a parliament at Ravennika in Thessaly, and received homage from many Latin lords. Ravano dalle Carceri did not swear liege homage to him until the emperor Henry demonstrated his military power at the siege of Thebes in May 1209. The lord of Negroponte thenceforth owed allegiance both to the Latin emperor and to the doge of Venice, which provoked no trouble as long as the interests of emperor and doge were parallel. Liege homage was given to the emperor. Notwithstanding the claims of the Latin emperor and his successors, the Venetian position on Negroponte continued to grow stronger.

At the death of both Ravano dalle Carceri and the Latin emperor Henry in 1216, the heirs of the terciers turned to the Venetian bailie Peter Barbo to adjudicate between their conflicting claims. Venice, as feudal overlord, awarded the three parts of the island to the several heirs of the terciers. In so doing, the Venetian bailie extended his jurisdiction from the city of Negroponte to the entire island, and also guaranteed to Venice its property in Negroponte—houses and churches, fields, a wine cellar, and land. The 1216 agreement also stated that Venetian weights and measures should prevail on the island.<sup>116</sup>

The Venetian influence over the terciers on Negroponte appears

115. Tafel and Thomas, II, 89–96; “Les Seigneurs terciers,” pp. 239–241; Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, pp. 185–189. This treaty was negotiated in Italy two years earlier by doge Peter Ziani and Ravano’s Veronese brothers, bishop Henry of Mantua and Redondollo dalle Carceri.

116. Loenertz, “Les Seigneurs terciers,” pp. 243–244, no. 23; Tafel and Thomas, II, 175–184; Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 77–78; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 52–55; Bury, “Lombards and Venetians in Euboea,” pp. 319–320.

more understandable when one considers the increasing Venetian influence over Verona, homeland of the dalle Carceri. This family played a leading role in Veronese affairs. Redondolo dalle Carceri was podestà of Verona in 1210, Pecoraro de' Pecorari da Mercanuovo was podestà in 1215 and 1223. Leon dalle Carceri, podestà, *capitano del popolo*, and head of the Guelf party, led the city in 1225 against the Veronese Ghibellines, whose champion was Ezzelino III of Romano. The Venetian Renier Zeno, a future doge, was Veronese podestà in 1229 and 1230. Later in the century, three other Venetians held office as podestà in Verona: Andrew Zeno in 1261, Marco Zeno in 1262, and Philip Belegno in 1263. Ezzelino da Romano executed the Venetian Peter Gallo in Verona in 1246.<sup>117</sup>

The Veronese terciers on Negroponte began to experience difficulty when their liege lord, the emperor Baldwin II of Constantinople, transferred his sovereignty over the islands of the Archipelago (including Negroponte) in the 1240's to William II of Villehardouin, prince of Achaëa, who in the next decade attempted to enforce his authority as feudal sovereign over the terciers. This brought war to Negroponte. Venice assisted the terciers against Villehardouin, and the terciers once more accepted Venetian sovereignty in an agreement of 1256, renewed in 1258. All the earlier Venetian privileges were repeated, the extra-territoriality, the cloth of gold, the weights and measures, the Venetian real estate. This agreement, in addition, granted the Venetians two quarters in the capital city of Negroponte and all the revenue from the import and export taxes (*commercium maris*) instead of the amount fixed previously. These augmented privileges for the Venetians on Negroponte were confirmed by Villehardouin himself in 1262, after the war on Negroponte had come to an end.<sup>118</sup>

By that time the political power of the Latin crusader principalities had so declined that the entire balance of power in the Aegean shifted. In July 1259 the combined Latin forces under William of Villehardouin, deserted by their Greek ally, despot Michael II Ducas of Epirus, had been decisively defeated on the plain of Pelagonia by John Palaeologus, brother of emperor Michael of Nicaëa. William of Villehardouin himself was taken prisoner and, in return for his release, granted the Greeks a foothold in the Morea. In 1261 Michael Palaeologus, aided by the Genoese, took Constantinople. The Latin empire, through which Venetian commerce had flourished, was ended.

117. Pier Zagata, *Cronica della città di Verona*, ed. Giambattista Biancolini (Verona, 1745), I, 22, 26, 50, 52-60.

118. Loenertz, "Les Seigneurs terciers," pp. 246, 249-256, nos. 34, 45-67; Tafel and Thomas, III, 13-16.

With the Greeks triumphant over William of Villehardouin and once again dominant in Constantinople, the war of Negroponte came to an end. Venice, the terciers, and Villehardouin drew up a peace treaty at Thebes in May 1262.<sup>119</sup> It guaranteed continued Venetian economic domination on Euboea through recognition of Venetian weights and measures on the island and through the payment of all customs revenues to Venice. It restored to the Venetians all property and business rights held earlier and enlarged the Venetian quarter in the capital city of Negroponte. On the other hand, the terciers recognized William of Villehardouin, not Venice, as their feudal overlord, and continued to live in the capital city. The castle of Negroponte, ceded to the Venetians in 1256, was demolished.

The peace did not last long. Licario of Carystus attempted by force of arms to control the island from 1264 to 1280, encouraged by the Greek emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologus. The Greeks wished thus to extend their holdings, and Negroponte like Crete became an arena for Greek and Latin combat. The Venetians assisted the terciers very little in their struggle with Licario.

During the century after Licario's death, Venetian political influence and economic penetration of Negroponte gradually increased. The Villehardouin rights weakened and were inherited by the Angevins of Naples. By 1390 Venice gained full possession of the island, which became its most important commercial and maritime possession in the Aegean. It was not until 1470 that Venice lost Negroponte to the Ottoman Turks.

In addition to rights in Negroponte, Venice purchased the entire island of Crete from Boniface of Montferrat by the Treaty of Adrianople, in August 1204. The geographical position of Crete, the largest of the Greek islands, made its possession extremely important for Venetian commerce.<sup>120</sup> Fleets from Venice stopped at Canea and Candia on the north coast. From there they sailed to Egypt, Syria, the upper Aegean, or Constantinople. Winds, currents, and the need for supplies made this stop an essential one. The inhabitants of Crete eagerly purchased from the Venetians the products of their workshops and lumber from the Adriatic. They sold to the Venetians merchandise from the eastern Mediterranean; pepper and slaves, for example, in addition to the products of local agriculture: wheat, cheese, wool,

119. Tafel and Thomas, III, 46-55.

120. Manoussos I. Manoussacas, "L'Isola di Creta sotto il domino veneziano: Problemi e ricerche," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-2, 473-513.

skins, horn from wild Cretan goats, wine, firewood, barley, and salt.<sup>121</sup> A flourishing market in grain futures existed in Crete, providing Venetian merchants, Venetian colonists on Crete, and native merchants with a source for speculative gain. Cretan grain fed not only Venice and other Aegean islands, but also the great Greek monasteries of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai and St. John on Patmos, with dependent monasteries on Crete.

After purchasing title to Crete, Venice gained possession by driving out the Genoese under Henry Pescatore, count of Malta, and by subduing the Greek land-owning noblemen, known as *archontes*. During these campaigns the Venetian general and vice-doge, Renier Dandolo, was captured and died in a Genoese prison on Crete. Jacopo Tiepolo, the first Venetian duke of Crete, finally subdued Pescatore, and effective Venetian control of the island dates from 1211.

The problem of gaining the allegiance and coöperation of the Greek nobility, clergy, and commoners on Crete remained. The Greeks on Crete, organized for centuries under their *archontes*, rebelled against the Venetians just as they had opposed the Byzantine emperors. The Venetian military occupation force on Crete was led by a Venetian duke (or "rector") who was sent from Venice every two years. From his special responsibilities in the capital city, he was often known as the duke of Candia.<sup>122</sup> Venice also systematically organized its own citizens to go to Crete as military colonists. The island was divided into six areas, corresponding to the Byzantine administrative subdivisions and also corresponding to the six sectors of Venice itself. Each sector of the home city was expected to send Venetian nobles and other colonists to the corresponding area in Crete. The first group of colonists from Venice set out in 1211. Other Venetian military colonists were added during the succeeding centuries of Venetian domination of Crete. Exempted from this military partition of Cretan lands was the capital city of Candia, ruled by the Venetian duke of Crete. Also separate were the lands held by the church. With the assistance of this force, Venice kept control over the island, fought the numerous Cretan revolts, and protected the island from invasions by other Greeks, other Italians, and Moslems.<sup>123</sup>

Yet Venice could not hold the island without the coöperation of

121. *Liber Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi, p. 117; Borsari, *Crete*, pp. 71-72, 94-95; Setton, "The Latins in Greece," p. 428.

122. These governors are listed for the thirteenth century in Borsari, *Crete*, appendix I, pp. 127-131.

123. Tafel and Thomas, II, 129-142; see also Miller, *Essays*, pp. 178-180, and Borsari, *Crete*, pp. 28-29.

at least some of the native leaders who held the allegiance of the mass of free and semi-free Greeks. Major revolts against Venetian authority broke out in 1219–1222 and 1282–1299. Some Venetian colonists with knight's fiefs turned native, joined the Orthodox church, and, pushed by the same economic and social interests as were the Greeks, joined the Greeks in revolt against Venice itself. Some freemen owed allegiance to the feudal lords on Crete, and a small group of free merchants lived in Cretan cities, but the mass of the Cretans were serfs. A large majority of the residents of Crete were engaged in agriculture. Even the Venetian military colonists, for the most part, gave up their interest in trade and became more concerned with the products of the soil and life on a country estate.

The crusading effort did profit from the Venetian possession of Crete because Crete was a stopping place for military forces en route to the Holy Land. Before the Venetian occupation, Richard the Lion-hearted had stopped on Crete in 1191. The Frisian crusaders in 1218 rested in Candia on the way to Acre. The emperor Frederick II sailed by Crete in 1228 on his way to Cyprus; and king Louis IX considered stopping in Crete in 1248 en route to Egypt.

Venice would eventually lose the island to the Turks in the war of Candia, 1645–1669. The last Venetian strongholds fell to the Turks in 1691, after which the Treaty of Passarowitz of 1718 confirmed Turkish sovereignty over the island. For five centuries Crete was the most important Venetian acquisition from the Fourth Crusade, because its material resources and its location contributed so greatly to the strength of the maritime republic.

While gaining rights on Negroponte and Crete from Boniface of Montferrat and establishing a long-lived hegemony over these islands, the government of Venice after the Fourth Crusade also sent embassies and organized expeditions to establish control over the eastern coast of the Adriatic and the Ionian seas. These coastal areas formed part of the Venetian grant in the Treaty of Partition in October 1204. The Republic had fought since the tenth century to make these waters safe for its shipping, and in 1202 the crusading fleet had confirmed Venetian possession of the Istrian coast and Zara. The treaty allowed a continuation of that domination which the Byzantine empire had permitted earlier.

The first official Venetian expedition of conquest after the Fourth Crusade took Ragusa and Durazzo on the Dalmatian coast, and the strategic island fortress of Corfu in the Ionian Sea. The same fleet



continued east and brought Thomas Morosini, the Latin patriarch-elect, to Constantinople in the summer of 1205. When they arrived in Constantinople, they learned that doge Enrico Dandolo had died and that the Venetians in Constantinople had chosen Marino Zeno as their podestà. The question briefly remained open whether Ragusa, Durazzo, and Corfu would fall under his jurisdiction, but the Venetian doge Peter Ziani, elected in August 1205, soon forced the Venetians in Constantinople to recognize that Durazzo and Avlona, former Byzantine territories in the Adriatic, would come under the home government.<sup>124</sup> Thus with the aid of the Venetian crusader fleet of 1202 and the Venetian patriarchal fleet of 1205, Venice reasserted its control over several important seaports on the Adriatic: the Istrian peninsula, Zara, Ragusa, Avlona, and Durazzo, and over the Ionian Sea island of Corfu.

The most important of these acquisitions was Ragusa.<sup>125</sup> Even before the Fourth Crusade, the Ragusans had often accepted a Venetian as count; from 1205 to 1358 the count was named biennially as the doge's representative. Venetian citizens received preferential treatment in Ragusa and its hinterland, but Ragusan merchants in Venice were subjected to restrictions imposed by treaties in 1232, 1236, and 1252. The Ragusans promised Venice annual tribute, ships and sailors for its war fleets, and coöperation against its maritime rivals. They also agreed to accept from the Venetians an archbishop who would be subject to the patriarch of Grado.<sup>126</sup> In return the Venetians protected the sea lanes outside Ragusa from pirates, and encouraged the growth of Ragusa as an entrepôt of trade and center of communication between Italy and the Balkans.

Ragusa provided an outlet for products from the Balkan hinterland such as skins, wool, furs, wax, honey, forest products, rough textiles, and slaves. Silver also became an important export from Ragusa to Venice, especially from 1250 to 1350. About 1300 output from the Serbian silver mines increased greatly. The Ragusans possessed the right to exploit these mines in the Serbian kingdom, but kept only a small part of the silver for their own coinage. Venetian merchants took the rest to Venice, where Serbian silver became an increasingly

124. Tafel and Thomas, I, 569-571.

125. Bariša Krekić, "Contributions of Foreigners to Dubrovnik's Economic Growth in the Late Middle Ages," *Viator*, IX (1978), 375-394.

126. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 293; on Ragusa (Dubrovnik) see also Krekić, "Le Relazione fra Venezia, Ragusa e le popolazioni Serbo-Croate," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-1, 390-401; and Francis W. Carter, *Dubrovnik (Ragusa)* (London, 1972), pp. 88-89.

important source of silver for the Venetian mints. Serbian mines also produced some gold, lead, copper, iron, and cinnabar.<sup>127</sup> Venice monopolized the shipping between the Rialto and Ragusa, except for four Ragusan ships each year. Venetian ships sailing down the Adriatic usually stopped at Ragusa for food and water, for final outfitting, and often to recruit ships' crews. From Ragusa south, both Venetian and Ragusan ships carried merchandise back and forth across the Adriatic, to the Aegean Sea area, Constantinople, Syria, and Egypt.<sup>128</sup> Ragusans developed their own merchant marine during the century and a half of Venetian protection and, aided by the Venetians, maintained their freedom from the kings of Serbia, from Dalmatian pirates, and from the Genoese war fleets. In 1358 the Angevin king Louis I of Hungary, after a two-year war with Venice, succeeded in wresting Ragusa and the entire Dalmatian coast from Venetian control. With this event Ragusa, unhampered by its nominal ties to Balkan sovereigns, began two centuries of independent commercial growth, now in competition with Venice.

Durazzo, also conquered in 1205, had been an important Greek city on the Adriatic. Venetian fleets had helped protect the city against Robert Guiscard in 1082. Now the Venetians appointed a strong resident duke of Durazzo, the Venetian nobleman Marino Vallaresso. A Latin bishop of Durazzo presided over the Latin church there after 1205 and inherited certain possessions and revenues from his Greek predecessor. But the Venetian hold on Durazzo lasted only until 1213, when Michael I Ducas, ruler of Epirus, conquered the city. With the Epirote conquest Durazzo lost its importance as a seaport and Ragusa served the Venetian fleets instead as a depot for trade with the Balkans.<sup>129</sup>

The island of Corfu guarded the mouth of the Adriatic, and the Venetian state sent expeditions immediately after the Fourth Crusade to establish its power there also. During this crusade Corfu had been conquered by a Genoese pirate, Leone Vetrane. In response the Venetian patriarchal fleet that had taken Ragusa in the spring of 1205 also occupied Corfu briefly, but the Genoese pirate returned. Venice sent

127. Desank Kovàcevic, "Dans la Serbie et le Bosnie médiévales: Les mines d'or et d'argent," *Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations*, XV (1960), 249–252, 254–258.

128. For examples of shipping out of Ragusa see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, nos. 519, 624, 629, 711, 777; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 281, 299 n., 305, 312–314; and Martin da Canal, *Les Estoires*, ed. Limentani, II, LXXXI, LXXXVI, XCIII.

129. Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 26, 27, 44, 45, 48–50, 94, 102–103, 124. The first known Latin bishop of Durazzo was Manfred in 1209.

a second expedition of thirty-one galleys in 1206 and another expedition in 1207 led by ten noble Venetians, who brought their own military force and the right to conquer Corfu and hold it and its castle for Venice. They were to protect the church and the state as it had existed under the Byzantines, allow Venetians freedom of commerce, and pay annual tribute to Venice.<sup>130</sup> This 1207 expedition successfully conquered and held Corfu until 1214, when the despot of Epirus seized it too.

To protect Venetian interests in the southern Adriatic and the Ionian Sea after the Fourth Crusade, the Republic needed to make agreements with the new rulers of the bordering lands. Both Michael I Ducas, Greek despot of Epirus, and the count palatine of Cephalonia, Maio Orsini, acknowledged Venetian superiority. Michael of Epirus did homage to Venice in 1210 as had the count of Cephalonia in 1209.<sup>131</sup> Each lord swore to hold his lands from Venice, to be its vassal, to pay it feudal dues, to support and protect Venetian commerce in his domains, and to treat the enemies of Venice as his enemies. On parchment, at least, these agreements guaranteed Venetian sovereignty over much former Byzantine territory in the west. But in reality, each vassal of Venice honored these promises only so long as it was personally advantageous. Michael of Epirus demonstrated his independence in 1213 and 1214 by taking both Durazzo and Corfu. Orsini disregarded his oath to Venice when he placed himself directly under pope Innocent III in 1213. Venice had no authority over either the island of Cephalonia or the coast of the despotate of Epirus during the remainder of the thirteenth century. This meant that Venice did not control any Dalmatian seaports south of Ragusa during these years, although it did dominate the northern Adriatic and did influence the commercial and naval operations of Italian ports on the Adriatic.

Venetian shipping around Greece should have benefitted from the Treaty of Partition, which promised Venice the Morea, excepting the fortress of Corinth and the Argolid. But in 1204 William of Champlitte and Geoffrey of Villehardouin, nephew of the chronicler-marshal of Champagne, landed at the protected harbor of Modon on the southwest corner of the Morea. They took the entire Morea with the

130. Tafel and Thomas, II, 54–59; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 26–28, 49–50, 95–96, and Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, p. 253.

131. For Michael Ducas see Tafel and Thomas, II, 119–123; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 43–45. The text of the treaty with the count of Cephalonia has not survived. See, however, Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 284.

assistance of Frankish land forces and the encouragement of Boniface of Montferrat.<sup>132</sup> Notwithstanding this Frankish occupation, pirates seem to have returned to Modon and the nearby seaport of Coron. The Venetian expedition under Renier Dandolo which conquered Corfu from Genoese pirates in 1207 went on to besiege and take Modon and Coron. Shortly after, in 1209, Venice made peace with Geoffrey of Villehardouin, who succeeded William of Champlitte as prince of Achaëa. Venice secured its authority over Modon and Coron by means of the Treaty of Sapientsa, by which Villehardouin, like the despot of Epirus and the count of Cephalonia, swore feudal homage to Venice, promising to be its vassal, to recognize its rights in the Morea, to protect Venetian commerce, and to treat Venetian enemies as his own. He also agreed that Venice should retain complete possession of the Morean seaports Modon and Coron.<sup>133</sup> He and his heirs respected Venetian control over these two seaports, as did their successors, the Angevins of Naples. Venice did not control any other part of mainland Greece in the thirteenth century.

Venice held Modon and Coron for almost three hundred years. Renier Dandolo personally governed them until his death on Crete. Thereafter the Venetian doge sent two castellans biennially to Modon and Coron to administer the ports. In the later thirteenth century, the administrators appointed from Venice increased in number. Venice strengthened the fortifications of Coron from 1269 and of Modon from 1293. These two harbors, naturally protected from the interior by rocky hills, also marketed the agricultural products of southern Greece, especially grain, wax, and silk, and provisioned the Venetian fleets which sailed between the Adriatic and the Aegean.<sup>134</sup>

Venetian territorial gains following the Fourth Crusade confirmed the Republic's control over the strategic seaports on the sea-lanes from Venice to Constantinople. To control the Aegean Sea, Venice needed more ports on the Aegean islands. Instead of sending out more expeditions of conquest, it encouraged its citizens to organize private forces at their own expense to conquer additional Greek islands. These private Venetian conquerors retained their Venetian citizenship and

132. See volume II of the present work, p. 236.

133. Tafel and Thomas, II, 96-100; Borsari, *Studi*, p. 46; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 284. Only once, during the war of Negroponte, did a Villehardouin attempt to take Coron, but his siege was unsuccessful.

134. *Liber Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi, pp. 195-196; *Bilanci generali della repubblica di Venezia* (R. Commissione per la pubblicazione dei documenti finanziari della repubblica di Venezia, ser. 2, vol. I, t. I; Venice, 1912), no. 27; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, no. 816; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 96-98, 124-125; Luce, "Modon," pp. 195-208.

loyalty, even when they became vassals of the Latin emperor for their new lands.<sup>135</sup> Should they wish to dispose of their conquests, they were to be sold or bequeathed only to Venetians.

The most spectacular such private conquest was made by Marco Sanudo, nephew of doge Enrico Dandolo. He had already distinguished himself as a member of the Venetian crusading expedition of 1202–1204, as Dandolo's private envoy to Boniface of Montferrat for the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Adrianople, and as a judge in the Venetian quarter of Constantinople. Marco Sanudo set out from Constantinople in 1207 to conquer the Cyclades with a privately financed expedition of eight galleys manned by Venetian and Italian adventurers.<sup>136</sup> After landing at Potamides in southwest Naxos, Sanudo burnt his galleys behind him to encourage his followers to victory. He had to face Genoese corsairs under Henry Pescatore, count of Malta, who surrendered after a five-week siege. With a second expedition equipped in Venice, he completed the conquest of the other islands in the Cyclades: Paros, Antiparos, Cimolos, Melos, Amorgos, Ios, Cythnos, Sikinos, Siphnos, Syros, and Pholegandros.<sup>137</sup> He awarded Andros as a fief to Marino Dandolo, his cousin, another nephew of the late doge.

By whose authority did Marco Sanudo hold these islands? According to a Venetian decree, any Venetian citizen at his own expense was encouraged to conquer lands promised to Venice in the Treaty of Partition, on condition that the conquests should be bequeathed or sold only to other Venetians. On the other hand, the Treaty of Partition awarded the Cyclades to the Frankish crusaders as fiefs of the Latin emperor. Marco Sanudo, a Venetian nobleman, apparently did homage to the Latin emperor for these islands. He ruled his duchy of Naxos (sometimes called the duchy of the Archipelago) as a powerful, independent feudal lord who coöperated with the doge of Venice only when it suited him. If the Venetians in Crete needed his military assistance, he might sometimes provide it.<sup>138</sup> He built a harbor on Naxos and a unique castle where he lived and under the walls of which he installed the Latin clergy and encouraged a colony of Venetians.<sup>139</sup>

135. Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, p. 272; Borsari, *Studi*, p. 39; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 48–51, 60–61; Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 400–401.

136. Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, ch. v; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 38–40. These authors have organized the confusing evidence given in the sources.

137. Setton, "Latins in Greece," p. 425; Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 38–40; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 68–69.

138. Marco Sanudo helped in the conquest of Crete, but he fell out with the Venetian duke of Crete, Jacopo Tiepolo, and withdrew: Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, ch. v.

139. *Ibid.*, pp. 70–75.

His dynasty brought peace and prosperity to the island, and removed the danger of piracy. Greeks and Latins lived amicably side by side under the Sanudo dukes. Marco's heirs gravitated closer to Venice, as its naval protection was essential to the peace of the islands. The Sanudo dynasty died out in 1371 and was succeeded by another Italian family of the Latin east, the Crispi, who ruled Naxos until 1566. Venice continued to influence and protect the islands until 1718 when the last of them, Tenos, was ceded to the Turks in the Treaty of Passarowitz.<sup>140</sup>

Marino Dandolo, residing in Constantinople,<sup>141</sup> held Andros, the second largest of the Cyclades, in fief from his cousin Marco Sanudo, having accompanied him on the expedition of 1207. Marino established the Latin church on the island and built a castle there for his personal residence. He also carried on a long conflict with John, the Latin bishop of Andros, who was forced into exile, appealed to pope Gregory IX, and obtained Marino's excommunication in 1233, all without any result. Between 1238 and 1243 Jeremiah Ghisi and his brother Andrew, Venetian rulers of other Aegean islands, took Andros from Marino Dandolo and sent him into exile, where he died. Dandolo's sister Maria Doro and his widow Felisa, who married Jacopo Querini, appealed to Venice for justice against the Ghisi usurpation. Doge Jacopo Tiepolo upheld their rights, declared confiscated the goods of the Ghisi in Venice, and threatened Jeremiah Ghisi with exile if he would not comply. Nevertheless, the Ghisi held the island for decades. In 1282 doge John Dandolo and the council of Venice, upon the petition of the heirs of Marino Dandolo, declared that Andros should revert back to the possession of its feudal overlord, Marco II Sanudo, duke of Naxos.<sup>142</sup>

The Ghisi of Venice also made independent conquests. The brothers Andrew and Jeremiah Ghisi organized an expedition in 1207; Andrew occupied and held Tenos and Myconos in the Cyclades, and Jeremiah became lord of Skyros, Skiathos, and Skopelos in the northern Sporades.<sup>143</sup> In addition to creating their principality in the Cy-

140. Miller, *Essays*, p. 68; *idem*, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 591-610. The Marino Dandolo of Andros is not the same as his namesake who was podestà of Constantinople and of Treviso, contender for the ducal office in Venice, and murdered in 1233: Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 402-403.

141. Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, no. 43.

142. Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 399-419; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 282; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, p. 59; Borsari, *Studi*, p. 40; Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 44, 578-580.

143. Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 400, 405; Borsari, *Studi*, p. 41; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 56-70.



clades and northern Sporades, the Ghisi made numerous commercial investments and international loans.<sup>144</sup> Another brother, John, and his son Natalis lent a huge sum to king Andrew II of Hungary. In 1224 Andrew sent 201 silver marks to Venice, where doge Peter Ziani and his councillors accepted this pledge for the Ghisi. Andrew Ghisi, lord of Tenos and Myconos, in 1239 lent 400 gold perperi to Angelo Sanudo, duke of Naxos, and was repaid in 1245. The brothers Jeremiah, Marino, and Andrew Ghisi had a fraternal company, which indicates that the family resources existed, in part, as an indissoluble common fund. Their investments were placed in *colleganza* contracts, and three such Ghisi contracts for the decade 1251–1261 have survived. Not all their affairs prospered; in 1252 they were placed under the ban of Venice for having seized Andros. Another misfortune occurred when Andrew Ghisi was victimized by pirates in 1259. He appealed to the doge for relief and the doge lifted the ban against him. Before 1261 members of the family participated in the Great Council of Venice and held office as ducal councillors and as inspector of public works. These details suggest that the Ghisi held their islands, not only by political acumen and by right of conquest, but also by means of financial strength and business ability. They were related by marriage to other Venetian and Frankish lords of the Aegean, and the Ghisi line continued to hold Aegean islands until 1390, when the family became extinct.

Lemnos (called Stalimene by the Latins), where a Latin church dependent upon the Venetian monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore existed in the twelfth century, was assigned to the Latin emperor by the Treaty of Partition. However Filocalo Navigaioso, a Venetian and a member of the Constantinopolitan community, took possession of Lemnos at least as early as 1206, holding it as a fief of the Latin emperor.<sup>145</sup> He held the Byzantine title megaduke, which customarily conferred high naval command. The Navigaioso family held this island for generations.

The tiny islands of Cerigo (Cythera) and Cerigotto (Anticythera), which lie like stepping stones between the Morea and Crete, also became the property of Venetian families. Marco Venier set out from Crete to conquer Cerigo, and James Viaro to conquer Cerigotto. They also assisted the Venetian military effort to subdue Crete. Viaro had

144. Loenertz, "Généalogie des Ghisi," pp. 144–148; *Liber Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi, pp. 70–71; Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Nuovi documenti*, nos. 95, 96; and their *Documenti*, II, no. 774.

145. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, no. 519; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, p. 282; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, p. 59.

assisted Marco Dandolo previously in the Venetian conquest of Gallipoli. When their families were abruptly dislodged by Licario about 1278, Venetian rule on Cerigo and Cerigotto ended until the fourteenth century.<sup>146</sup>

Another Venetian nobleman, Lorenzo Tiepolo, held territory in the Aegean. He was the son of doge Jacopo Tiepolo, who had been the first Venetian duke of Crete, and he too would rule Venice as doge from 1268 to 1275. Possibly through his second wife, Agnes Ghisi, he became lord of the islands of Skyros and Skopelos. Lorenzo Tiepolo also held a fief from the Villehardouin princes of Achaea.<sup>147</sup> The sources do not record who held these islands in the last part of the century; possibly they reverted back to the Ghisi.

Among the Aegean islands conquered and held privately by Venetians, only the above-noted principalities of the Navigaiosi, Marco Sanudo, Lorenzo Tiepolo, the Ghisi brothers, Marino Dandolo, the Veniers, and the Viari were established in the early thirteenth century. Recent scholarship has refuted the claims of nineteenth-century historians that many other Venetians established feudal principalities on the Aegean islands at the same time. Not until the end of the thirteenth century did other Venetian families gain possession of Aegean islands. The evidence<sup>148</sup> suggests that only in the fifteenth century did the Querini come to Astypalaea (Stampalia); and in the fourteenth century the Barozzi came to Thera (Santorin) and Therasia, the Foscoli to Anaphe (Namfio), and the Ghisi to Chios and Seriphos. These acquisitions belong to the Venetian holdings of the Renaissance rather than the crusading epoch.

Of all the islands and the seaports of the Near East, the most important for Venetian commerce had always been Constantinople. The Venetian quarter in Constantinople had formed the principal center for its foreign commerce since 1082, and Venetian efforts to maintain this position against Italian and Byzantine competition had preceded the Fourth Crusade by over a generation. The establishment of the

146. Borsari, *Studi*, p. 38; Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 138, 564-568; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, p. 58.

147. Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, p. 195; Loenertz, "Marino Dandolo," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, p. 409, note 5. Lorenzo Tiepolo's first wife, Agnes, was either a Brienne or the daughter of a Balkan prince.

148. Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 38-43; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 56-70; Loenertz, "Les Querini, comtes d'Astypalée, 1413-1537," *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, pp. 503-536. Loenertz, "De Quelques îles grecques et de leurs seigneurs vénitiens du XIVe et XVe siècles," *Studi veneziani*, XIV (1972), 9, suggests the possibility of a Venetian lord over Astypalaea in the thirteenth century, but states that no surviving source documents this possibility.

Latin empire in Constantinople in 1204 jointly by the Venetians and the Frankish crusaders gave the citizens of Venice a greater security in Constantinople than they had ever known.

When the Latin empire was established,<sup>149</sup> the Venetians acted as a unit under their doge to gain economic and ecclesiastical supremacy in Romania. The Fourth Crusade returned all previously held commercial privileges and monopolies to Venice. The well-disciplined coherence of the Venetians in Constantinople is attested by the continuance of their corporate activity in the summer of 1205, after the death of Enrico Dandolo. They elected Marino Zeno to be their podestà in Constantinople, and he surrounded himself with a group of magistrates bearing the same titles as ducal councillors at home—judges of the commune, councillors, treasurer, and advocate. The military and commercial responsibilities of the Venetians in Constantinople necessitated a continuity of leadership. Zeno at first used Enrico Dandolo's title, *dominator quartae partis et dimidie Imperii Romanie*. He remained in office until 1207 but had to acknowledge the leadership of the doge in Venice. In September 1205 he notified doge Peter Ziani of his election as podestà, and promised that the Venetians in Constantinople would in the future accept as their podestà only a man sent from Venice and that the fiefs gained by the Venetians in Romania would not be sold or bequeathed to foreigners. One month later, he acknowledged the doge's sovereignty over all former Byzantine possessions in the Adriatic and Ionian seas granted to Venice by the Treaty of Partition. He also confirmed the obligations and the treaties made in 1204 between the French crusaders and the Venetians under doge Enrico Dandolo.<sup>150</sup> This confirmation was signed in the imperial red ink by Henry, brother of the captured emperor Baldwin I, and by Zeno. According to this confirmation, the Latin emperor could act only with the advice and consent of his council, composed half of Venetians and half of Franks. In addition, the defense of the empire depended during the campaign season upon military contingents from both Franks and Venetians. The Venetians were confirmed in all rights and privileges they had ever held in Constantinople under the Greeks. Venetian strength in Romania also rested on control of its Latin church, whose head, the patriarch of Constantinople, according to arrangements in 1204, was always a Venetian.<sup>151</sup>

The Venetian Civil Law promulgated in 1242 by doge Jacopo Tiepolo testifies to the position of Constantinople as the second city in

149. See chapter VI of volume II of the present work.

150. Tafel and Thomas, I, 566–574; Wolff, "The Oath of the Venetian Podestà," pp. 544–551.

151. See McNeal and Wolff, in volume II of the present work, pp. 195–199.

the Venetian dominions. This law restricted the drawing up of *breviaria*, notarized documents, to Venice and Constantinople only. Furthermore, documents notarized in Constantinople had to be drawn up in the presence of the podestà, his agent, or one of the councillors of the doge.<sup>152</sup> The law code further states that private contracts for loans could not be paid off in any city other than that specified, except Venice itself or Constantinople.<sup>153</sup> These laws further demonstrate that the Venetian colony in Constantinople, led by the podestà, had more independent authority and more power than any other Venetian colony.

The colony's strength is further attested by the story, which appears only in the Renaissance chronicle of Daniele Barbaro, that the Venetians debated at length whether or not they ought to transfer the seat of their government to Constantinople. The conservatives won, and the doge remained in Italy. Every Venetian podestà in Constantinople except the first was nominated by the home government, not by the Venetian community in Constantinople. All Marino Zeno's successors took an oath to follow the directives of the home government, and to administer justice for the profit and honor of Venice and for the safety of Romania. They also swore that they would not act in fiscal or financial matters or in foreign affairs without the consent of their councillors.<sup>154</sup> Each was assisted by two councillors, six judges, and a treasurer.

Venice chose some of its most outstanding men to be podestà in Constantinople.<sup>155</sup> Marino Dandolo, probably related to doge Enrico Dandolo, held office as podestà sometime between 1209 and 1221. Later, in Venice, he served as ducal councillor in 1223, and as vice-doge in 1224. Still later, in 1229, he tied with Jacopo Tiepolo for election to the ducal office itself. He never held the office, but became podestà of the nearby city of Treviso and was assassinated in 1233.<sup>156</sup> The noble Venetian family of Michiel, which contributed three doges to Venice in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, gave two podestà to

152. *Gli Statuti veneziani di Jacopo Tiepolo del 1242*, ed. Cessi, I, xxvii, 62. *Breviaria* meant any documents drawn up by a notary; *ibid.*, I, xxxvi, 67, esp. gloss 205. Another Venetian gloss from the second half of the thirteenth century (*ibid.*, I, xxvii, 62) extended the right to authenticate such *breviaria* to any Venetian governor be he bailie, podestà, rector, the duke of Crete, or one of their agents. The date of this extension, after 1261, demonstrates that other legal provisions had to be made for authenticating such *breviaria* after the fall of the Latin empire.

153. *Ibid.*, V, viii, 22.

154. Wolff, "The Oath," pp. 552-557; Lombardo and Morozzo della Rocca, *Nuovi documenti*, no. 52; Luzzatto, *Storia economica di Venezia*, p. 62.

155. Wolff, "The Oath," pp. 559-564.

156. See above, note 140.

Constantinople, Marino Michiel in March 1221 and John Michiel in 1240–1241. Marino Storlato, podestà in 1222 and 1223, served the Venetian state at home as judge in 1195, as examiner in 1210, and as councillor in 1219, and represented Venice in Rome as witness to the oath of John of Brienne in April 1231. Teofilo Zeno, one of the wealthiest Venetians, was podestà of Constantinople sometime between 1224 and 1228, and again about 1235–1238. He also served Venice as judge in 1219, and as ducal councillor in 1228 and 1229. Jacob Dolfín, podestà in 1256, also served Venice at home as judge of the commune in 1241. Marco Gradenigo, the last Venetian podestà before the fall of Constantinople to the Greeks in 1261, also served Venice as captain of the Venetian army in Romania before 1256, and as bailie in Negroponte.

The most important podestà of Constantinople was Jacopo Tiepolo. As a young man before the Fourth Crusade he was active in commercial voyages, going to Messina and to Constantinople in 1190.<sup>157</sup> Before becoming podestà he had held the offices of bailie of Negroponte and duke of Crete; he held the chief office in Constantinople in 1219–1221, and again about 1224. In Constantinople Tiepolo carried out a policy designed to bring more commercial advantages to Venice, despite the weakening of the Latin empire.<sup>158</sup> In 1219 he reaffirmed the Venetian responsibilities to the Latin empire in a convention signed with the regent, Conon of Béthune. In the same year he increased Venetian business opportunities by making treaties, on his own authority as podestà, with foreign sovereigns in Anatolia. According to his commercial agreement with Theodore I Lascaris, Greek emperor of Nicaea, Venetians could trade in the empire of Nicaea without paying customs dues. In 1220 Tiepolo made a commercial treaty with Kai-Kobād I, the Turkish sultan of Konya. In 1224, acting as agent for the doge, he settled a dispute with the Latin emperor Robert of Courtenay whereby three eighths of certain fields near Constantinople would be assigned to the Venetians, according to the earlier Franco-Venetian treaties. A document also survives from the years of Tiepolo's leadership wherein the Venetians controlling the seaport of Lampsacus on the Dardanelles agreed to pay annually 1,000 gold perperi to the Venetian podestà in Constantinople.<sup>159</sup> He brought his extensive commercial, political, and administrative experience back to Venice in 1229 upon his election as doge.

157. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, nos. 377, 388, 389.

158. See Wolff, "The Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1261," in volume II of the present work, pp. 220–233.

159. Tafel and Thomas, II, 205–210, 214–225, 255.

During his twenty years in that office, Jacopo Tiepolo continued his policy of protecting Venetian commercial advantages in the Near East.<sup>160</sup> His amicable relations with the Greeks at Nicaea ceased when John III (Ducas) Vatatzes ruled Nicaea from 1222 to 1254. On the other hand, as doge he concluded commercial treaties with the Aiyūbid lord of Aleppo, with king Béla IV of Hungary, with king Heṭoum I of Cilician Armenia at Ayas (Lajazzo), with the Aiyūbid sultans al-ʿĀdil II and aṣ-Ṣāliḥ of Egypt, and with the Ḥafṣid lord of Tunis, Yaḥyâ I. His commercial agreement with and support of Leo Gabalās, Greek ruler of Rhodes, came to nothing when John Vatatzes of Nicaea took Rhodes. He also carried out the first complete surviving codification of the Venetian civil and maritime laws. His policy, like that of other doges of this era, was economic domination in Romania.

The power of the Venetian *podestà* continued to be only as strong as Venetian influence in Constantinople and surrounding territories. Of the lands near Constantinople promised to Venice in the Treaty of Partition, not all came under Venetian jurisdiction. Although the Venetians were granted Thrace as far as Adrianople by the Treaty, the Bulgarian king Ioannitsa conquered most of it in 1204–1205. Ioannitsa captured the Latin emperor Baldwin I in April 1205, when he attempted to retake Adrianople. After the siege, doge Enrico Dandolo moved south with his forces to Rodosto on the Sea of Marmara, where he left a Venetian garrison.<sup>161</sup> Rodosto had seen resident Venetian churchmen and traveling Venetian merchants often in the twelfth century. But the Venetians did not hold Rodosto long in 1205. Ioannitsa led the Bulgars south after taking Adrianople, and, after his victory at Rusion in January 31, 1206, took Arcadiopolis, Rodosto, Heraclea, and other places on the Thracian coast. Rodosto must have been regained by the Venetians because they sent a castellan there in 1224. West of Rodosto, at the mouth of the Dardanelles, the seaport of Gallipoli became firmly Venetian when Marco Dandolo and Jacob Viadro conquered it in 1205. Gallipoli too received a Venetian castellan in 1224. Venice held Gallipoli until 1235, when it was taken and sacked by the Greek ruler John Vatatzes.<sup>162</sup> The Venetians also held Lampsacus on the Asiatic shore of the Dardanelles.

Control of seaports was more important to Venice than ephemeral sovereignty over the inland regions of Thrace. At Adrianople the Greeks

160. *Ibid.*, II, 274–307.

161. Ivan Dujčev, "Rapporti fra Venezia e Bulgaria nel Medioevo," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-1, 246.

162. Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 282, 295; Wolff, in volume II of the present work, p. 219; Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo*, pp. 50–51; Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, pp. 85, 92.



soon despaired of Ioannitsa's leadership and secretly arranged to surrender the city to the Greek leader Theodore Branas in Constantinople. By an agreement in 1206, the Venetians in Constantinople gave up their rights in Adrianople to Branas. He entered into actual possession only after the second Latin emperor, Henry, and his army retook the area from the Bulgars in late August 1206.<sup>163</sup> Through these seaports on the Dardanelles and the Sea of Marmara, the Venetian colony in Constantinople not only controlled the approaches to Constantinople but also profited from the renewal of the ancient Venetian commercial privileges there. In return, Venice contributed to the defense of the European possessions of the Latin empire.

Italians, who had not been welcome in the Black Sea until 1204, soon afterward began their eastward voyages in search of markets and grain. Venetian voyages into the Black Sea are known as early as 1206, when one was made to Soldaia in the Crimea.<sup>164</sup> By mid-century Venetian merchants had explored the Black Sea and established commercial contacts, like the Polo agency in Soldaia, which dated from 1250. The Black Sea trade must have yielded mainly grain, timber, and salt fish to the Venetian merchants before the Mongol conquests in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The unstable and fragmented pre-Mongol governments of the Black Sea littoral would not have attracted the long-distance Asiatic caravans which later, during the *Pax Mongolica*, were to bring precious goods from the Far East.

Venetians were to learn more about the conquests of Genghis Khan and his successors than most Europeans.<sup>165</sup> Mongol horsemen had invaded western Europe, in the 1240's reaching Udine, only about eighty miles from Venice. The Mongols pushed the Hungarians and the central Balkan peoples, who, in turn, put pressure on the Venetian-dominated Dalmatian coast. Renier Zeno, a future doge, represented Venice in 1245 at the First Council of Lyons, where pope Innocent IV discussed the defense of Europe against the Mongols. Before the Greeks returned to Constantinople in 1261 and temporarily prohib-

163. Villehardouin, ed. Faral, II, 234-237, 246-247; Tafel and Thomas, II, 17-19; Cessi, *Le Colonie medioevali*, I, 105; Dujčev, *loc. cit.* (note 161, above).

164. Marie Nystazopoulou Pélékidis, "Venise et la Mer Noire," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-2, 545-548, believes that the Genoese were allowed to trade in the Black Sea by the Byzantines, in 1169 and 1192, when the Byzantines granted privileges to the Genoese to counteract Venetian predominance; cf. Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, II, nos. 478-479.

165. See Roberto Almagia, "Marco Polo," *Nel VII Centenario della nascita di Marco Polo*, pp. 12-24; Rodolfo Gallo, "Marco Polo, la sua famiglia e il suo libro," *ibid.*, pp. 63-77; Leonardo Olschki, "1254: Venezia, l'Europa, e i Tartari," *ibid.*, pp. 302-308.

ited Venetians from going to the Black Sea, Venetian merchants had already established themselves in Mongol lands. Jacob Venier and Nicholas Pisani, two Venetian merchants resident in Kiev, which was controlled by the Golden Horde, met John of Pian del Carpine, the official ambassador of pope Innocent IV, about 1244, on his return from the Mongol empire.

The father and uncles of Marco Polo set out from their agency in Soldaia, in 1260, on their first long journey into Mongol lands. They traveled much farther into Mongol domains than other known Venetians. On their first journey they visited the Ukraine, Bukhara in Turkestan, and also China, and returned by land in 1269–1270 to Ayas in Cilician Armenia, and thence by sea to Acre, Negroponte, and home. The Polo brothers did not return via the Black Sea because, while in Asia, they must have received information that the Greeks had reconquered Constantinople and had closed the Black Sea to all but their allies, the Genoese and the Pisans. The Venetians, however, negotiated a treaty in 1268 with the Greek emperor, Michael VIII Palaeologus, whereby they could resume trade within the empire and in the Black Sea. Consequently the Venetians sent a consul to Soldaia in 1287 with authority over all the Crimean area. They could now take advantage of the opportunity to purchase precious stones, metals, luxury textiles from the Far East, furs, pelts, wax, and honey from Russia, and timber, salt, and salt fish from the regions near the Crimea. Matthew and Nicholas Polo began their second journey in 1271, the year after a Venetian truce with Genoa, and took seventeen-year-old Marco with them. Marco Polo's famous book recounts his overland journey to the court of Kubilai Khan in Cathay, his long service under Kubilai Khan, and his return, mainly by sea, reaching Constantinople and finally Venice in 1295. His travels have become the best-known Venetian venture of the thirteenth century and demonstrate the unlimited opportunity opened up to Venice by commercial colonization during the crusades.

Syria and Palestine continued to attract Venetian commerce after 1204, despite the beginning of armed conflict between the Italian communes there in the second quarter of the thirteenth century.<sup>166</sup> When Frederick II became king of Jerusalem, fortified the coastal cities, and regained Jerusalem on his bloodless crusade,<sup>167</sup> the Venetian position seemed strong. Following Frederick's departure, however, open

166. Cessi, *Le Colonie medioevali*, I, 118–126; volume II of the present work, pp. 546–569.

167. See Thomas C. Van Cleve, "The Crusade of Frederick II," in volume II of the present work, chapter XII.

warfare broke out among the Latins in the kingdom of Jerusalem. The Hohenstaufen or imperial party, led by the imperial bailie Richard Filangieri and his brothers, included the Teutonic Knights, some local barons, and the Pisans. The Lombard party, led by the Ibelins, included many barons of Jerusalem and the Genoese. At first the Templars, the Hospitallers, and the Venetians held aloof, but later the Venetians joined the Lombard party against the Ghibellines. The fighting attempted to settle whether the local Christian barons or the absent Hohenstaufen king of Jerusalem should rule, and also which Italian sea power should be supreme on the Palestinian and Syrian coast. Until 1243 the Pisans enjoyed the strength which came from their support of the imperial cause. The Pisan strength declined with the decline of the imperial power and their loss of Tyre in July 1243. From this date to the fall of Acre in 1291, the kingdom of Jerusalem was governed loosely by the barons.

The Italian communes formed the strongest and richest elements in the port cities of Antioch, Tripoli, Tyre, Acre, and Jaffa. No harmony existed between them after the common enemy, the Hohenstaufen party, was gone. Every irritation erupted into armed conflict, interrupted only briefly by Louis IX's visit to the Latin kingdom during his first crusade. First Genoa sided with Pisa against Venice. From 1257 on Venice and Genoa fought a long series of wars which lasted over a century. Pisa, gradually weakened through conflict with Genoa at home, sided with Venice in the first war, known as the War of the Communes or the War of St. Sabas because conflict broke out over possession of a house belonging to the abbey of St. Sabas in Acre. After several bloody land and sea battles, the Venetians decisively defeated the Genoese in June 1258 at sea off Acre. Lorenzo Tiepolo, son of doge Jacopo Tiepolo and a future doge himself, commanded the Venetians. After the naval victory the Venetians razed the Genoese quarter in Acre, and Tiepolo carried some of the stones of Acre home in triumph to Venice. Genoa then left Acre, which had formerly been its strongest point, for other coastal cities. The Venetian power appeared in 1258 to be at its height in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

The Venetians in thirteenth-century Tyre retained their commercial privileges, which had first been granted them in the *pactum Warmundi* of 1123. Tyre continued to be their chief center. According to the *pactum Warmundi* the Venetians were to receive one third of the city, and the Latin kingdom two thirds. As they were recorded in the inventory of Venetian holdings in Tyre made in 1243 by the Venetian bailie, Marsiglio Zorzi, Venetian holdings included land and streets

along the eastern shore of the harbor, bordering on the holdings of the Genoese, the order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, and others.<sup>168</sup> The largest structure there, the grand palace of the Venetian *fondaco*, provided substantial rents to Venice. The church of St. Demetrius and the chapel of St. Mark, the arsenal, and many other structures in the area belonged to the Venetians. Venetian law prevailed there. Venetian noblemen resided in this section for years at a time while retaining their property and privileges at home.<sup>169</sup> Other Venetian noblemen and commoners lived in Tyre only for a few months, between the arrival of the fall fleet from Venice and its spring departure. Apparently native Syrians and other Latins also lived in the Venetian section.

One third of the countryside surrounding Tyre also belonged to Venice, and two thirds to the kingdom of Jerusalem. The Venetian share included, according to a recent study, about twenty-one small villages and their surrounding cultivated land. Wheat and barley fields, crops of legumes, and orchards planted on these lands supplied the Tyrians with their food. In other irrigated areas, the Venetians maintained sugar plantations, and sugar presses near Tyre produced a local product for export.<sup>170</sup> Near the Venetian agricultural villages there were 2,000 olive groves worked by compulsory labor. The famous glass-blowers of Tyre also produced exports for Venetian merchants. Some of them emigrated to Venice in the mid-twelfth century to found the Venetian glass industry. In addition to these local products, the Venetians also exported from Tyre other products of the region. Most important were the textiles: cotton cloth and cotton thread, linen, camel's-hair cloth, buckram or canvas, and wool for caps.<sup>171</sup> Other thirteenth-century Venetian exports from the Holy Land included spices, pigments, medicines, and lead.<sup>172</sup>

While the Genoese colonies in Syria and Palestine continued to be exploited mainly by independent Genoese citizens, some of them feudal lords like the Embriachi in Jubail and others on Aegean islands, the Venetian colonies in Palestine were more closely controlled by

168. Tafel and Thomas, II, 351-398; Praver, "Étude de quelques problèmes," pp. 10-58; *idem*, "Veneziani e colonie veneziane," *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-2, 637, 643-651.

169. *Ibid.*, pp. 655, 638-642.

170. *Gli Statuti marittimi veneziani fino al 1255*, ed. Predelli and Sacerdoti, p. 73; see also above, pp. 257-259.

171. *Bonbace, bambace filum, filum, zambelloti, boccarani, lana de berretis, Gli Statuti marittimi*, p. 73.

172. *Piper, incensum, endegum, zinzibar, zeroata, mirra, lacca, bomarabica, aloes, nuces muscate, gariofoli, gardamomum, melegete, canfora, auresi, sandalo, mirobalani, galenga, simoniacum, cubebe, piper longum, aurum pigmentum, armoniacum, cera, alumen, vitreum, vitriolum, smerilium, requiricia, spigum, canella, cominum, maci, anisi, zambelloti, ibid.* Praver has given a translation of this list, *Crusaders' Kingdom*, p. 400.

the Venetian state. The home city regularly sent out its representatives, known as bailies, to the chief colonial city in Palestine. The first known bailie was Teofilo Zeno in 1117. In the thirteenth century the bailie held office for one year and was chosen by the doge of Venice from among those Venetians familiar with conditions in the Latin kingdom. Venetians residing in Palestine, among them the chronicler Martin da Canal, contributed greatly to Venetian life when they returned home. The coastal city of Tyre served as the headquarters for Venice in Palestine throughout most of the thirteenth century, except from 1262 to 1270 when the Genoese forced them to concentrate in Acre. After the conquest of the remainder of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem by the Mamluks in 1291, the Venetians had to make their peace with the new rulers.

Although Venice had traded with Egypt at least since the tenth century, only thirteenth-century sources present many details. Sometime between 1205 and 1217 Venice stabilized its position in Egypt by negotiating a series of six commercial agreements with the Aiyūbid sultan, al-ʿĀdil.<sup>173</sup> These agreements outlined the position of Christian merchants in Moslem Egypt and probably reflect the terms of earlier arrangements. The sultan agreed to honor and protect all Venetians and their Christian agents in his domains. He also promised to protect the pilgrims whom they might transport to the Holy Sepulcher. Venetian merchants were to pay no more than the regular customs duties in Egypt. They were granted a *fondaco* in the chicken market in Alexandria where they might live, and the right to come and go freely in Egypt. They were also given freedom to buy and sell any merchandise anywhere in Egypt without restraint. They were to be judged in their own courts. The sultan agreed to respect their customs provided that they were observed within the Venetian *fondaco*, such as the drinking of wine with meals and the taking of usury, both of which were prohibited to Moslems. The Venetians agreed on their part to follow the regulations of the Egyptian customs officers.

These arrangements must have broken down in 1217–1218 during the Fifth Crusade. King Andrew II of Hungary had assumed leadership of the crusading army in 1216, and secured the assistance of Venetian shipping by granting Venice perpetual sovereignty over Zara and various commercial privileges in his realm. Venice was to provide ten

173. Although the treaty used to be dated 1202 and given as a cause for the diversion of the Fourth Crusade, the treaty now is dated later; Gabriel Hanotaux, "Les Vénitiens ont-ils trahi la Chrétienté en 1202?" *Revue historique*, IV (1877), 87–100; *The Latin Conquest of Constantinople*, ed. Queller, pp. 24–43; Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, 482. For the text, see Tafel and Thomas, II, 184–193.

large ships, at a rental of 550 Venetian silver marks each, and numerous smaller vessels.<sup>174</sup> The crusaders assembled in Spalato the following summer in such numbers that not enough ships were ready. Eventually transportation for all was secured; and the crusaders proceeded to Acre. There is no evidence of Venetian participation in the Palestinian military phase of the Fifth Crusade, and the Venetians did not assist the Hungarian crusaders to return home. Sick and weakened, king Andrew returned home by land, leading his army through Syria, Cilician Armenia, the Latin empire of Constantinople, and Bulgaria. The Fifth Crusade proceeded without him during 1218, embarking from Acre to attack Damietta in Egypt. Possibly Venetian ships transported the crusaders to Egypt, since Venetian troops and ships were present at Damietta at the time of the military disaster at Mansurah. The Fifth Crusade was the last such venture for the commune of Venice. Except to further its quarrel with Genoa, Venice did not participate in any other thirteenth-century crusade. Some Venetians resided in Acre and assisted in the defense of the city until its fall in April 1291 to the Mamluks. Of all the crusading expeditions before 1291, Venice had participated most fully and gained most from the Fourth Crusade.

After the Fifth Crusade Venice, like the papacy, prohibited any of its citizens or ships from trading with Egypt. Trade in lumber, iron, and ship tackle was specifically prohibited. Evidence of these prohibitions exists for the years 1224 to 1228.<sup>175</sup> Doge Peter Ziani sent a decree to the duke of Crete in 1226 prohibiting Venetian ships from trading with Egypt. Bonds were to be posted to insure compliance and violators of the decree were to suffer confiscation of their goods and fines.<sup>176</sup> But the ships did not stop sailing to Venice from Alexandria. In 1226 the doge fined certain Lombard merchants and confiscated their cargo of dates and seven great elephant tusks brought from Egypt. Venetians were also issued permits for organized piracy against Egyptian shipping in 1226.<sup>177</sup> Venetian trade with Egypt seems to have continued from Constantinople, where the Venetian patriarch had the right to absolve the sins of those who carried on illicit trade with Moslems contrary to papal decree.<sup>178</sup>

Venice resumed its regular trade with Egypt when Jacopo Tiepolo

174. Van Cleve, "The Fifth Crusade," in volume II of the present work, pp. 388-389; Andrea Dandolo, *Chronica*, pp. 286-287.

175. *Liber Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi, pp. 17, 19, 28, 29, 31, 33, 94, 95, 98.

176. Tafel and Thomas, II, 260-264. The duke in 1226 was Marino Soranzo.

177. *Liber Plegiorum*, ed. Cessi, pp. 96, 140-142, 144.

178. Wolff, "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate," p. 277.



was doge. The sultan of Egypt, al-Kāmil, in 1238 gave the doge's agents, Romeo Querini and Jacopo Barozzi, knights, a renewal of Venetian privileges.<sup>179</sup> In addition, he promised Venice an additional *fondaco* where its laws might prevail and money, gold, and silver might be exchanged under supervision. The treaty also stated that neither Egyptians nor Venetians should commit acts of piracy against each other. Six years later the Egyptian sultan aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Aiyūb again guaranteed the safety of Venetians and their goods in his domains.<sup>180</sup>

The crusade of Louis IX to Egypt and the end of the Aiyūbid line must have ended the effectiveness of these treaties, for in 1254 Venice negotiated a new pact with the first Mamluk sultan of Egypt, Aybeg, shortly after he assumed power. This pact detailed the customary rights and privileges of the Venetians in Egypt much more clearly and precisely than any earlier pact had.<sup>181</sup> It is not known whether these Venetian privileges in Egypt continued after 1257 when Aybeg was murdered, but Venetian trade continued with Egypt during the remainder of the century.

Tunisia was another area where Venetian merchant diplomats negotiated treaties before the end of the Latin empire. With Pisan merchants already firmly established, the Venetian doge Jacopo Tiepolo in 1231 made a formal compact with the rulers of Tunis to ensure the safety of Venetians, their merchandise, and their shipping.<sup>182</sup> Although the treaty was to run for forty years, the Venetians and the Ḥafṣid rulers of Tunisia renewed it in 1251, probably because Louis's crusading expedition to Egypt had disrupted trade along the North African coast. The treaty of 1251 repeated the usual safeguards to Venetian commerce, and added that, when famine threatened Venice, the Venetians were permitted to export grain from Tunisia if its price did not exceed a certain figure.<sup>183</sup> These arrangements to purchase grain in Tunisia were particularly significant because they were made the same year Venice went to war with Genoa.

The crusades provided Venice with many opportunities for overseas expansion. Not only did the Fourth Crusade give Venice a monopoly of trade in Constantinople, but Venetian merchants enjoyed unusual commercial advantages and protection in the Frankish states of the former Byzantine empire. Pirate nests in Ragusa, Corfu, Mo-

179. Tafel and Thomas, II, 336-341.

180. *Ibid.*, 416-418.

181. *Ibid.*, 483-492.

182. *Ibid.*, 303-307.

183. *Ibid.*, 450-456.

don and Coron, Crete, and Naxos were destroyed by Venetian ships before 1212, and Venetian colonies in Romania served as bases from which later Venetian squadrons policed the seas.

Emboldened by greater commercial security, thirteenth-century Venetian merchants sought new markets. They explored the Black Sea and established commercial colonies from Soldaia in the Crimea eastward to the Sea of Azov and Tana on the river Don, and southward to Greek Trebizond. From these distant stations Venetians regularly did business with the Mongols and met the caravans from the Far East. In the next century Venetians penetrated deeply into Mongol lands. Similarly, in the western Mediterranean Venetians frequented the ports of Moslem Tunisia and the rival Christian ports: Pisa, Genoa, Marseilles, Barcelona, and Palma di Mallorca. Shortly after 1300 Venetian ships would sail past the Strait of Gibraltar north to England and Flanders.

Certain established markets became more precarious for Venetian merchants during the thirteenth century. Palestine was convulsed with wars between the Franks, and by mid-century the hinterland felt the pressure of the advancing Mongols.

The Genoese and the Greeks repeatedly challenged the Venetian commercial monopoly of the eastern seas. Open warfare commenced with the devastating War of St. Sabas in Palestine, which ended in 1258 with the Genoese expulsion from Acre. Then Genoa turned to Michael VIII Palaeologus, who was consolidating his holdings in Europe and Asia. This Greek emperor of Nicaea allied with Genoa in the Treaty of Nymphaeum, took Constantinople from the Latins in 1261, and expelled the Venetians. Genoa, replacing Venice in Constantinople, established a permanent commercial colony at Pera, across the Golden Horn. Although Michael VIII restored Venetian commercial privileges in 1268 and restored the Venetian quarter in Constantinople in 1277, his reconquest had effectively destroyed the Venetian trade monopoly in Constantinople.

Greeks and Genoese also challenged the large and strategic Venetian islands of Negroponte and Crete. War was endemic on Negroponte in the last half of the century when Licario, supported by the Palaeologi and the Genoese, led uprisings against the Lombard *terciers* supported by the Venetians.<sup>184</sup> On Crete, Alexius Callerges, similarly, led revolts against Venice. On both islands, however, the Venetians finally prevailed.

184. Borsari, *Studi*, pp. 98–99; Miller, *Latins in the Levant*, pp. 102–104, 136–141, 208–210; Loenertz, “Les Seigneurs *terciers* de Négrepont,” pp. 249–276.

The century closed with Venice's Second Genoese War, although the two cities had been encouraged to make a truce in 1270 by the French king, Louis IX, in preparation for his last crusade. Hostilities between Venice and Genoa began again in 1294 and involved the Palaeologi the next year, when the Venetian-Byzantine treaties expired. Venice made peace with Genoa in 1299 only after suffering defeat at the disastrous battle of Curzola. Peace was not renewed with Byzantium until the winter of 1302-1303.

In response to these challenges, Venice sought alternate markets in Anatolia, in Greek, Moslem, and Armenian lands. By 1300 Ayas in Cilician Armenia and Alexandria in Egypt had become the foreign ports most often frequented by Venetian merchants.

Despite the failure of Venetian attempts at commercial monopoly of the eastern Mediterranean and Aegean after the fall of the Latin empire, Venetian commercial power and wealth probably grew throughout the century,<sup>185</sup> though precise documentation is not possible. There are, however, a number of Genoese notarial cartularies, largely unpublished, from which Vsevolod Slessarev has drawn figures illustrating the growth of Genoese overseas trade in the thirteenth century.<sup>186</sup> "The minutes of a single notary out of some twenty-nine active in Genoa . . . indicate a flurry of investment to Ultramar (Syria and Palestine) between August 21 and September 24, 1191. The value of goods and cash destined for the Levant amounted to 8,570 Genoese pounds, which suggests [an annual] total of perhaps 80,000 pounds, a staggering sum for that time, partly explainable by the complete absence of investments [in trade with] Alexandria. Seven years later, according to a very fragmentary source, two ships left Genoa for Ultramar and four for Alexandria, indicating thus a return to peacetime commerce."<sup>187</sup> After the Fourth Crusade and the growth of Venetian colonies in Romania, the Genoese trade continued to increase. "Occasional references to customs dues *ad valorem* and the amounts for which they were farmed permit us to calculate the overall growth of the trade. In 1214 the minimum of anticipated turnover, [both] export from and import to Genoa, amounts to 380,520 Genoese pounds; in 1274 to 720,000; and in 1341 to 1,403,400. The share of Ultramar in these sums cannot be ascertained. If a routine survey of many unpublished notarial cartularies can be regarded as evidence, one would

185. Luzzatto, *Storia economica di Venezia*, pp. 45-47.

186. Unable to bring his study of Genoa to completion, the late Vsevolod Slessarev urged me to add his conclusions to this chapter. The following comments on Genoese commerce during the crusades are taken from his unfinished study.

187. For the volume of Genoese trade, cf. Prawer, *Crusaders' Kingdom*, pp. 399-400, 402.

have to concede that of all areas to which the Genoese ships sailed, Syria was able to draw the biggest clusters of investments. For example, between September 17 and 27, 1227, a single notary registered commercial ventures to Ultramar to the impressive total of 21,347 Genoese pounds. Such figures, however, should be viewed with caution, for, as it seems, the preceding year was singularly unfavorable to overseas trade. Another factor . . . was the repeated prohibitions of trade with Alexandria. Judging by the . . . notaries Giovanni di Guiberto and Lanfranco, the Genoese refrained from trading with Egypt in 1205, 1216, and 1226.”

In the case of Venice, evidence for the extension and growth of Venetian commerce in the thirteenth century can be found in the wider circulation of Venetian coinage. Venice embarked upon the Fourth Crusade with a monetary system based on silver, which endured until 1282. The *grosso*, its strongest and most widely recognized coin, appeared in 1194 early in the reign of doge Enrico Dandolo. It maintained the same weight and fineness until 1379. Merchants used these coins for payments of large sums at home and abroad. The coin for petty transactions was the *denaro* or *piccolo*, smaller in size and much less pure silver than the *grosso*. A quarter *denaro* (first struck to pay shipyard workers for the Fourth Crusade) and a half *denaro* also circulated. The *grosso* and *piccolo* circulated at a ratio of 1:26, but by 1290 the ratio had increased to 1:32. For the measurement of sums and the calculation of accounts, Venetian merchants used two monies of account, the *lira di piccoli*, which equaled 240 *piccoli*, and the *lira di grossi*, which equaled 240 *grossi*. Because gold coins were often demanded in the Levantine trade, the Byzantine gold coin, the *hyperperon*, continued in use, although it no longer was issued in quantity by the mints of Constantinople and rival *hyperperi* were struck by the Greek and Latin successor states in the Aegean. Venetian *grossi* and silver bullion were exported to the east because the Venetians seem to have needed to supplement their export of western commodities with an export of coinage and bullion. The value of Levantine products brought west to Venice seems to have exceeded that of the European commodities shipped east.<sup>188</sup> Probably the good Venetian silver *grosso* was more in demand in the eastern Mediterranean because men recognized its constant silver content and the commercial strength of Venice behind it. Historians have long assumed that the Venetian *grosso* became the principal silver coin of the eastern Medi-

188. Luzzatto, *Storia economica di Venezia*, pp. 45–47; Lopez, “Il Problema della bilancia dei pagamenti nel commercio di Levante,” *Venezia e il levante*, ed. Pertusi, I-1, 431–451.

terranean in the thirteenth century, which presupposes a tremendous production and export of Venetian silver coin in this century.

The Venetians did not need a gold coin yet, but by 1252 Genoa and Florence began to mint gold coins. The genovino and the florin were struck at the same weight and fineness as the old good standard full-weight Byzantine hyperperon. Probably the growing scarcity of good hyperperi and the increased availability of gold bullion brought about this action. Venice did not take this step for another generation. Apparently its output of silver grossi, fueled by increasing imports of silver bullion from Germany and Hungary, and the use of Levantine gold hyperperi, satisfied its needs. The restored Palaeologi in Constantinople struck a silver coin to rival the grosso but containing less silver. At this challenge Venice in 1282 struck its first gold ducat, later known as *zecchino*. It had the same weight and fineness as the florin, the genovino, and the old good full-weight hyperperon. Venice minted this gold coin for five hundred years, with only two tiny debasements in the sixteenth century. Venice did not strike as many gold ducats in the thirteenth century as in later centuries. It was not recognized or used nearly so extensively in the eastern trade at this time as were the Venetian silver grosso or the Florentine gold florin, both of which were accepted from one end of the Mediterranean to the other in 1300.

In addition to the spread and acceptance of Venetian coin throughout the Mediterranean, the thirteenth century also gives evidence of Venice's position as chief creditor of the Latin east. Already, in 1124, Venice had financed the patriarch of Jerusalem and the Latin knights at the siege of Tyre, and Venetian credit, of course, also financed the Fourth Crusade.<sup>189</sup> The division of the spoils in Constantinople as well as the Treaty of Partition were repayment to Venice for its financial and naval assistance. Individual Venetians during the Latin empire financed impecunious rulers. For example, the Ghisi lent money both to the king of Hungary and to the Venetian duke of Naxos. Only the Venetians could assemble the vast sums necessary to finance the later Latin emperors in Constantinople. In 1238 they advanced 13,134 gold hyperperi to the Frankish barons in Constantinople in return for the pledge of the Crown of Thorns, which was later redeemed by Louis IX of France. Again, between 1248 and 1258, the Ferro brothers, Venetian merchants in Constantinople, advanced a huge sum of money to the last Latin emperor, Baldwin II, in security for which he gave the Venetians the custody of his only son and heir, Philip.

189. For example, see Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo, *Documenti*, I, no. 462.

Philip's mother, the empress Mary of Brienne, finally received the money to redeem her son from Alfonso X of Castile, and the young man was free by 1261.<sup>190</sup> These examples suggest that the Venetians in these decades possessed the greatest financial resources in the eastern Mediterranean.

Money is one Venetian commodity which circulated more widely and in greater quantities in the thirteenth century, and documents suggest other commodities which similarly increased in thirteenth-century Venetian commerce. More references appear to the production and export of agricultural products from Venetian colonies in this century than survive from earlier centuries. Grain, olive oil, wine, and cheese came from Crete, wine from the Moreote ports of Coron and Modon, grain and olive oil from Negroponte. Tyre sent cotton, sugar, dyestuffs, and glass. At the end of the century the Crimea sent wheat, as well as furs and slaves. Venetian shipping seems to have completely supplanted the earlier Greek intercoastal trade in the Aegean. The peoples in the eastern Mediterranean demanded more Italian and Flemish textiles, and European merchants brought them to Venice by way of the river systems of north Italy or the Alpine passes. The Venetians then exported more of these textiles to the east. These commodities and probably others added to the volume of earlier Venetian trade and supplemented the luxury goods from the east and the raw materials from Europe which had been the basis of twelfth-century trade and which were discussed earlier.

Technological changes in shipping also gave the Venetians greater ability to expand their seaborne commerce in the thirteenth century. These changes have been called the nautical and commercial revolution.<sup>191</sup> Portolani, early marine charts with drawings of land forms, became more common and the compass came into regular use. New types of vessels appeared. Triremes began to replace biremes, heralding the fourteenth-century development of the great galleys with their greater capacity and crews. Soon after 1300 the great round sailing ships of the Mediterranean were also transformed. During the thirteenth century trading voyages from Italy to the Levant took on a regular rhythm. Previously the Venetian voyages to Syria had probably not been regularly scheduled, although armed convoys regularly sailed the Adriatic in the twelfth century. The Venetian *muda* system seems to have been organized about 1230. Then Venetian convoys

190. Wolff, "Mortgage and Redemption of an Emperor's Son," pp. 45-84.

191. Lane, *Venice, a Maritime Republic*, pp. 119-152.



began to travel from Venice to Constantinople, to Cyprus-Armenia-Syria, and to Alexandria. According to the Venetian maritime statutes of 1233, Venetian vessels in the spring *muda*, which had carried pilgrims to the Levant, were advised to leave Syria for the return voyage on May 8; vessels in the fall *muda* had to depart for Venice on October 8. Venetian vessels setting out from Venice for voyages on the summer *muda* to Cape Malea on the Morea had to prepare to leave Venice by mid-August.<sup>192</sup>

Similarly, in the early thirteenth century the Genoese changed their sailing schedule. Earlier the Genoese dispatched their fleets to the Levant in late September and early October. In 1205, however, the vessels left Genoa shortly after May 20. This was probably dictated by the severe losses of ships in their home port on October 11, 1204, just before their departure for Ultramar, Ceuta, and other markets. "A spring *muda* was certainly foreshadowed, and the Genoese were about to bring their overseas and overland trade with the fairs of Champagne into better harmony."<sup>193</sup>

The growth of Venetian commerce and wealth was paralleled by the growth of Venetian population.<sup>194</sup> The city of Venice itself welcomed newcomers. In the thirteenth century they arrived from the Italian mainland nearby, from Treviso, Padua, Ferrara, Verona, Vicenza, and Istria. Men also immigrated to Venice from other regions of northern Italy, especially from Milan, Florence, and Lucca and their environs. The men whom the Venetians called Germans came from Austria, Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary. In the thirteenth century they were organized as a German colony in Venice in the *Fondaco dei Tedeschi*. Seafaring men also came to Venice from the Adriatic coasts of Apulia and Dalmatia. Jews, Greeks, and Franks also appear as permanent residents. This varying multitude, drawn to Venice by the economic opportunity of the great port city, was assimilated into the Venetian population. Some even gained Venetian citizenship. The thirteenth-century records show no attempt to limit immigration into Venice, nor to deny these men the rights of Venetian citizenship after a certain term of residence.

Not only did foreigners come into Venice, but the Venetians themselves left Venice to take up residence in the east. Every Venetian col-

192. Hans E. Mayer, *The Crusades*, tr. John Gillingham (Oxford, 1972), p. 220; Luzzatto, "Navigazione di linea e navigazione libera," *Studi di storia*, p. 54; Lane, "Fleets and Fairs," *Venice and History*, pp. 128-129; *Gli Statuti marittimi veneziani*, ed. Predelli and Sacerdoti, pp. 69-70, 74-75.

193. Slessarev, see above, note 186.

194. Luzzatto, *Storia economica di Venezia*, pp. 38-41, 58-61.

only records the presence of resident Italians who maintained their Venetian citizenship and yet lived with wives and children in one of the far-flung outposts of the Venetian colonial empire. After years or even generations in residence in an overseas colony, these citizens could return to the home city and be accepted as Venetians. Some indigenous inhabitants of the Venetian overseas colonies also could claim Venetian citizenship in certain cases. To be a Venetian entitled one to the protection of the Republic at home and abroad, and also to the special commercial privileges of Venice.

It has been suggested that the number of inhabitants in the city of Venice in 1300 was about 100,000, which would place Venice among the three largest cities of western Europe, the others being Paris and Naples. The total number of people who called themselves Venetians must have been much greater, if one includes the Venetian residents of all the seaports and islands of the Mediterranean. The Venetians could also draw from an even greater manpower pool to fill their war fleets, since subject and allied cities were expected to contribute ships and men.

Alongside the Venetian growth in numbers and wealth during the years of colonial expansion after the Fourth Crusade, the rich merchant princes of Venice continued to strengthen the Venetian government. These wealthy old noble families had controlled the Venetian state since they had put down the insurrection in 1171 and chosen the businessmen doges of the late twelfth century. The thirteenth-century Venetian governmental regulations were not nearly so restrictive as the rules of later centuries.<sup>195</sup> Since only Venetians could engage in the profitable overseas trade, and since Venice, unlike Florence, did not organize guilds for overseas commerce, navigation, and banking, these occupations were scarcely restricted until the end of the thirteenth century. Foreign businessmen in Venice were much more closely regulated. The artisans of Venice, the small shopkeepers, and the service professions were organized into guilds with written statutes, corporate identity, and ceremonial distinction. The reign of doge Lorenzo Tiepolo (1268–1275) produced the first significant number of these guild statutes. The councils and chief magistrates of the city had their functions and membership more narrowly defined, while the number of public offices proliferated.

The oligarchy further limited the doge with the rewriting of each ducal oath of office. They attempted to limit factional strife by de-

195. Lane, *Venice, a Maritime Republic*; *idem*, "The Enlargement of the Great Council of Venice," *Florilegium historiale* (Toronto, 1971), pp. 236–274.

veloping a complex system for ducal elections and by defining the membership in the Great Council. The Great Council in this century became the chief Venetian legislative body and also the body which elected men to the growing number of public offices. The Great Council defined and enlarged itself in 1297; this was the "closing of the Great Council" (*Serrata del Maggior Consiglio*). These domestic responses to external change were recorded in the laws of Venice, and in the records of its councils and magistrates. These public records survive from the thirteenth century, after the fire in the Venetian public archives of 1223. Written laws and governmental regulations assisted the oligarchy to maintain its control of Venice.

Throughout these centuries Venice had vigorously expanded its trade, its colonies, its population, and its wealth. In the twelfth century Venetian businessmen had exercised their privileges in the Byzantine empire, lived under their own laws in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, and sent trading voyages to Moslem Egypt. After the Fourth Crusade, Venetians had greater rights in Rumania and ruled many islands of the Aegean. In the thirteenth century Venice obtained commercial privileges in Egypt, Tunis, Cilician Armenia, Konya, and the Black Sea coasts. During these crusading centuries, Venice became in fact the "queen of the Adriatic" and the ruler of the richest commercial empire in the Mediterranean.