

VI

SOCIAL EVOLUTION IN LATIN GREECE

Latin expansion into Byzantine territory – “Romania” – took place in several closely related fields: in addition to military and political aspects, it had also economic, demographic, and ecclesiastical repercussions. Military expansion with its political consequences is no doubt

Published sources, studies, and bibliographies bearing on Latin Greece are numerous. Therefore only publications with a direct bearing on the subject of this chapter are cited here, especially those which have been published in the last twenty years or so and present new evidence or interpretation.

Treatments of the history of Latin Greece or parts of it, accompanied by extensive bibliographies, have appeared in several recent studies. For the general background see the concise account by Kenneth M. Setton, “The Latins in Greece and the Aegean from the Fourth Crusade to the End of the Middle Ages,” in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, IV-1, ed. Joan Hussey (1966), 389–420, 908–938, and the detailed treatment in the first volume of his *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)* (Philadelphia, 1976). Jean Longnon has studied the Frankish states in Greece in his *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949), and the same states to 1311 in volume II of the present work, pp. 235–274, and Peter Topping has dealt with Frankish Morea from 1311 to 1460 in volume III, pp. 104–166; see also Antoine Bon, *La Morée franque: Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)* (2 vols., Paris, 1969), and the revised edition of Denis A. Zakythinos, *Le Despotat grec de Morée* (London, 1975; originally published in Paris and Athens, 1932–1953), with updated bibliographies in vol. I, pp. 359–371, and vol. II, pp. 381–403. Venetian Greece has been extensively treated by Freddy Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au moyen-âge: le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIIe–XVe siècles)*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1975), with an updated bibliography, pp. 467–481; see also Louise Buenger Robbert, “Venice and the Crusades,” in volume V of the present work, chapter IX. An extensive bibliography has been compiled by Manousos I. Manousacas, “L'Isola di Creta sotto il dominio veneziano: Problemi e ricerche,” in *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV*, ed. Agostino Pertusi (Atti del I Convegno internazionale di storia della civiltà veneziana; Florence, 1973), I-2, 473–514. On the history of the Catalans in Greece see Setton, in volume III of the present work, chapters VI and VII, pp. 167–277, and his *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311–1388*, rev. ed. (London, 1975). Numerous studies published by Raymond-Joseph Loenertz, some of which have a bearing on the subject treated here, have been republished in his two volumes of *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca* (Rome, 1970–1978). The same holds true of the studies of Anthony Luttrell, republished in his *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes, Greece and the West (1291–1440)* (London, 1978), and his *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades, 1291–1440* (London, 1982). Genoese Chios has not been treated here; on this subject, see the recent book by Michel Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIIe-début du XVe siècle)* (2 vols., Rome, 1978).

best known. It began in the early thirteenth century, during and following the Fourth Crusade, which was a turning-point in the political history of Romania. Within a few years Frankish knights, the Venetian state, and several Italian adventurers acting on their own behalf conquered extensive areas of the Byzantine empire, some of which re-

Among the sources reflecting the structure and evolution of society in the feudalized areas of Latin Greece, the *Assizes of Romania* are the most important. This legal treatise compiled in the Morea has been edited and translated into French by Georges Recoura, *Les Assises de Romanie* (Paris, 1930); an English translation and a study of it have been made by Topping, *Feudal Institutions as Revealed in the Assizes of Romania, the Law Code of Frankish Greece* (Philadelphia, 1949). Corrections to the text and previous translations, as well as a thorough study of the *Assizes*, have appeared in David Jacoby, *La Féodalité en Grèce médiévale: les 'Assises de Romanie': Sources, application et diffusion* (Paris, 1971); see also *idem*, "Les Archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque," *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation byzantines*, II (1967), 421-481, reprinted in his *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine (XIIIe-XVe siècles)* (London, 1975).

The *Chronicle of the Morea* presents a vivid description of feudal society in the Morea. On the four versions of the *Chronicle*, of which the French seems definitely to be the original, see Jacoby, "Quelques considérations sur les versions de la 'Chronique de Morée'," *Journal des Savants* (1968), pp. 133-189, reprinted in his *Société et démographie* (cited above); see also M. J. Jeffreys, "The Chronicle of the Morea: Priority of the Greek Version," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LXVIII (1975), 304-350, whose claim it is impossible to accept on historical grounds. Although at times faulty, the chronicle of Marino Sanudo Torsello, "Istoria del regno di Romania," in Charles (Carl) Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin, 1873; repr. 1966), pp. 99-170, is an invaluable source for the Morea and especially the Aegean lordships in the second half of the thirteenth century. The letters of Sanudo provide evidence by a contemporary till 1337, especially on Euboea: on their edition and dating see Jacoby, "Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Romanie (1305-1332): un nouveau témoignage de Marino Sanudo Torsello," *Studi medievali*, ser. 3, XV (1974), 217-223.

Documentary evidence on the Morea for the reigns of Charles I and Charles II of Anjou, kings of Sicily, who from 1278 on interfered directly in the life of the principality, is to be found in Riccardo Filangieri et al., eds., *I Registri della cancellaria angioina*, vols. I-XXXII (Naples, 1950 ff.), which supersedes all previous publications of documents from the Angevin archives of Naples; for the period of Charles II see also Charles Perrat and Longnon, *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée, 1289-1300* (Paris, 1967). Longnon and Topping, *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1969), provides invaluable evidence on landholding, agricultural exploitation, and the status of the peasantry, which corroborates the information found in the *Assizes of Romania*; see also Jacoby's review in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LXIX (1976), 87-92. Ernst Gerland, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Erzbistums Patras* (Leipzig, 1903), includes documents on the Morea and Venetian Messenia dealing with similar problems.

In view of the position of Venice in the eastern Mediterranean and particularly in Latin Greece, it is not surprising that Venetian documents should be of utmost importance for the whole area. They await an exhaustive examination, and most of them remain unpublished. Official documents or summaries thereof are included in the following publications (only the main ones are mentioned here): *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), and Roberto Cessi, *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia* (3 vols., Bologna, 1931-1950), up to 1300; Giuseppe Giomo, *I 'Misti' del senato della repubblica veneta, 1293-1331* (Venice, 1887). Georg M. Thomas and Riccardo Predelli, *Diploma-*

mained for two centuries or more under Latin rule; such was the case with Crete, most of the Peloponnesus (Morea), Attica, Boeotia, and Euboea, as well as numerous other islands of the Aegean. This chapter deals with these areas of Greece down to about 1450.

In the political sphere, the most striking result of the Latin con-

tarium veneto-levantinum (2 vols., Venice, 1880-1899), and Constantin N. Sathas, *Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au moyen âge* (9 vols., Athens and Paris, 1880-1890), for the period from 1300 on. Thiriet, *Régestes des délibérations du sénat de Venise concernant la Romanie* (3 vols., Paris, 1958-1961), and *Délibérations des assemblées vénitiennes concernant la Romanie* (2 vols., Paris, 1966-1971), cover the whole period.

Venetian documents bearing exclusively on Crete have been published by Spyridon M. Theotokos, *Apophaseis Meizonos Symbolou Venetias, 1255-1689* (Athens, 1933), and *Thespismata tēs Venetikēs Gerousias, 1281-1385* (2 vols., Athens, 1936-1937), and for the last seventy of the years treated here, by Hippolyte Noiret, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485* (Paris, 1892). Numerous files have been preserved in the Archivio del Duca di Candia, a section of the Archivio di Stato in Venice. A selection from these documents has been made by Gerland, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Kandia* (Strassburg, 1899), and by Johannes Jegerlehner, "Beiträge zur Verwaltungsgeschichte Kandias im XIV. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XIII (1904), 435-479. Systematic publication of files by the "Comitato per la pubblicazione delle fonti relative alla storia di Venezia" is slowly proceeding. P. Ratti Vidulich has edited two volumes of public documents: *Duca di Candia, Bandi (1313-1329)* (Venice, 1965), and *Duca di Candia, Quaternus Consiliorum (1340-1350)* (Venice, 1976). Freddy Thiriet has edited *Duca di Candia, Ducali e lettere ricevute (1358-1360; 1402-1405)* (Venice, 1978). Numerous unpublished documents appear in Giorgio Fedalto, *La Chiesa latina in Oriente*, vol. 3: *Documenti veneziani* (Verona, 1978).

Notarial documents reflect accurately the rhythm of daily life and provide insight into social and economic structures and institutions. Several hundred notarial registers are preserved in the Archivio del Duca di Candia; only five have been published so far, the last four in the Venetian "Fonti" series: Antonino Lombardo, ed., *Imbreviature di Pietro Scardon (1271)* (Turin, 1942); Mario Chiaudano and Lombardo, eds., *Leonardo Marcello, notaio in Candia (1278-1281)* (Venice, 1960); Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca, ed., *Benvenuto de Brixano, notaio in Candia (1301-1302)* (Venice, 1950); Lombardo, ed., *Zaccaria de Fredo, notaio in Candia (1352-1357)* (Venice, 1968); Salvatore Carbone, ed., *Pietro Pizolo, notaio in Candia (1300)* (Venice, 1978). Elisabeth Santschi has summarized several files of judicial and administrative documents, which are equally valuable, in *Régestes des arrêts civils et des mémoriaux (1363-1399) des archives du duc de Crète* (Bibliothèque de l'Institut hellénique d'études byzantines et postbyzantines de Venise, 9; Venice, 1976). Loenertz, *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel, 1207-1390* (Florence, 1975), has edited and commented on an important selection of documents and other sources bearing on Crete and the Aegean islands. The same author has summarized, edited, and commented on numerous documents in several studies republished in his *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, especially I, 329-369, 503-536, and II, 141-393. The fifteenth-century work of Laurentius de Monachis, *Chronicon de rebus Venetis ab U.C. ad annum MCCCLIV* (Venice, 1758), is based on an intimate knowledge of documents and is most precious for Cretan history. For Catalan Greece the reader will consult the almost exhaustive collection by Antoni Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari de l'Orient català (1301-1409)* (Barcelona, 1947); the dating of twenty documents has been corrected by Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatras: Régestes et notices pour servir à l'histoire des duchés catalans (1311-1394)," *AFP*, XXV (1955), 100-212, reprinted in his *Byzantina et Franco-Graeca*, II, 183-393.

Papal correspondence bearing on the Roman and Greek churches and relations between their members has appeared mainly in the calendars published by the École française de Rome; for details see Leonard E. Boyle, *A Survey of the Vatican Archives and of its Medieval Holdings*

quest was the extreme fragmentation of Romania after 1204, in marked contrast to the earlier unity of Byzantium. To a large extent, this fragmentation explains the diversity of the political and social regimes instituted by the Latins, as well as the nature and orientation of the

(Toronto, 1972), esp. pp. 123–127; see also the volumes edited on behalf of the PC, *Fontes*, ser. 3: *Vaticani* (Vatican City, 1943–1960, and Rome, 1961 ff.).

Until recently only moderate attention has been devoted to the social history of Latin Greece. This chapter aims at reconstructing the dynamics of social evolution resulting from the encounter of Latin conquerors and settlers with the indigenous population, overwhelmingly Greek; for lack of space, small minorities such as the Jews, the Slavs, the Albanians, and the Armenians have not been treated here. Besides, an attempt has been made to study feudalized and non-feudalized areas in a comparative framework. This method has enabled us to trace Byzantine continuity in the social, legal, and institutional spheres. With the help of material relevant to Latin Greece it has thus been possible to supplement the available documentation on Byzantine Greece before 1204. This approach is illustrated in three recent studies by Jacoby, whose views differ on many points from those of previous authors: "The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade," *American Historical Review*, LXXVIII (1973), 873–906; "Une Classe fiscale à Byzance et en Romanie latine: les inconnus du fisc, éléuthères ou étrangers," *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des études byzantines*, II (Bucharest, 1975), 139–152; and "Les États latins en Romanie: Phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204–1350 environ)," *XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines, Rapports et co-rapports*, I: *Histoire*, sect. 3 (Athens, 1976). The present chapter relies heavily on these studies, all reprinted in Jacoby's *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle: Peuples, sociétés, économies* (London, 1979), as well as on the same author's other studies already cited above; see also Jacoby's "Les Gens de mer dans la marine de guerre vénitienne de la mer Egée aux XIe et XVe siècles," in *Le Genti del mare Mediterraneo*, ed. R. Ragosta (= *XVII Colloquio internazionale di storia marittima, Napoli*, 1980) (Naples, 1981), I, 169–200. On society in Byzantine Greece shortly before the conquest and on Frankish Greece, see the studies by Jacoby just mentioned.

Recent work on the Byzantine upper class in general is by Aleksandr P. Kazhdan, *Social'nyi sostav gosподstvjushchego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow, 1974) [in Russian]; *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*, ed. Michael Angold (BAR International Series, 221; Oxford, 1984), and especially Angold, "Archons and Dynasts: Local Aristocracies and the Cities of the Later Byzantine Empire," *ibid.*, pp. 236–253. On Byzantine Greece in particular see Judith Herrin, "Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government: Hellas and Peloponnesos, 1180–1205," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, XXIX (1975), 253–284. Antonio Carile, "Sulla Pronoia nel Peloponneso bizantino anteriormente alla conquista latina," *Zbornik Radova*, XVI (1975), 55–61, has contested the conclusions of Jacoby on the *pronoia*. On Frankish Greece see also Longnon, *Les Compagnons de Villehardouin: Recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade* (Geneva and Paris, 1978), a mine of information on many of the Frankish conquerors and their family background; this work, however, requires additions and corrections. See also Gherardo Ortalli, *Da Canossa a Tebe: Vicende di una famiglia feudale tra XII e XIII secolo* (Padova, 1983).

On the class ethos of the Franks and the Greek feudatories in Morea see Jacoby, "La Littérature française dans les états latins de la Méditerranée orientale à l'époque des croisades: Diffusion et création," in *Essor et fortune de la chanson de geste dans l'Europe et l'Orient latin: Actes du IXe Congrès international de la Société Rencvals pour l'étude des épopées romanes (Padoue-Venise, 1982)* (Modena, 1984), pp. 617–646, and *idem*, "Knightly Values and Class Consciousness in the Crusader States of the Eastern Mediterranean," *Mediterranean Historical Review*, I (1986), 158–186. On landholders and peasants see also Angeliki E. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire: a Social and Demographic Study* (Princeton, 1977), who refers to the pre-1204 period and Frankish Morea, yet does not always offer convincing interpretations, and Topping, "Le Régime agraire dans le Péloponnèse latin au XIVe siècle," *L'Hellén-*

economic activity and demographic currents in this area after 1204. Although the conquest resulted in a definite break in the political sphere, it did not bring about a similar phenomenon in the social or economic field. Latin Romania witnessed the encounter of various ethnic com-

isme contemporain, ser. 2, X (1956), 255–295, reprinted in his *Studies on Latin Greece A.D. 1205–1715* (London, 1977). Carile, *La Rendita feudale nella Morea latina del XIV secolo* (Bologna, 1974), is a partly unsuccessful attempt to deal with the society and the economy of the Morea; cf. Jacoby's review in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LXXIII (1980), 356–361. See also Carile, "Rapporti fra signoria rurale e *despoteia* alla luce della formazione della rendita feudale nella Morea latina del secolo XIV," *Rivista storica italiana*, LXXXVIII (1976), 548–570.

On the Aegean see Silvano Borsari, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1966), which should be corrected and supplemented by Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, part III, and "Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens" (both cited above). In addition to his synthesis on the Venetian empire, Thiriet has published numerous articles, several of which are now available in his *Études sur la Romanie gréco-vénitienne (Xe–XVe siècles)* (London, 1977); see especially "La Condition paysanne et les problèmes d'exploitation rurale en Romanie gréco-vénitienne," previously published in *Studi veneziani*, IX (1967), pp. 35–70, and "Villes et campagnes en Crète vénitienne aux XIVe–XVe siècles," reprinted from *Actes du IIe Congrès international des études du sud-est européen*, II (Athens, 1972), 447–459. See also Borsari, *Il Dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1963), which includes numerous excerpts of unpublished documents. Santschi has dealt in several studies with legal problems in Crete; two of them are particularly relevant: *La Notion de "feudum" en Crète vénitienne (XIIIe–XVe siècles)* (Montreux, 1976), is useful on the status of military tenures in Crete, but mistaken about "feudalism" in the island. Her study on "Quelques aspects du statut des non-libres en Crète au XIVe siècle," *Thesaurismata*, IX (1972), 104–136, is partly based on unpublished sources; it requires emendation on many points. Although dealing mainly with a later period, B. J. Slot, *Archipelagus turbatus: les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation ottomane c. 1500–1718* (2 vols., Istanbul, 1982), proves useful for our purposes.

Setton has written on society in Catalan Greece in his *Catalan Domination* and in "Catalan Society in the Fourteenth Century," *Essays in Memory of Basil Laourdas* (Thessalonica, 1975), pp. 241–284. On the early years of the Catalan Company in the duchy see Jacoby, "La 'Compagnie catalane' et l'état catalan de Grèce: Quelques aspects de leur histoire," *Journal des Savants* (1966), pp. 78–103.

Slavery in the eastern Mediterranean is treated in the recent work by Charles Verlinden, *L'Esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale*, II (Ghent, 1977), which supersedes all his previous studies on the subject; see also Elizabeth A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415)* (Venice, 1983).

Various aspects of social, economic, and religious antagonism or accommodation between the Latins and the Greeks have been treated in numerous publications cited above and also recently in the following studies: Topping, "Viticulture in Venetian Crete (XIIIth C.)," *Fourth International Cretological Congress (1976)*, *Acta*, II (Athens, 1981), 509–520; *idem*, "Co-existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete," republished in his *Studies on Latin Greece*. Thiriet, "La Symbiose dans les états latins formés sur les territoires de la *Romania* byzantine (1202 à 1261); phénomènes religieux," was, like the previous one, a paper for the *XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines, Rapports et co-rapports*, I, sect. 3 (Athens, 1976); see also *idem*, "Églises, fidèles et clergés en Crète vénitienne (de la conquête 1204/1211 au XVe siècle)," in *Fourth International Cretological Congress, Acta*, II, 484–500; in addition, Fedalto, *La Chiesa latina in Oriente*, I (2nd rev. ed.; Verona, 1981), and III (mentioned above); Setton, *The Papacy* (cited above). See also Laiou, "Quelques observations sur l'économie et la société de Crète vénitienne (ca. 1270–ca. 1305)," in *Bisanzio e l'Italia: Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi* (Milan, 1982), pp. 177–198, and her "Observations on the Results of the Fourth Crusade: Greeks and Latins in Port and Market," *Medievalia et humanistica*, n.s., XII (1984),

munities as well as social groups and classes. The Latin conquerors faced an indigenous population, predominantly Greek, whose social structure, institutions, legal traditions, and mentality differed from their own. The encounter of westerners and Byzantines resulted in continuity in certain spheres, a break in others, and accommodation elsewhere. An investigation of the character, stages, and limitations of this encounter requires a survey of the structure of Byzantine society before 1204, an examination of the Latin impact, and an evaluation of the social, legal, and institutional evolution generated in both societies by the conquest.

Recognition of the clear-cut distinction between slaves and free men is fundamental to the understanding of Byzantine society.¹ Legally, all free men were equal; in practice, however, obvious social and economic differences existed, yet they did not generate legal classes, as in the west at the same period. The same holds true of imperial privileges granted on an individual basis or collectively: the grantees remained justiciable according to Byzantine common law. The classification of free men as "powerful" (*dynatoi*) or "weak" (*ptochoi*) lacked precision. It is indicative of the absence of a rigid system of social stratification and of well-defined legal classes; this was still the case in the twelfth century. A restricted measure of social mobility enabled men of lowly origin to gain access to the elite by displaying efficiency in the imperial administration or the army, or by serving powerful men. The status of the *paroikos* or dependent peasant was somewhat exceptional in the Byzantine framework; although legally free and answerable as such to public courts, he was subject also to personal restrictions and was tied to his lord by links of dependence of a legal nature.

In the western provinces, as elsewhere in the empire, land was the major source of wealth, power, and prestige. Society was essentially rural in character. It was dominated by an upper class lacking legal definition, embracing great landlords, imperial officials, and imperial dignitaries. The use of the term "archon" for all these powerful men

47-60. A. R. Lewis, "The Catalan Failure in Acculturation in Frankish Greece and the Islamic World during the Fourteenth Century," *Viator*, XI (1980), 361-369, does not point to the main reasons for this phenomenon, examined below.

This study has been prepared with the help of a grant provided by the American Philosophical Society in 1977, and has been revised and updated since.

1. On Byzantine society and the archontes see Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 875-876, 879-883, and "Les États latins," pp. 4-7, where the reader will find extensive bibliographical references. See also Kazhdan, *Social'nyi sostav*. On the Slav archontes of the Peloponnesus see below, note 14.

clearly indicates that they were often identical. One occasionally would make a distinction between the rich landlord or *ktematikos archon* and the official in charge of civilian administration or the military officer, known respectively as *thematikos* and *tagmatikos archon*, who exercised authority from the urban center over a district which at times was limited to a city and its neighboring territory. In certain cases the emperor recognized the authority and traditional status of the chiefs of foreign populations which had settled in the empire; by conferring on them imperial titles, he strengthened their position. It is therefore not surprising that they too were considered as archontes. This was the case with the chiefs of Slav groups who preserved their tribal structure in the Peloponnesus, such as the Melings of Mount Taygetus.

The great provincial landlords were not content with the power deriving from their estates. In order to enhance their prestige and social ascendancy they strove to acquire administrative or military functions within the imperial machine of government or honorary titles in the imperial hierarchy. Imperial grants of offices and court titles ensured their coöperation. On the eve of the conquest, several great landlords of Crete and the Peloponnesus bore court titles, and some had close relations with the imperial court. A Cretan archon who was a *magistros* and "friend of the emperor" traveled to Constantinople and persuaded Isaac II Angelus (1185–1195) to grant an estate to the bishop of Calamona (Retimo) for his lifetime.² Leo Sgouros, an archon of Nauplia in the Peloponnesus, married the daughter of ex-emperor Alexius III Angelus (1195–1203) in 1204. The association of the archontes with the church was often quite close, since some of their relatives served as church dignitaries or officials. Besides, the patronage of ecclesiastical institutions enhanced their prestige and, occasionally, also their income, whenever they obtained the management of these institutions and their property.

Powerful archontes also developed in their own interests a network of personal bonds of dependence, yet these always retained their private nature and were never recognized by law or sanctioned by custom. They were thus basically different from western vassalage. Dependents, real or fictitious relatives, and allies occasionally constituted a large family or a real clan.³ It is within this framework that the *archontopouloi* of Crete and the Peloponnesus were to be found. In the early thirteenth century, these were not just "sons of archontes", but a par-

2. See text in Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 18, note 26.

3. See an example *ibid.*, p. 60: in the late thirteenth century, four *famiglie* were supposed to include about two thousand *prole* or descendants.

ticular group situated at a lower rank than the archontes within the social elite.

Although landed property constituted the principal source of their income, many archontes resided in cities, especially in those which served as administrative, military, or ecclesiastical centers, such as Athens, Thebes, Monemvasia, Corinth, or Nauplia. Those who lived within the urban enclosure of a *kastron* or the fortified acropolis overlooking a city were sometimes called *kastrenoi* or "dwellers of a fortified city", as in Athens. Yet not all archontes lived in urban centers. The leaders of the Slav populations of the Taygetus and most of the Cretan archontes presumably resided on their rural estates, in the midst of their followers and dependents; such would also be the case after the Latin conquest. It has already been mentioned that occasionally the emperor granted privileges to individuals, to ecclesiastical institutions, or collectively to the inhabitants of a city or territory, like those of Monemvasia. These privileges, which were mostly of a fiscal nature, did not entail a definitive alienation of state prerogatives or the development of private jurisdiction.

Among the various grants awarded, the *pronoia* has drawn particular attention.⁴ Literally "provision", it consisted of a concession of state revenues to an individual who collected them directly; to effect this the emperor transferred to the recipient certain peasants and the imperial land they cultivated. The *pronoia* originated in the late eleventh or early twelfth century and became more widespread under emperor Manuel I Comnenus (1143–1180). It has been claimed that the *pronoia* was the counterpart of the western fief, the basis of the imperial military system, and a major factor in the so-called "feudalization" of the empire, which allegedly led to its downfall. Furthermore, the similarity between a *pronoia* and a fief supposedly explains why the Latin conquerors found it so easy to adapt to Byzantine conditions. The foregoing examination of Byzantine society has already emphasized that it differed fundamentally from feudal society. For our purpose here it is essential to discover how widespread the *pronoia* was in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries in the regions of Greece conquered by the Latins.

It is rather striking that no contemporary source ever mentions the existence of *pronoiai* or *pronoia* holders. A privilege delivered in 1183 by the duke of Crete, Constantine Ducas, confirmed the property of George Skordilis and his brothers, members of an archontic family.

4. On the *pronoia* see Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 876–879, with bibliographical references to previous work on the subject.

Pronoiai are mentioned in the preamble of this document, together with patrimonial estates, in what clearly appears to be a current formula used by the imperial administration. The provisions of the privilege mention, however, only hereditary property. The preamble may therefore provide evidence as to the existence and diffusion of the *pronoia* in the empire, although not to its extent. It certainly does not prove that *pronoiai* were to be found in Crete before 1204, nor can one deduce this from a grant of Cretan imperial land made in 1170–1171.⁵ The main argument in favor of a wide diffusion of the *pronoia* in the empire before 1204 rests on the Greek version of the *Chronicle of the Morea*. However, this is a late source deriving from a French original; it obviously reflects conditions existing in the second half of the fourteenth century in the principality of the Morea, an area feudalized after its conquest by the Frankish knights. The Greek *Chronicle* was presumably composed between 1341 and 1388 by a Greek archon who was firmly integrated into the class of feudatories of the principality.⁶ His work is therefore not a valid source for a description of Byzantine social and institutional realities at the time of the conquest, about a century and a half earlier. In view of his social standing, it is not surprising that the author was familiar with feudal institutions. His use of *pronoia* as the equivalent of fief and of archon as the counterpart of knight may be explained by the absorption of the archontes into the feudal hierarchy of the Morea, as well as by the evolution of the Byzantine *pronoia* in the period of the Palaeologi and the knowledge thereof in the principality; indeed the *pronoia* gradually evolved into a hereditary tenure, its military nature became more pronounced, and it then resembled the western fief more than it previously had.⁷

It should also be noted that the *Assizes of Romania*, a legal treatise compiled in the Morea between 1333 and 1346, had retained various provisions of Byzantine law as they existed before the Latin conquest.⁸ There is no trace, however, of the *pronoia*. Although called fiefs, the landed estates of the Greek archontes of the Morea mentioned in the *Assizes* were not analogous to Frankish fiefs, nor were they subject to feudal law; their transfer and succession, as well as the constitution

5. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," p. 7–8.

6. See Jacoby, "Quelques considérations," pp. 150–158 and 187 on this version; Jeffreys, "The Chronicle of the Morea," pp. 304–350, attempts to prove that the prototype was written in Greek. It is impossible, however, to deal with the subject only on a literary and philological basis. The social context has to be taken into account, and it is unlikely that Greeks should have praised the deeds of the Franks before the latter did so.

7. See especially Jacoby, "Les Archontes grecs," pp. 429–439.

8. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 75–82, on the dating of the *Assizes*, and pp. 32–38, on Byzantine law therein.

of a dower, reveal that they were in fact patrimonial estates governed by Byzantine law. To sum up, there is no evidence of the *pronoia* before 1204 in the territories of Greece conquered by the Latins.⁹ This is rather surprising, considering the general evidence for its existence in the Byzantine empire. Specific references to Greece may be lacking because sources bearing on this region are scant, or because the diffusion of the *pronoia* in the empire may have been more limited, quantitatively and geographically, than is commonly assumed; at any rate, it is quite obvious that the *pronoia* was not the dominant form of possession of landed property at this period. The possible annexation of *pronoiai* by local archontes who assimilated them to their patrimonial estates is also to be taken into account, especially in the political context of the period immediately preceding, and contemporaneous with, the Latin conquest, with the disappearance of the curbing restraint of the imperial authority.

There can be no doubt that the weakening of the imperial government after the death of Manuel I Comnenus in 1180 enabled the expansion of the large estates, both lay and ecclesiastical, especially at the expense of the small landholders and the state. In 1198 Michael Choniates, the metropolitan of Athens, accused the *kastrenoi* inhabiting this city of using coercion to acquire land in the surrounding countryside. This evolution was accelerated at the time of the Latin conquest. Virtually independent for a few years, the great archontes were able to seize estates of the fisc and, in the Peloponnesus, also appanages of members of the imperial family, as well as property of Constantinopolitan monasteries.¹⁰ It may be conjectured that the grant of such land to their followers enhanced their prestige and authority. The annexation of *pronoiai* at this period is not to be excluded. The Latin conquerors consulted Byzantine cadastral registers with the help of archontes, as in the Morea,¹¹ and gathered oral evidence, as in Crete, which enabled them to detect instances of fraud.¹² It was thus possible

9. See Jacoby, "Les Archontes," pp. 451–463; this is also the case in the areas of Coron and Modon and in the rest of the southern Peloponnesus which came under Venetian rule in 1207: *ibid.*, pp. 426–427, 438–439. Carile, "Sulla pronoia," claims that the *pronoia* existed in the Morea before 1204. However, he (on p. 58) does not take into account that the rules of succession to the "fiefs" of the archontes were entirely different from those applying to fiefs in the areas from which the knights originated.

10. On these estates in the Peloponnesus see Jacoby, "Les Archontes," pp. 423–427.

11. See the French version of the *Chronicle of the Morea, Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée, Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)*, ed. Longnon (Paris, 1911), pars. 107, 120, and the Greek Chronicle, *Chronikon tou Moreos*, ed. John Schmitt (London, 1904), verses 1649–1650, 1831–1835.

12. Texts in Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 17, note 26.

to discover evidence of the usurpation of land that had belonged to the imperial fisc, yet no trace of *pronoiai* was found. It may be that in the cadastral registers annexed *pronoiai* had been disguised as patrimonial estates; as they were already inscribed before 1204 under the name of their beneficiaries, such deception would have been easier than for other land. This conjecture is no doubt tempting, yet only direct evidence will enable us to ascertain the existence and diffusion of the *pronoia* in the areas of Greece conquered by the Latins. For the time being, such evidence is lacking.

The collapse of the Byzantine provincial government shortly before 1204 also had other consequences: the great archontes took over its military, fiscal, and judicial prerogatives.¹³ Especially those who were invested with imperial power or bore court titles took advantage of the new situation.¹⁴ Leo Chamaretos ruled in 1205 over Sparta and the neighboring countryside; Leo Sgouros inherited the tyrannical power of his father in Nauplia and extended his sway over Argolis and the city of Corinth, where another archon succeeded him; in the southern Peloponnesus, yet another archon from the area of Modon convinced Geoffrey of Villehardouin to conquer the peninsula together with him. In Crete the heads of great archontic families fully exercised state prerogatives in the areas which they controlled. The social standing of these archontes, the means at their disposal, their ascendancy over their clients and dependent peasants, and the support they offered to the Greek clergy facing the Latin church, all marked them as leaders of the Greek resistance to the conquerors.¹⁵

In the region under consideration here, it is practically impossible to get a clear view of the groups of society situated below the archontes and *archontopouloi*. Sources referring to city-dwellers other than the archontes are totally lacking. Many questions concerning the status of the peasantry remain unresolved. Peasants subject to a lord or to an ecclesiastical institution and settled on their land were known as *paroikoi*. An issue hotly debated in recent years is whether there still existed free peasants paying fiscal dues directly to the state, or whether these peasants had all been assimilated to the *demosiarioi*

13. On the general situation in the area see Herrin, "Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government"; the author somewhat underestimates the role of the independent archontes.

14. The leaders of Slav groups settled in the Peloponnesus had long before been granted court titles and fiscal privileges, and their traditional status and authority had thereby been strengthened: see the case of the Melings in Hélène G. Ahrweiler, "Le Sébaste, chef de groupes ethniques," *Polychronion, Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag* (Heidelberg, 1966), pp. 35-38.

15. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," p. 11.

paroikoi or dependent peasants of the state.¹⁶ Twelfth-century evidence from Crete does not help to clarify the matter. A charter of 1197 deals with the donation of property by a Cretan to the monastery of Patmos, where the grantor became a monk. According to another charter, drafted in 1193, the vendors of a vineyard had first offered it to the holders of adjoining plots, in accordance with Byzantine law, so as to enable them to exercise their right of preëmption (*protimēsis*); thereafter, the vendors had asked two imperial officers for permission to proceed with the sale. At first glance, this would seem to indicate that they were *paroikoi* of the state, yet no such conclusion can be reached. The two Cretan charters do not inform us about the status of either the grantor or the vendors. Moreover, various sources indicate that the donation and sale of property, as well as the exercise of the right of preëmption, were not peculiar to free peasants. Finally, the transfer of immovable property was severely controlled by the state, as such property was liable to fiscal dues; this may explain why imperial officials intervened in the sale of 1193. Thus the evidence of the two Cretan charters remains inconclusive.¹⁷ The rather meager twelfth-century sources on the Byzantine peasantry in general may be supplemented with later data from areas conquered by the Latins; this procedure is justified by the fact that various provisions of Byzantine law were preserved and applied under their rule.

There can be no doubt that even before 1204, the subjection of the *paroikos* to his lord had become very tight. The subjection of the *paroikos* may have become binding one year after he had been settled by a lord on his land. The acquisition by the lord of definitive rights to his person and that of his descendants was achieved after a period of thirty years, during which the peasant fulfilled his fiscal and manorial obligations. The exercise of a thirty-year prescription is not documented directly for the twelfth century, yet it can be inferred from later sources bearing on Latin Romania. Moreover, it is quite likely that this prescription was already applied in the eleventh century, if not earlier.

16. Opposing views have been expressed by George Ostrogorskij, *Quelques problèmes d'histoire de la paysannerie byzantine* (Brussels, 1956); by Johannes Karayannopoulos, in his review of this study in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, L (1957), 167–182; and recently in *idem*, "Ein Problem der spätbyzantinischen Agrargeschichte," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik*, XXX (1981), 207–237, where he also deals with the pre-1204 period; this author claims that no dependent peasantry existed in Byzantium. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society*, pp. 142–222, 264 (especially 142–158), is of the opinion that the hereditary status of the *paroikos* was not extended to all his offspring before the fourteenth century; this would imply that the subjugation of the *paroikos* to his lord in territories held by the Latins was an innovation introduced by the conquerors. For a different interpretation, see below.

17. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 11–12.

The calculation of the thirty-year period extended not only to the subjection of the dependent person, but also to that of his descendants, at least of his male offspring. This confirms that the status of the *paroikos* was permanent during his lifetime, as well as hereditary. The *paroikos* remained legally free, in strict accordance with Byzantine law, as is clearly illustrated by the fact that he had access to, and testified in, imperial courts. Occasionally he was transferred from one lord to another, yet he could not escape his social status, while paradoxically the slave became free when emancipated by his lord. When the *paroikos* had severed the link of subjection by migrating afar and was no longer inscribed on the cadastral registers as belonging to the estate of his lord, he became "unknown to the fisc" or "free" (*eleutheros*), that is, free of any specific fiscal obligations toward the state and of dependence on a specific lord. It should be emphasized that this "freedom" was only of a fiscal nature, and was temporary; it did not extend to the social status of the *paroikos*, which remained permanent and hereditary. Indeed, the imperial administration considered the *eleutheros* as a *paroikos* of the state or *demosiarios paroikos*, and the same rule applied to persons previously not subjected to any lord, but unable to explain their fiscal status: the assimilation of the latter group to the *paroikoi* of the state implies that the Byzantine peasantry as a whole was of dependent status. The temporary nature of the "freedom" enjoyed by the *eleutheros* is illustrated by the procedure implemented by the imperial administration: once located, he was settled on imperial or state land, or else granted to an individual or an ecclesiastical institution, and became again liable to fiscal dues. He was thereby fully reintegrated into the class of the *paroikoi*.¹⁸

Two documents seem to contradict the assumption that the status of the *paroikos* had already become hereditary before 1204. Imperial privileges delivered respectively to the monastery of Lavra on Mount Athos in 1079 and to that of Eleousa in Macedonia in 1156 granted them the right to increase the number of *paroikoi* exempted from fiscal dues whom they held in their subjection; the additional peasants were to be selected from among their descendants.¹⁹ The exercise of imperial rights over the descendants would seem to indicate that they did not belong to these institutions. A closer examination of these documents reveals, however, that the provisions of the grants aimed only

18. On the *eleutheros* see Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," pp. 139-152.

19. Texts in Paul Lemerle, André Guillou, and Nicolas G. Svoronos, *Actes de Lavra*, I [*Archives de l'Athos*, V] (Paris, 1970), pp. 215-219, no. 38, and Louis Petit, "Le Monastère de Notre Dame de Piti en Macédoine," *Izvestija russkago arkheologicheskago instituta v Konstantinopole*, VI (1900), 28-29, 32-40; see also Ostrogorskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30.

at the creation of additional exempted fiscal units. For this purpose, peasants could of course have been recruited, as in other cases, among the *paroikoi* of the state or the *eleutheroi*, who were temporarily free of tax payments and of subjection to a specific lord. The imperial government was reluctant, however, to grant manpower which it considered as belonging to the state. Instead, it was stipulated that the new fiscal units should be constituted by peasants who were already established on the monasteries' lands. The issue was thus exclusively of a fiscal nature. The status of the descendants of the exempted *paroikoi* was not at stake, and no change in their status was contemplated: they were *paroikoi* of the monasteries before the imperial grants were made, and remained so afterwards.

It is already evident by now that the subjection of the *paroikos* to his lord entailed severe restrictions on his freedom. The lord could prevent him from leaving his land. However, migration did not necessarily sever the link to the lord; subjection was maintained as long as the *paroikos* paid the customary dues incumbent upon the fiscal unit for which he was responsible. The link of the *paroikos* to his lord was thus of a personal nature; he was not tied to the soil. Some degree of mobility among the *paroikoi* is indeed attested. In certain cases, it was due to economic incentives; in others, it was prompted by the urge of the *paroikos* to find a spouse: the high excess of males in many villages, as well as ecclesiastical prohibition of marriage between relatives, inevitably led to exogamy. It is therefore not surprising that members of the same family appeared occasionally in villages of the same lord or on the estates of neighboring landlords, as well as in a nearby city.²⁰

The economic and fiscal unit or *stasis* headed by the dependent peasant was liable to taxes known as *telos*, as well as to labor services or *angareia* which he owed to the state; they were occasionally transferred by the emperor to an individual or an ecclesiastical institution. As a rule, the *stasis* included land. An eleventh-century legal decision rendered by the *magistros* Cosmas specified that land held according to the *paroikikon dikaion* or "law of the *paroikos*" belonged to the lord and could not be alienated by the *paroikos*.²¹ In practice, however, it was inherited, divided among heirs, or partly granted in dower. It may be assumed that in all these cases the lord did not object and possibly even agreed to the transfer of property, as long as the land was held

20. See Jacoby, "Phénomènes de démographie rurale à Byzance aux XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles," *Études rurales*, V-VI (1962), 177, 180-181, 184 (reprinted in Jacoby, *Société et démographie*).

21. Text in Fedor I. Uspenskij, *Actes de Vazelon* (Leningrad, 1927), pp. xxxv-xxxvi. No such problem arose when land was held under a lease, as legal conditions were then duly specified.

by people subject to him and the obligations of the fiscal unit were fulfilled. Restrictions on the rights of the *paroikos* to his lord's land did not prevent him from acquiring full ownership of land and other property by purchase or through agricultural contracts; some of these provided for the division of newly planted trees or vines between the lord on whose land they were grown and the peasant who had supplied the labor. Thus the *paroikos* could come into possession of free property even on his own lord's land. Yet if the dependent peasant died without heirs of his body, his lord succeeded to the entire immovable property situated on his domain, as well as to his chattels; this was a further mark of the *paroikos*'s subjection to his lord.²²

The impact of the Latins on this Greek society was particularly marked in the fields of political organization and social structures closely linked to each other. The nature of the encounter of conquerors and conquered varied, however, according to the nature of the new ruling elite. Some territories were conquered by knights who imposed a feudal superstructure upon Byzantine society; other territories came almost directly under the rule of Venice or the Catalans, both with non-feudal elites; and some territories went first through a phase of feudal rule before being occupied by Venice.

In the territories belonging to the first category, such as the Morea and the duchy of Athens, feudalism was introduced by knights who came mainly from the county of Champagne and the duchy of Burgundy;²³ in these areas of the west, feudalism was then in full bloom. In Euboea, which belonged to the third category of territories, it was introduced by knights from Lombardy and Tuscany, areas where feudalism was in regression as a result of the fierce onslaught of the communes. In many islands of the Aegean, Italian knights from these same areas, and the Venetians, imposed feudal institutions upon local society.²⁴

Despite significant differences in their respective backgrounds, the French and Italian knights and the Venetian lords of the Aegean brought with them political institutions and traditions, as well as attitudes and values, common to the whole of the feudal elite in the west toward

22. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 13-14. On these agricultural contracts see Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, p. 37 and note 4; they were similar to the *complant* or *métayage* found in the west in the same period, yet in Byzantium they generated property rights.

23. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 29-30, 82-83, 85-86. Longnon, *Les Compagnons de Villehardouin*, shows that many crusaders were relatives or neighbors; others were vassals of the powerful feudatories.

24. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 185 ff., 237-239, 248-252, 271-293.

the end of the twelfth century.²⁵ In the areas from which they came (except for the city of Venice) society was strictly stratified, social status being virtually synonymous with legal status and transmitted by inheritance. Each class was governed by its particular legal system. Social promotion involving the crossing of class boundaries was largely restricted to the lower strata of society, when servile peasants became free. Promotion to the upper class of society was rendered most difficult by the development of class-consciousness within the ranks of the feudatories, illustrated by the ceremony of dubbing and the evolution of the nobility into an order, with its specific rituals, morals, and obligations, as well as a particular life-style and mentality. Personal bonds of a private nature, backed within the knightly class by vassalage, provided the backbone of social and political hierarchy, while judicial and legislative authority, as well as the right of taxation, were essentially vested in private hands; the concept of a state was alien to the minds of the members of the knightly class.

All these features of political institutions and social structure were transplanted by the feudal elite to Greece. Prerogatives exercised by the Byzantine imperial government until a few years before the conquest passed into the hands of the upper echelons of the Latin knightly class. The feudal hierarchy is best known in the principality of Achaëa. At most, it had only three ranks below the prince: there were his direct vassals, whether liege men or feudatories of simple homage; among the liege men the barons enjoyed a special position as his tenants-in-chief. In turn, all the liege men of this first rank could have vassals of their own, and so too could those of the second rank. Social differentiation within this Frankish elite was pronounced, and the gulf between vassals of simple homage and greater feudatories was especially marked; members of the lowest stratum, among whom sergeants were included, were not members of the knightly class. This fact goes far to explain the gradual integration of Greek archontes within their ranks and, in some cases, even within the ranks of the knightly class. Besides, Italians of non-noble descent also gained access to this class, whose nature thus evolved in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

A hierarchy of fiefs corresponding to that of the feudatories, knights

25. For what follows see Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 883-885, 887-888, 890, 901-902. On the integration into the feudal hierarchy of Slavs and, exceptionally in 1263, of Turkish leaders who were baptized see *ibid.*, pp. 900-901. The description of the feudal hierarchy in the present work, vol. II, p. 249, should be corrected. The social ethos of the knights was reflected in their life style, the books they read, and the literary works they composed, as well as in the wall paintings that adorned their mansions: see Jacoby, "La Littérature française" and "Knightly Values".

as well as sergeants, was also instituted. As the conquest proceeded, Latin knights assisted by Greeks consulted the Byzantine cadastral registers and divided into feudal tenements land previously held by the Byzantine fisc, the crown, and ecclesiastical institutions housed in Constantinople, land perhaps partly usurped by local archontes. The same holds true of the estates of absentee archontes or those opposing Latin rule, as well as numerous ecclesiastical properties, parts of which were secularized on various occasions. Enfeoffment of knights and mounted sergeants was restricted, however, by the prince and the barons, who were eager to preserve their political, social, and economic ascendancy. Many knights held only one fief, the standard yearly revenue of which was about 1,000 hyperpers, or part of a fief, and mounted sergeants half a fief or even less. The existence of money-fiefs and household knights further emphasizes the precarious standing of many feudatories and their dependence upon their lords.²⁶

The feudal class in the Morea was more numerous than in other areas of Latin Greece and displayed strong cohesion, stability, and continuity. All these factors help to explain the important role of the Morea, especially after 1248 when its prince William II of Villehardouin received from emperor Baldwin II suzerainty over the islands of the Aegean. The main vassals of the prince, including the triarchs (*terzieri*) of Euboea, the lords of Tenos and Myconos, and the dukes of the Archipelago, participated in court gatherings convened by him and, from 1278, occasionally by his representative or bailie; they also took part in military expeditions. They were thereby closely associated with the progressive growth and diffusion in their own territories of a body of law transcribed in the *Assizes of Romania*, whose final version in French was compiled between 1333 and 1346. This private legal treatise was based partly upon custom, imported by the conquerors from their native countries as well as from the Latin empire of Constantinople and the Latin kingdoms of Jerusalem and Cyprus, where the Latins faced political and military circumstances similar to those of the Morea, and existed in a virtual state of perpetual war. In addition, the influence of royal Capetian legislation and of the Angevin kingdom of Sicily is perceptible in the *Assizes*. Byzantine private law applicable to family possessions and agricultural exploitation, as well as various rules concerning the *paroikos* or dependent persons, were also incorporated, although the conquerors severely restricted their use when it conflicted with seignorial prerogatives. Finally, the *Assizes of Romania* also embody legislation emanating from the princely court, and

26. See Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 886-887.

legal principles based on sentences pronounced by various courts of the principality. As a result of immigration after the conquest, *burgenses* or non-nobles, coming mostly from Italy, soon constituted the majority of the Latin population in the Morea. Political power remained, however, in the hands of the knightly class, and the regime instituted by the conquerors bore a decisively feudal imprint. The *Assizes of Romania* faithfully reflect the social, legal, and political realities of Frankish Morea.²⁷ This was not the case in all the territories of the Aegean where the *Assizes* were applied. In several of them, the process of "feudalization" was quite limited; it nevertheless had an impact on the structure of Greek society.²⁸

Other territories of Romania were conquered by non-feudal elites and therefore did not witness the imposition of a feudal regime. Such was the case in areas which came under the sway of Venice; in them the commune made use of feudal institutions and terminology which it had previously applied in its territories of the Latin Orient, as in the region of Tyre. This was the case when in 1207 Venice ceded Corfu to ten members of old Venetian families, with extensive prerogatives, and in the territories around Coron and Modon, two ports in the southern Morea. Feudal terminology was also applied in Crete after 1211, the year in which Venice began the colonization of the island, which it intended to keep under its direct rule. The settlers who belonged to the old Venetian families were called in Crete *militēs* or *feudati*, knights or feudatories; they were provided with military tenements called *militiae*, *cavalleriae*, or *feuda*, for which they owed mounted military service. The *popolani* or members of non-noble families were given smaller tenures called *serventariae* or sergeantries, liable to service on foot.

Yet the use of this terminology should not be mistaken for the introduction in Crete of a feudal regime, which was totally alien to the social and political structure of Venice and the mentality of its citizens. This is clearly illustrated by the system of government imposed upon Crete and the areas of Coron and Modon. The rule of Venice in these territories not only succeeded that of Byzantium; in many respects it also bore a striking similarity to that of the empire, and contrasted markedly with the feudal regime introduced in other Greek territories. The supreme and direct authority of the state remained unrestricted, and expressed itself in numerous spheres. Venice inherited the estates of the Byzantine fisc and its *paroikoi* or villeins (*villani*),

27. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 21-91.

28. See below, p. 200.

as well as the ownership by the state of the floating peasant population. The commune also confiscated Greek imperial monasteries and two thirds of the other Greek ecclesiastical estates, keeping one third for itself and apportioning the rest in military tenements for Latin settlers. The grant of these tenements in Crete, as well as in southern Messenia, where they seem to have been rather rare, did not restrict the authority of the state, nor did they imply any privatization of its rights and prerogatives in the judicial or fiscal spheres, as in feudalized areas. These prerogatives were exercised by means of a highly centralized administration, closely supervised by the metropolitan authorities.²⁹ Venetian law was enforced in all spheres and supplemented by rules adapted to the specific needs of each Venetian territory.³⁰

In 1311 the duchy of Athens too was subjugated by non-feudal conquerors, members of the so-called Catalan Company, who settled exclusively in cities. The feudal regime and institutions introduced by the Frankish knights were immediately abolished, as was the use of the *Assizes of Romania*. In a way, it was as if the conquerors had succeeded directly to Byzantine rule; this was certainly the case in southern Thessaly, which was conquered by the Catalans in 1318 and 1319. At the outset, authority was vested entirely in the hands of the Catalan Company, whose institutions were supplemented by the customs of Barcelona, presumably introduced soon after the conquest; this reflects the urban character of the Catalan conquerors. No wonder, therefore, that their attitude toward the indigenous population was similar to that of the Venetians. The legal and social framework reflecting this attitude, which they created in 1311–1312, was maintained by the Catalans, in spite of their acceptance in 1312 of the kings of Sicily as supreme rulers. Sicilian rule introduced two new factors in the life of the duchy. Royal authority evidently curtailed that of the Company, which was nevertheless maintained as a corporation composed exclusively of Latin settlers and representing their predominantly urban interests. Besides, Sicilian rule introduced feudalism into the duchy. This complex regime persisted as long as the Catalan duchy existed.³¹

29. See Thiriet, *La Roumanie*, pp. 120–133; Borsari, *Il Dominio*, pp. 27–30, 32–33, 39–40, 45–46, 109–110, 124–125; Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 225–226, 295–297, and “Une Classe fiscale,” pp. 139–152; Thiriet, *La Roumanie*, pp. 215–224, 251–254, deals with administration.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 235–241. On the rules applying to military tenures in Crete see Santschi, *La Notion de “feudum”*; pp. 93–167. The conditional character of these tenures and the feudal terminology applied in Crete do not warrant the conclusion of Santschi (*op. cit.*, especially pp. 185–212) that Venice introduced feudalism in the island. The basic characteristic of feudalism, the privatization of state prerogatives, is totally missing in Crete; see below.

31. See Setton, *Catalan Domination*, especially pp. 79–98, 151–165, and “Catalan Society in Greece,” pp. 242–278, 283–284. On the early legislation of the Company and the continuity

The island of Euboea or Negroponte, as well as those of Tenos and Myconos, about which we are less informed, may be included in the third category of territories alluded to above. Euboea was conquered in 1205 by Boniface of Montferrat and his vassals, who prevented Venice from taking possession of the two thirds of the island it had been promised by the other leaders of the Fourth Crusade in the treaty of March 1204. During the whole of the thirteenth century, except for the years 1255–1262, the authority of Venice in Euboea was restricted to its quarter in the city of Negroponte, which was progressively extended. Although Venice actively intervened in the political and feudal affairs of the island, whose main feudal lords were its vassals from 1211 on, it wielded no direct authority over their fiefs. It is only around 1323 that Venice began its territorial expansion in the island, which culminated in 1390 with rule over the entire island.³² At first, feudalism had coexisted in the island with Venetian rule. The imposition of the latter in areas previously governed by a feudal elite created a complex social, legal, and institutional regime, especially as Venice had to take into account existing structures. This is clearly borne out by its use of the *Assizes of Romania*, which were translated into the Venetian dialect, presumably in Euboea in the late fourteenth century. At the insistence of the feudal lords of the island, a version of the *Assizes of Romania* prepared by an official commission was sanctioned by the Venetian senate in 1452, and its dispositions acquired legal force. It soon became the only binding treatise of feudal law not only in Euboea, for which it had been prepared, but in all Venetian colonial territories, including even Corfu, which had never had any political or feudal link with the principality of Achaea. The continuity of feudal law was thereby ensured. It was applied by feudal lords as well as by Venice to feudatories, feudal tenements, and villeins. Byzantine private law regulated the civil affairs of the Greek population, restricting thereby the use of Venetian law. On the other hand, Venetian criminal and commercial law were fully enforced, as in Crete and southern Messenia.³³ A similar complex system prevailed in areas of Frankish Morea annexed by Venice, such as Nauplia and Argos in 1389, the hinterland of Coron and Modon from 1420 on, and Tenos and Myconos in 1390.³⁴

The Latin population established on Byzantine soil during the pe-

of its institutions see Jacoby, "La 'Compagnie catalane'," pp. 87–103; on the nobility, feudalism, and the communes see Loenertz, "Athènes et Néopatras," pp. 155–212.

32. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 185–203, and "Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens," pp. 217–261.

33. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 95–113, 201–211, 260–270, 297–299, 308.

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 213–252.

riod of the conquest was gradually reinforced in numbers by migration, and its composition became more diversified.³⁵ Except for the feudatories hailing from Capetian France, most new settlers, nobles as well as commoners, had lived in urban centers in the west, mainly in Italy, and were accustomed to urban life and occupations. It is therefore not surprising that they established themselves mainly in the cities of Latin Greece, especially in harbor cities, the centers of its most intense economic activity.³⁶ This was also the case with the settlers whom Venice sent to Crete: in addition to rural military tenements, they were provided with houses in Candia or in Canea. These settlers resided only temporarily in the villages assigned to them. In Euboea many feudatories lived in the city of Negroponte. Even knights originating from feudal areas in the west, though accustomed to a different lifestyle, favored urban settlement. True, some of them lived in isolated mountain castles or fortified rural mansions, although they resided occasionally in the houses they held in cities. Most of them, however, lived in the repaired or enlarged acropolis or *kastron* of a city or elsewhere inside the city walls, whether in the Morea or in the duchy of Athens. Significantly, after their conquest of the duchy in 1311 the Catalans acted in the same way and succeeded their Frankish predecessors in such fortified areas.

It is obvious that preference for urban settlement cannot be explained solely by economic considerations. Psychological factors of a more general nature also exerted a powerful influence in this respect: the tendency of the Latin conquerors and the western settlers who joined them to cluster behind the walls of a fortified city or acropolis arose from the urge for security of a minority group, conscious of its isolation in the midst of a numerous local Greek population. Events in Crete justified this feeling and clearly illustrate this phenomenon of aggregation: whenever a Greek rebellion threatened them, the Latins abandoned their rural holdings and took refuge in the cities.³⁷ It is therefore not surprising that Venetian settlement policy was aimed at increasing the numbers of Latins in urban centers. This is illustrated by the building in Crete of a new city, Canea, as well as by the grant of houses to Venetian settlers in the island in the thirteenth century, already mentioned, and even more markedly in the following century. In 1301 twenty-four Venetian families were sent from Venice to Coron

35. For what follows see Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 19-20.

36. Nevertheless, some Latins resided permanently in the rural area, close to Candia, where they engaged in land cultivation and the raising of animals: see Topping, "Co-existence of Greeks and Latins," p. 19.

37. An example of 1285 in Borsari, *Il Dominio*, pp. 82-83.

and Modon in order to reinforce the number of Latins residing in these cities. In 1340 Venetian citizenship restricted to Romania was granted to the Latins inhabiting the Venetian quarter of the city of Negroponte and to others who would settle there. In 1353, after the Black Death, Venice promised full and unrestricted citizenship to Latins willing to settle with their families for a period of at least ten years in the cities of Candia, Canea, Retimo, and Sitia in Crete, of Coron and Modon in the Morea, or in the Venetian quarter of Negroponte.

For lack of adequate sources, it is impossible to assess the relative numbers of the Latins and Greeks, yet the available information points to the fact that Latins remained a small minority. According to a list compiled around 1225, the principality of Achaea comprised 170 knight-fiefs and could muster some 450 mounted men. A report written in 1338 or somewhat later assessed at more than one thousand the number of knight-fiefs existing in the principality and territories subject to the suzerainty of the prince of Achaea. Even if accurate, this number is rather unimpressive, especially if the dispersion of the feudatories is taken into account. Moreover, it would be erroneous to multiply this number by a family coefficient in order to calculate the total knightly population. As all long-distance, voluntary, and individual migration is sex-selective, men accounted for an overwhelming majority among the knightly settlers; many of them arrived without a family, and subsequent immigration of relatives did not basically change the sex ratio (number of men to 100 women) within this group. The situation in this respect was worsened by the powerful class-consciousness of the feudal nobility and of the nobles hailing from Venice and other Italian cities who adopted their social ethos. Social exclusiveness, especially marked in the small group of the barons, was expressed in their matrimonial policy. Several Moreote knights married daughters of noble families in areas in the west from which they originated and later brought them over to Greece. Most of them, however, wedded Latin noblewomen from the eastern Mediterranean whose families had come from Venice, other Italian cities, France, or neighboring areas. The smallness of the knightly class and its predominantly male composition, as well as frequent marriages in its midst, gradually increased the problem of consanguinity which restricted marriage within the group, or threatened the validity of marriages already contracted. Economic considerations no doubt further limited the chances of marriage opportunities within the same group. It is significant that in 1336 pope Benedict XII justified his dispensation for a marriage in Negroponte within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity by stressing the small number of Latin nobles and his desire to prevent intermarriage with Greeks.

In Venetian Crete, the organized and imposed migration of families inaugurated in 1211, reinforced by voluntary migration, eliminated at the outset the impediment of consanguinity. Yet the groups of settlers sent from Venice to Crete were also small. In 1211 it was decided to establish 132 *militiae* and 408 sergeantries: thus the arrival of 540 families or some 2,500 persons was contemplated. However, the settlers who arrived in successive waves in 1211, 1222, 1233, and 1252 did not reach these numbers. This is confirmed by the holding of military tenements by Latins who were not Venetians, although initially only the latter were to hold them; the acquisition of several *militiae* or sergeantries by one settler also points to the same conclusion. In spite of a constant trickle of Latin settlers, the Latin population of the cities of the Venetian empire remained quite small. In 1302 Canea was almost totally empty; the year before, 24 Venetian settlers with their families, a small number indeed, departed for Coron and Modon. The population of Coron amounted in 1401 to 480 inhabitants, of whom only 80 were Latins. In the cities of the Catalan duchy of Athens, even the most populous, the Latins may not have numbered more than a few hundred.³⁸

As a result of the conquest, society in Latin Romania was divided into two distinct groups: on the one hand, the Latin conquerors and the western immigrants who joined them; on the other, the indigenous Greeks and Slavs. Religious affiliation did not constitute an important factor in the relations between the members of the two communities, yet it became a basic criterion of social stratification and individual status, providing a convenient means of group identification. The Latins were those who recognized the authority of the Roman church and enjoyed the status of freemen, hence *Francus*, synonymous with *Latinus*, also meant free. The indigenous society remained faithful to the Byzantine church. It underwent a considerable change, although some thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources seem to imply the contrary, and its internal structure was altered. In conformity with their own political and institutional traditions and concepts, the Frankish knights conceived of society as strongly stratified, each class being governed by its own set of laws. They therefore translated social realities into legal terms and ascribed to the local society a socio-legal system similar to the one proper to a feudal society. Conquerors of urban origin, such as the Venetians and the Catalans, applied a similar social stratification to the local population. On the whole, Greeks and Slavs, peas-

38. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 20-22.

ants and presumably city-dwellers, were relegated to the rank of villeins, regardless of their status before the conquest.

Those who escaped the process of debasement and leveling constituted numerically only a marginal element in the indigenous society: such were the archontes, the *archontopouloi*, and a few other Greek or Slav free men, as well as emancipated villeins or slaves. Thanks to their wealth, their social ascendancy, and their life-style, as well as to the fiscal exemptions they enjoyed occasionally at the time of conquest, the archontes differed considerably from the rest of the local population. They became under Latin rule a socio-legal class enjoying hereditary status and privileges. Only those who had belonged to their group, and their descendants, benefitted from this evolution; once defined, their class became practically sealed and crossing its boundaries presumably impossible. The *Assizes of Romania* forbade free Greek archontes to unfree villeins; the same holds true in Venetian Crete. The free status of archontes and *archontopouloi* is illustrated by the fact that some of them were granted military tenures. In the treaty of 1299 between Venice and Alexius Callerges, they appear alongside the Latins among those enjoying complete freedom. Moreover, the distinction between them and the villeins was recognized by Venetian courts.³⁹

In spite of the cleavage existing between the conquerors and the local population, archontes and *archontopouloi* were gradually integrated, in varying degrees, into the Latin social elite. In Frankish Morea, where they were particularly numerous, this integration began at the time of the conquest, when they submitted themselves to the authority of, and performed homage and swore an oath of fealty to, the leaders of the conquerors. On a personal and legal level they were integrated among the feudatories owing simple homage, the lowest stratum in the feudal hierarchy. Yet this integration did not affect the status of their patrimonial estates, which remained hereditary and were governed as before the conquest by Byzantine law. Toward the middle of the thirteenth century the integration of several archontes proceeded beyond this first stage; they were endowed with feudal tenements, many of them quite small, which were governed by feudal law. Some archontes were even dubbed by princes or barons; as a result, they became knights and were assimilated from a legal point of view to the liege men, their new status being hereditary. In this way they achieved so-

39. See Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 889-891, and "Les États latins," pp. 23-24. Only archontes who had sufficient proof of their status were recognized as such. This was not the case with Theodore Makrembolites, who fled from Constantinople in 1204 and became a *paroikos* in Corfu: see Demetrius Chomatianus, ed. Jean B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra et classica spicilegio solesmensi parata*, VI (Rome, 1891), col. 228, no. 1.

cial integration within the feudal nobility. Their holding of non-feudal land exempt from military service produced some resentment against them in the ranks of the Latin feudatories in the first half of the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, their integration continued unabated and even gained considerable impetus as time passed.

Two factors prompted the princes and barons to loosen the rigid system of social and legal stratification imposed by the Latin conquerors: the growing need for administrative personnel capable of handling the complex Byzantine fiscal system and the Greek documentation, and the lack of sufficient military forces, due especially to a decline in the number of Frankish feudatories. In the second half of the fourteenth century, the integration of some of the Greek archontes expressed itself in their subjective identification with the values, attitudes, and class-consciousness, as well as the cause and history, of the Latin knights who had conquered the Peloponnesus and other members of their class. This is well illustrated in the Greek version of the *Chronicle of Morea*, composed between 1341 and 1388. Yet the very existence of this version, no doubt intended for Greek-speaking feudatories, emphasizes that a cultural gap persisted between Greek archontes and Frankish feudatories. Moreover, several passages in this version emphasize the distinction between Greeks and Latins, especially in the religious sphere, although the author seems to have been an Orthodox Greek who accepted the supreme authority of the Roman church. Indeed, the religious distinction between Latins and Greeks persisted, in spite of some manifestations of religious symbiosis which will be discussed below. Intermarriage between members of the two groups must have remained rare, certainly not common enough to obliterate Greek identity. Mixed marriages were contracted by members of the highest echelon of feudal society, obviously for political reasons, while others involved members of the lowest stratum of the non-noble feudatories, as implied by the *Assizes of Romania* (arts. 75, 125, 180). Illegitimate children born of Greek mothers who were villeins could not gain access to the feudal class, as Moreote feudal law provided that in such cases "the offspring follow the status of the mother" (art. 174).⁴⁰

The eagerness of the archontes and other Greeks to achieve integration within the Latin elite may be ascribed to economic as well as social motivation. The conquerors confirmed their patrimonial estates and their hold on the peasants needed for their cultivation, which constituted the foundations of their power and social ascendancy, and endowed them with fiefs. These moves lifted the archontes to the level of

40. See Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 891-899, and *La Féodalité*, pp. 30-32, 108.

the Frankish feudatories and enhanced their social superiority within their own community. Administrative and military considerations already mentioned induced the princes and the barons of the Morea to encourage this process, thereby ensuring the loyalty, coöperation, and services of the Greek elite. As a result, the Greek population was deprived of an upper class willing to join the Greek church in its opposition to the Latins and to take the lead in this opposition, or to favor the Byzantine expansion in the Peloponnesus begun in 1262.⁴¹

A similar process of integration, although somewhat different in nature, took place in the lordships of the Aegean. The conciliatory approach of Marco I Sanudo, duke of the Archipelago (1207-1227), toward the Greeks was expressed in his religious policy and illustrated by the willingness of twenty Cretan archontes to leave their native island and join him in 1213. The smallness of the class of Latin conquerors and archontes in the duchy no doubt led, from an early stage, to the integration of Greeks of a lower rank into the class of the feudatories. The Ghisi, lords of Tenos and Myconos, awarded tenements to Greeks and Latins whom they bound to be their vassals and whom they "ennobled" in return for military service. The imposition of feudal terminology and rules constituted a legal fiction, both useful and necessary. Yet no change occurred in the economic activity of these Greek feudatories, who continued to till their land. Their particular status and social promotion produced, however, a new stratification within the indigenous society.⁴²

The Venetian implantation in Crete, begun in 1211, was based on the military colonization of the island. It led to an expropriation of church land and the estates of several archontes which drove the Greeks to rise against Venice in 1212. This first rebellion ended with the departure of twenty archontes from the island, yet most of their class remained in Crete. The division within their ranks, which dated back to the period preceding the conquest, prevented them from forming a united front against Venice, thus enabling the commune to rally them progressively to its cause by granting them various concessions. The settlement reached by Venice in 1219 with two rebel leaders may be considered as the first stage in the integration of the archontes within the ranks of the Latin elite. The commune granted each of them a half *militia* in return for military service, an annual payment, and a promise of loyalty. In all respects, the two archontes were assimilated to the Latin holders of military tenements, yet at the same time they retained

41. See Jacoby, "The Encounter," pp. 897-903, and his "Knightly Values," pp. 163-179.

42. See Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 242-250, 284.

their patrimonial estates, as well as their social position in Greek society. The same Venetian policy was applied on several occasions after 1219. In 1224 two *militiae* were granted; in 1233, several others; and in 1252 Greeks were to be endowed with some of the fifteen available; in 1265 two *militiae* and five and a half sergentries, each a sixth of a *militia*, were again granted. In 1299 Alexius Callerges obtained the restitution of confiscated *militiae*, and the commune granted him four more and allowed him to buy nine others, two to six of which were designated for his followers.

As in the feudal Morea, Venice integrated the archontes, yet according to its own interests, social structure, and institutions. The process of integration initiated in Crete in 1219 therefore differed markedly on many counts from that in the principality. It was neither progressive nor generalized, but took place in stages, and archontes enjoyed it only in exceptional instances, as a result of specific agreements arrived at with Venice after uprisings or as a reward for services rendered to the commune. The number of archontes benefitting from integration was therefore limited, although it steadily increased during the thirteenth century. The endowment of their followers with military tenements enhanced the social standing of the upper ranks of the archontes; so did their concern for the villeins oppressed by Latin masters, as well as for those who supported their successive rebellions and whose emancipation they managed to obtain or preserve, respectively. The concessions regarding villeins granted by Venice in 1299 to Alexius Callerges were particularly extensive. Venice even recognized the validity of the sentences pronounced by Alexius and the judges he had appointed during his long revolt, and he was allowed to receive voluntary payments and services from Greeks. All this implies considerable social ascendancy, not only over Greeks who were his followers or directly subjected to him, but also over Greeks subjected to Latin holders of military tenements or to the commune. It is therefore obvious that a network of social ties headed by the archontes existed alongside the social and legal relationship recognized by Venice.

The slow pace at which Venice succeeded in rallying the archontes to its cause explains the continuous role of the Greek church as a focus of opposition to foreign rule, both on a religious and on an ethnic level, and as a source of Greek popular resentment against the Latins. The alliance of the archontes with the Greek church, which enhanced their prestige, was also strengthened by the support lent on several occasions by the Byzantine emperors, such as John III Vatatzes and the Palaeologi, to those who rebelled. Although Venice granted military tenements to archontes in the thirteenth century, it remained suspi-

cious of the Greeks. In principle, military tenements could be alienated only in favor of Venetians, but in practice other Latins also acquired them; alienation was strictly controlled, however, especially in order to prevent Greeks from acquiring land held by Latins or by the commune. It is thus obvious that Greeks holding military tenements could do so only with the approval of the Venetian authorities. It is significant that Venice demanded hostages to ensure the implementation of agreements, at times even from the same archontes to whom it granted *militiae*. In view of this ambivalent attitude, one of the concessions granted to Alexius Callerges in 1299 commands particular attention: the right of Alexius and those who had followed him during the rebellion to marry into Latin families. In order to evaluate properly the scope of this privilege, its context should be closely examined.⁴³

There can be no doubt that Venice implemented a policy of segregation in Crete. To be sure, marriages of prominent Venetians with Greek women had already taken place earlier in the century and in some cases may have been favored by Venice. Such was certainly the case, for instance, with that of Marco Venier, holder of a *militia* in Crete, who by marrying the daughter of the Greek archon Nicholas Eudaimonoïannes acquired Cerigo in 1238 and thereby ensured Venice's control over this island.⁴⁴ George Ialina, holder of a sergeantry or sixth of a *militia* in 1271, if not earlier, married into a branch of the Venetian Gradenigo family in this period.⁴⁵ Yet when the daughters of Manuel Dragonopoulos were granted in 1272 the right to marry Latins, this was no doubt considered a major concession made by the commune.⁴⁶

In 1293 Venice forbade all Latins holding military tenements or other land to marry into Greek families and threatened them with the loss of all their estates and with banishment from the island if they did so. Venice obviously feared that these estates might be transferred to Greeks who married Latin women. The decree stating this policy of

43. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 26–29; Borsari, *Il Dominio veneziano*, pp. 75–77, has assembled evidence about non-Venetian and Greek holders of *militiae* or *sergenteriae* in the thirteenth century.

44. See Chryssa A. Maltézou, "Le Famiglie degli Eudaimonoïannis e Venier a Cerigo dal XII al XIV secolo: Problemi di cronologia e prosopografia," *Rivista di studi bizantini e slavi*, II (1982), 208–210, 217. Cerigo was lost to emperor Michael VIII between 1261 and 1275. A member of the Venier family recovered the island between 1301 and 1309, again by marrying the daughter of a local archon: *ibid.*, pp. 212–216.

45. On the Ialinas and their economic activities in this period see Topping, "Co-existence," pp. 18–19, and Laiou, "Quelques observations," pp. 194–197. In 1301 George's son Catarinus had already attained his majority, hence the holding of the *sergenteria* by George at an earlier period.

46. Text in Cessi, *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio*, II, 155, no. 72.

segregation in 1293 implied that such marriages were nevertheless taking place, although the commune was then fighting Alexius Callerges. In 1274, during the uprising of the Chortatzes clan, the commune decreed that rebellious *vasmuli* would be banished from Crete or, if found in the island, reduced forever to the status of villeins of the commune. These offspring of marriages to, and especially illegitimate unions with, Greek women, obviously were considered free, a fact confirmed by the agreement of 1299 in which they are mentioned alongside the archontes, the *archontopouloi*, and the Latins. According to Venetian practice in Crete, only the offspring, whether legitimate or not, of a Latin or a free Greek father was considered free.

Various sources seem to imply that most *vasmuli* of the upper class were the illegitimate children of Latin fathers and Greek mothers. The excess of men in the Latin population in Crete at all its social levels may well explain unions, legitimate and especially illegitimate, with Greek women. In 1319 Scopelleto Tiepolo was recognized as the illegitimate son of James Tiepolo, who had been duke of Crete in 1298, and of a Greek mother who presumably was a villein; his free status was confirmed by the authorities. In 1318 two Chortatzes attempted to prove, with the help of Greek and Latin witnesses, that they were "Latins and sons of Latins and Venetians"; they too were probably illegitimate sons of Venetian fathers. In 1302 the feudatories of Canea protested against the holding of military tenements and offices, to which they alone were entitled, by *vasmuli* and Greeks, as well as against the participation of members of these two groups in the assembly of the feudatories. Various sources seem to indicate that these *vasmuli* were favored by the Venetian officers in charge in Crete because they were the sons of Venetian noblemen, such as the Tiepolos mentioned above.

Obviously, the holding of military tenements did not ensure Greek archontes of social integration within the Latin elite. The eagerness of the Callerges and their subordinate archontes to contract mixed marriages is therefore understandable, yet the number of such marriages remained quite small, limited, it seems, to the Callerges of Milipotamo, whose members married into the noble Venetian families of Sagredo and Zeno. Other archontes remained within their own community, especially those refusing to accommodate themselves to Venetian rule; intermittent rebellions broke out in the area of Canea, and Venice remained suspicious. The acquisition by Greeks of Latin military tenures was prohibited in 1319, and in 1334 the authorities prevented Greeks from acquiring the estates of Andrew Callerges, who had died while heavily in debt. In spite of the favoritism displayed by Venetian

officers toward some Greeks, few sat in the great council of Candia.⁴⁷ In the fifteenth century Venice remained as intransigent as before about segregation, and persisted in opposing the participation of Greeks in Venetian assemblies and their holding of high administrative offices. A decree to this effect was issued in Crete in 1422.⁴⁸

It has been claimed that the agreement concluded in 1299 by Venice with Alexius Callerges opened the way to a reconciliation between Venice and the Greek community of Crete, which eventually, in the second half of the fourteenth century, generated an alliance of Venetian feudatories with the Greek archontes.⁴⁹ It is significant that members of the Gradenigo and the Venier families, who had intermarried with Greek archontic families, plotted against Venice in 1355 and were among the leaders of the Cretan rebellion in 1363. Their attitude, however, does not seem to have been shared by the majority of the Latin feudatories of the island. Nor should we be deceived by the measures they adopted in 1363. The substitution of the standard of St. Titus, patron of Crete, for that of St. Mark, patron of Venice, the license granted to Greeks to become priests if they wished, and the adoption of the Orthodox rite by Leonard Gradenigo were all measures dictated by the circumstances of the revolt and the opposition to Venice. They did not derive from a progressive rapprochement between Venetian and Greek elites (at best limited in scope), but reflected the opportunism of the Venetian leaders of the rebellion, who were fully aware of the ascendancy of the Greek archontes over their followers and dependents and of the absolute need to ensure their support.

Venice also strongly opposed the unions, whether legal or not, of Latins and Greeks within ranks of society other than the elites, yet could not entirely prevent them. Some Latin notaries and craftsmen married Greek women in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, learned Greek, and became hellenized, and this phenomenon no doubt increased in scope in the following period. The appearance of *vasmuli* in 1274 and 1299 as a particular group is no doubt significant, yet this is no indication as to their numerical importance. At any rate, they did not constitute a homogeneous social group; in all likelihood many, if not most, of them were illegitimate children of Latin fathers. Unlike the sons of Venetian noblemen mentioned above, the *vasmuli* whom Venice hoped to recruit for its armies in 1365, along with Turks and slaves, were no doubt the offspring of illegitimate mixed

47. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 29-31.

48. See Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 402.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 135, 276-277, 301-302.

unions at the lowest ranks of society. Nevertheless Venice reacted strongly when in 1369 the authorities discovered that many Italian mercenaries recruited during the great Cretan rebellion of 1363–1366 had married Greek women of the island. The considerations which prompted Venice to oppose such unions were different from those involving members of archontic families; evidently Venice feared that women of lowly origin would escape their unfree status by marrying free men and that their marriage to the latter would undermine the mercenaries' allegiance to the state. It therefore dismissed in 1371 all mercenaries married to local Greek women, as well as all Greeks serving in the Venetian armies.⁵⁰

This examination of the social evolution in Crete leads to the conclusion that Venice persisted in its policy of segregation there, although it could not effectively enforce its ban on intermarriage at all levels of Cretan society. The religious policy implemented by the commune in Crete also points to the continuity of its segregationist attitude. Venice considered the Latin church an instrument of government, indispensable for the strengthening of its rule over former Byzantine territories. It was to serve the interests of the state, and therefore the Venetian authorities interfered in ecclesiastical appointments and closely supervised the activity of the Latin and Greek churches. Venice was well aware of the strong opposition of the Greeks, especially the Greek clergy, to any attempt to persuade them to join the Roman church or to enforce the union of the churches proclaimed in 1369 and 1439. On the whole, therefore, it refrained from supporting any action to this effect for fear of unrest. In fact, few Greeks joined the Latin church. Venetian suspicions were aroused by Greek religious unrest, constantly stimulated by the arrival of numerous Greek priests from Byzantine territories, especially around 1450.⁵¹ The commune's segregationist policy led to strong misgivings in Venice about the growing numbers of Latins attending services in Greek churches or having recourse to Greek priests. In 1349 the duke of Crete forcefully reiterated that such practices were prohibited, and imposed fines on all Latins and Greek priests involved in them. Significantly, this decree was to be publicly read every three months in all parts of Crete. It was promulgated anew

50. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 29–32; Laiou, "Quelques observations," pp. 197–198.

51. On Venetian religious policy in general see Borsari, *Il Dominio*, pp. 106–125; Fedalto, *La Chiesa*, 2nd ed., I, 377–448, and III, 9–24; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, especially pp. 283–286, 288–291, 403–406, 429–433, who has been corrected on events in the 1450's and 1460's by Manousakas, *Hē en Krētē synōmosia tou Sēphē Blastou (1453–1454) kai hē nea synōmotikē kinēsis tou 1460–1462* (Athens, 1960) [in Greek]; Thiriet, "La Symbiose," pp. 26–35, and his "Églises, fidèles et clergés," pp. 484–500.

in 1405.⁵² The same problem arose again in the following years.⁵³ Though Venice shared the opposition of the popes to religious symbiosis, its considerations were not exclusively of a religious nature. It combatted grecization because it entailed the loss of Latin group identity and endangered the basic tenets of a rule based on segregation.

In Catalan Greece, the conquerors imposed a segregation similar to that implemented by Venice in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Crete. In 1311 the *kastron* of Livadia was handed over to the Catalan Company by several of its inhabitants, presumably archontes. They and their descendants were rewarded with the grant of the status of Franks or Latins, thus constituting an exception to the rule. However, their full integration as freemen within the class of the conquerors was prevented, since the Company decreed in 1311–1312 that Greeks could not marry Catholic women. This ban was extended even to Greeks who had joined the Roman church. Catalan legislation was somewhat more lenient than Venetian legislation in Crete, since Latins could marry Greek women; several such marriages occurred in the upper class of Latin society.⁵⁴ The Company also prohibited, presumably in the early years of its rule, the acquisition of real estate by Greeks. The link between this provision and the interdiction of marriage of Latin women to Greeks is obvious. As in Venetian Crete, land was the source of political and military power, and its transfer to Greeks was to be prevented, or at least strictly controlled.⁵⁵ Further social integration, which was contrary to the policy of the Company, was only exceptionally granted. Such was the case in 1362, when two Greek notaries and their male offspring, though remaining Orthodox, were authorized to marry Latin women. One of them also obtained the right to acquire and alienate real estate like the Franks or Latins. In 1380 the latter privilege was also granted to the Greek mistress of the military commandant of Athens, by whom she had borne several children; she was also awarded personal freedom on the same occasion.⁵⁶ Few Greeks of the Catalan duchy of Athens seem to have joined the Roman church, and some

52. Venice, Archivio di Stato, *Duca di Candia*, busta 50, fols. 58^v–59^r (nuova numerotazione); unsatisfactory edition by Emiliano Barbaro, *Legislazione veneta: I capitolari di Candia* (Venice, 1940), pp. 124–125.

53. Venice, Archivio di Stato, *Senato, Secreta*, reg. 7, fol. 58^r (unpublished), in 1418, and see below, note 91.

54. Texts in Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari*, pp. 352–354, nos. 268–269. On legislation in 1311–1312 see above, note 31. On Latins marrying Greek women see Setton, *Catalan Domination*, p. 252.

55. Text in Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari*, p. 382, no. 294; see also p. 477, no. 391.

56. See above, note 54 and last citation in note 55. He was Romeo de Bellarbre; she was Zoe of Megara.

of these were induced to do so for opportunistic reasons; their return to the Orthodox faith was punished by the confiscation of their property.⁵⁷ On the whole the Greeks remained within their community, as implied by the case of the two notaries mentioned above. The prolonged excommunication of the Latins residing in the Catalan duchy no doubt weakened the Roman church within its boundaries, but the outcry of pope Urban V in 1363 that almost all the Latins had gone over to the Orthodox rite seems to have been an overstatement.⁵⁸ As a rule, social segregation based on religious affiliation was strictly maintained in Catalan Greece.

It is significant that both in Venetian Crete and in the Catalan duchy of Athens social segregation was enforced by legislation. In spite of some variations due to different local conditions, one perceives a striking agreement between the behavior of the conquering elites of urban origin in these two areas. Everyday life and the pursuit of similar or joint economic activities brought Latins into close contact with the ruled, especially in urban centers, and hardly any factor save religion differentiated them from the Greeks, whose numbers were vastly superior. The constant threat of assimilation into the surrounding Greek society endangered their social supremacy and political prerogatives. The ruling Latin elite therefore resorted to institutionalized segregation in order to preserve the separate group identity of the Latins. The knights of the feudal Morea did not have recourse to such measures. Their class-consciousness and sense of social superiority and the strictly stratified structure of society, as well as their life-style and particular occupation, which matched their status, all created a deep gulf between them and most Greeks and ensured social segregation.

In spite of substantial differences among the various regimes established by the Latins in Romania, the evolution of the bulk of the indigenous population ran along parallel lines. Both in feudal and non-feudal areas one finds similar social institutions, rules, and phenomena, which go back in part to the Byzantine period. It would be erroneous, however, to assume that the conquest resulted solely in a change of masters for the dependent peasants. The Latins assimilated the entire subjugated indigenous population, rural as well as urban, to the *paroikoi*, or villeins (*villani*) as they were called by the Latins.⁵⁹ Only the archontes and *archontopouloi*, as well as a few free and emanci-

57. Text in Rubió i Lluch, *Diplomatari*, pp. 380–381, no. 292.

58. *Ibid.*, pp. 338–339, no. 255.

59. The equation appears in a Cretan text: see Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 89, note 100.

pated *paroikoi*, escaped debasement. Thus most free men sank into a state of dependency. Moreover, in spite of continuity in the use of the term *paroikoi*, a major change occurred in the status of these men and women: Byzantine *paroikoi* were legally free, but under Latin rule the villeins were considered unfree, and as such constituted a legal class from which they could escape only by a formal act of emancipation. The presumption of subjection was so well established that the status of freedom became exceptional and had to be duly proven by those who enjoyed it. In addition to its legal aspect, the subjection of the villeins was also expressed in the attitude of the Latin lords toward them. This attitude was similar to that of their counterparts in the west, where the dependency of the peasantry entailed a definite note of inferiority and contempt. No doubt it differed from the attitude of the Byzantine lord toward his *paroikoi*, who were legally free and had access to imperial courts. It may be assumed, however, that under the influence of the Latins a change also occurred in the relationship of Greek lords with their own *paroikoi*. To some extent, continuity prevailed in Venetian territories, where the commune had succeeded to the Byzantine state: it owned villeins known as *villani comunes*, similar to the *demosiarioi paroikoi* in the empire. Moreover, the commune assimilated to its own villeins "non-inscribed" villeins (*agrafi*) or "foreign men" (*exteri homines*), Greeks not subject to any lord; this practice was similar to that applied to the *eleutheroi* in the empire. No such precedence in the acquisition of new manpower existed in feudalized territories, where this former right of the state was now exercised by all feudal lords. There were also *villani militum* included in the military tenements granted by Venice to Latins, and occasionally to Greeks. Villeins could also be owned privately as patrimonial property if they were *extra feudum*, not part of a military tenement. Villeins of the state were obviously not to be found in feudalized areas, in which the prerogatives of the state had been transferred into private hands.⁶⁰

Like the Byzantine *paroikos*, the villein inherited his status from his father; illegitimate children born from a free father and a dependent mother were considered villeins according to feudal law, but free under Venetian rule, in accordance with Roman law.⁶¹ The dependence of the villein extended to his descendants, and enforcement of the thirty-year prescription resulted in perpetual subjection to the lord: the *Assizes*

60. See Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," pp. 146-151; the number of villeins heading fiscal units in a Cretan *militia* varied from seven to twenty-five: *ibid.*, p. 149, note 54.

61. For feudal law see Jacoby, *La Féodalité*, pp. 30-31, 209, on the basis of the *Assizes of Romania* (ed. Recoura), arts. 78, 174, 189; for Venetian rule see Santschi, "Quelques aspects du statut," pp. 110 ff.

of Romania attest it for the Morea; it is also documented in the fifteenth century for Euboea; and in 1410 it was specified that in Crete the calculation of the period extended to the direct male ancestors of the person whose status was debated. The enforcement of the prescription in these three areas, each with a different regime, implies that it was applied continuously since the conquest, and also valid in the Byzantine period. Cases regarding the subjection of villeins were indeed decided on the basis of testimonies regarding their lineal ancestors.⁶² Besides, Venetian officials in Crete were ordered to reclaim all fugitive villeins of the commune, whether heads of fiscal units or their sons inscribed on the cadastral registers within these units. The purpose of this inscription, as well as that of the eldest brother when only orphans were left, was to ensure the subjection of these villeins to their lord. It is therefore not surprising that the villein could be transferred with his wife and children, if the latter were less than sixteen years old. At this age fiscal responsibility was reached, and the son could be removed from the fiscal unit headed by his father or widowed mother, or his elder brother or sister if only orphans were registered as belonging to the fiscal unit.⁶³

The subjection of the villein to his lord was extremely rigorous, regardless of whether the lord was an individual, an institution, or the state as in Venetian territory. The villein was a mere chattel who could be owned jointly by several lords, enfeoffed, held in seisin, exchanged, or sold. As his labor constituted a source of income, he might even be leased for a definite period extending from a few days, especially during the peak of the agricultural season, to several years. If he was removed by the state from a property in Venetian territory or killed by accident by a liege man in a feudal area, he was replaced by another villein. His lord was entitled to remove him from his holding and take his movable goods, provided he left him the means necessary for his sustenance and for the fulfilment of his fiscal obligations. In the case of transfer or lease for a definite period, the temporary lord exercised the prerogatives of the legitimate lord, except in the realm of criminal justice.⁶⁴

As a rule, the lord determined where the villein should reside. In

62. See Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," pp. 143-145.

63. On this rule see texts in Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 91, notes 10 and 11.

64. See *Assizes of Romania* (ed. Recoura), arts. 25, 107, and also 187, 197, 211; Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," p. 147; Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 91, note 107; Thiriet, "La Condition paysanne," pp. 46-48, 56; Santschi, *La Notion de "feudum"*, p. 177, note 23; p. 178, note 28; p. 179, notes 37, 39, and 40; p. 180, note 42. On the jurisdiction exercised by the holder of a lease see Jacoby, "Les États latins," p. 37, and *La Féodalité*, p. 208.

this respect the condition of the state's villeins in Venetian Crete seems to have been somewhat better. Since the domain of the commune extended over large sections of the island, there was more room for mobility. The agreement of 1299 with Alexius Callerges specified that villeins other than those belonging to military tenements should be allowed to reside where they wished. In 1313 it was decreed that villeins of the state might dwell in Candia or in a village, at will, without fear of being regarded as villeins of feudatories; they were, however, forbidden to leave Crete or the land they held and were compelled to fulfill their obligations to the commune, such as the payment of the *villanazio*, an annual tax amounting to one hyperper imposed upon state villeins. In 1334 the Venetian authorities refused to exempt villeins inhabiting Canea from this tax, for fear that this might lead to a massive exodus of peasants from rural areas to the city. At any rate, the commune exercised strict supervision over its villeins. In 1339 those of Crete were ordered to register in the district where they had settled within fifteen days of their arrival; the following year the authorities discovered that in the area of Canea many state villeins had exhibited false privileges of enfranchisement which they had purchased, *inter alia*, in order to be allowed to settle wherever they wished.⁶⁵

In spite of the restrictions imposed upon the mobility of the villeins, their migration is abundantly documented for Latin Greece. Besides economic or matrimonial considerations of an individual nature, as in the Byzantine empire, catastrophic events, as well as the general conditions prevailing in the area, explain this mobility. Frequent revolts in thirteenth-century Crete, warfare between Latins and Byzantines in the Morea, the raids of the Catalans in the peninsula and in Euboea from 1311 to 1329, the activity of Latin—and in the fourteenth and fifteenth century also of Turkish—pirates, all these increased the number of fugitive villeins. Besides, famine and recurring waves of plague after the Black Death of 1347–1348 prompted them to seek refuge elsewhere. In 1401 the Venetian authorities complained that many Greeks fearing service in the navy had fled to Anatolia. The extreme political fragmentation of Greece after 1204 no doubt provided villeins many opportunities to abandon their residence and thereby sever the link of subjection.⁶⁶

The lord had the right to recover a villein who had abandoned his residence without permission. After locating the fugitive, he appealed

65. See Jacoby, "Les États latins," p. 38, and "Les Gens de mer," pp. 182–183.

66. See Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," p. 142; for the Catalans till 1329 and the Turks see also Jacoby, "Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens," pp. 238–261. For 1401 see Noiret, *Documents inédits*, p. 116.

to a competent court in order to prove his subjection and obtain the intervention of state officials in Crete or, if in feudalized territories, that of the prince, the barons, or other feudal lords exercising high justice. In Venetian territories the state villeins were recovered by officials. Any unilateral action by the lord to reclaim his villeins was prohibited, as the Cretan feudatories were reminded in 1349. Moreover, the commune imposed heavy penalties on fugitive villeins and those who provided them with shelter, often with the intent of holding them permanently. While awaiting the verdict of the court, the fugitive was usually imprisoned at the expense of the lord who claimed him; if the lord did not provide for his sustenance, he forfeited his rights over the villein.⁶⁷

The legal capacity of a villein was also restricted in other ways. We are particularly well informed about the Morea. He could neither contract marriage himself nor marry off his daughter, especially if the spouse was dependent upon another lord, without the permission of his own lord; the latter was compelled, however, to accept a marriage which had been contracted, even by a female villein with a free man, whereby she acquired permanent freedom. A villein was tried by his lord in civil cases, although criminal jurisdiction was the exclusive right of the prince and the barons. A villein wronged by his own lord could not lodge a complaint against him, nor appeal to a superior lord; his testimony was valid only if it concerned a portion or the boundaries of a fief, but not a liege man in a criminal case. If a villein fled, died without offspring, or willed his property without the consent of his lord, the latter inherited his goods. This rule also held in favor of a foreign lord whose land he had cultivated under a contract providing for the division of newly planted trees or vines.⁶⁸ In Venetian territories criminal justice was an exclusive prerogative of the state, and all villeins were tried in state courts, whether or not they belonged to a military tenure, an individual, or the commune. These courts also dealt with civil cases, especially those involving control over state villeins.⁶⁹ Unfortunately, there is no information about the exercise of civil justice by Latin lords or Greek archontes.

The continuity of certain aspects of the Byzantine fiscal system is well documented, yet this system underwent important changes as the

67. See Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," pp. 142-145; cases in Santschi, "Quelques aspects du statut," pp. 110-112, 121-122; Ratti Vidulich, *Duca di Candia, Quaternus Consiliorum*, p. 117 (February 4, 1349).

68. *Assizes of Romania* (ed. Recoura), arts. 42, 43, 125, 174-175, 184-186, 189, 198, and see above, note 67.

69. Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 235-239.

Latins adapted it to their own needs and concepts. The debasement of many free men who had become villeins under Latin rule obviously entailed the imposition of heavier fiscal obligations upon them. It will be remembered that the Byzantine *paroikos* owed dues and labor services to the state. After the Latin conquest, this remained the case with Venetian state villeins only. All the other villeins, whether in Venetian or in feudal territories, were bound to provide dues and services to their lord; if the land on which they dwelt was leased to an individual or an institution, the temporary lord was entitled to collect them, as illustrated by evidence from Venetian Messenia.

The rights of the permanent or temporary lord, as well as those of the commune, also restricted the legal capacity of the villein in the economic sphere. As a rule, he could not borrow, engage in trade, or alienate movable property without the consent of his lord. The *Assizes of Romania* (art. 215) clearly distinguish between villeins who borrowed for sustenance and those who incurred commercial debts, even with the permission of their lord, which was considered more serious. A similar distinction between indebtedness and a trade operation is to be found in Venetian Crete; the villeins of the commune were allowed to borrow and to engage in trade, unless they had been explicitly forbidden to do so.

The alienation of real estate presented a particular problem, as this property was taxable and had to be registered in the cadastral registers. It was therefore necessary for villeins to obtain the agreement of their lord, or that of the commune, for villeins of the state. In 1292 a state villein living in Coron made his will after its clauses had been approved by Venetian officials. Lack of approval entailed the cancellation of sales.⁷⁰ On the other hand, the acquisition of property was not restricted, as it was indirectly of advantage to the lord. It may be assumed that in many cases, the person entering an agreement with a villein was aware of the latter's status and limitations; however, this was not always the case. In 1319 the commune ordered the official brokers operating on its behalf in Crete to disclose the status of the borrower to the other contracting party before the latter provided a loan to, or accepted surety from, a villein, to enable the lenders to protect their interests and prevent them from being defrauded by villeins. Villeins are seldom mentioned in notarial documents; either they concealed their status, or else the parties to a contract did not consider that it need be stated explicitly. In any case, it seems evident that the overwhelming majority of the Greeks involved in agricultural con-

70. The *stasis* could not be alienated: *Assizes of Romania* (ed. Recoura), art. 215.

tracts, loans, or the purchase of animals were villeins. It would be a mistake to consider them as free when their status is not specified;⁷¹ cross-checking with judicial documents will no doubt confirm this assumption.

Manumission of villeins does not seem to have been practised on a large scale, except in special circumstances; such was the case in 1299 at the request of Alexius Callerges. The manumission of a villein belonging to a military tenement obviously reduced its value. It was therefore subject to approval by the prince in the Morea, presumably by the chief lord in each of the various lordships of the Aegean, or by the commune in Venetian territory. On the other hand, the Latins and the Greek archontes of Crete could free, without restriction, villeins whom they held in full ownership. In Venetian territories the commune also manumitted villeins who belonged to other lords and compensated the latter for the loss by granting them "non-inscribed" or state villeins. Manumission was granted by lords mainly as a pious act, and by the commune as a reward for services or loyalty. According to Venetian sources of the first half of the fourteenth century conditional freedom was granted in Crete to Greek sailors newly established in the island and to Greek villeins settling in Candia as long as they would serve aboard the ships of the Venetian navy.⁷²

In certain cases a villein could redeem himself by paying a large sum to his lord.⁷³ In 1434 the Venetian senate decided that state villeins in Crete should be able to do so if they paid to the commune 50 ducats or more, which at the time amounted to some 250 hyperpers. This fiscal expedient was regarded as particularly useful because Venice was then at war in Lombardy and in urgent need of income; besides, manumission on a large scale would have reduced administrative expenses involved in the collection of the yearly *villanazio* of one hyperper. It seems unlikely, however, that many state villeins took advantage of the offer, as the sum required was huge compared with the yearly tax they paid, equivalent to the price of several oxen, even one of which peasants often found it difficult to afford.⁷⁴ Yet there can be no doubt that many

71. As assumed by Borsari, *Il Dominio*, p. 88, and by Thiriet, "La Condition," pp. 39-41.

72. See Jacoby, "Une Classe fiscale," pp. 147-148, and "Les États latins," pp. 41-42, and "Les Gens de mer," pp. 183-184.

73. A case for 60 hyperpers is mentioned in 1388: see Santschi, *La Notion de "feudum"*, p. 177, note 28.

74. Text in Noiret, *Documents inédits*, pp. 363-364. For the approximate rate of exchange of the ducat around this date see Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 412. The price of a slave was then lower, between 27 and 40 ducats: see Verlinden, *L'Esclavage*, II, 879-881. In 1416 oxen were bought from villeins in the west and the center of Crete for 25 hyperpers, and sold in the eastern part for 60 hyperpers: see Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 416.

villeins aspired to freedom. In 1415 social unrest spread among the villeins of Crete, when several of them claimed that they were free men and should be treated as such.⁷⁵ No doubt the demographic contraction of the fourteenth and early fifteenth century — due to catastrophic events and the recurring plague — had increased the pressure of the lords on their villeins and, on the other hand, the awareness of the latter that the economy of the island and the prosperity of their lords depended on them. Enfranchised villeins were not always entitled to move freely. In Crete the commune occasionally imposed residence in inland cities on its former villeins. The loss of the document granting enfranchisement, disobedience, or rebellion involved a return to the unfree status.

Freedom was so exceptional that free Greeks who were not *archontes* or *archontopouloi* sometimes specified their status in documents, for fear of being mistakenly considered villeins. This was especially so in cases involving residence in a rural area or agricultural work. In 1301 a free Cretan Greek indebted to a Latin promised to reside for four years in a village of his and pay him dues “as do the other free inhabitants of this place”; in 1352 a plot of land was leased to four Cretan Greeks who stated explicitly that they were free. On the basis of documents bearing on the area of Patras in the northern Morea it has been claimed that communities of free peasants still existed in the fourteenth century in certain areas of Latin Greece. A closer look at these documents reveals, however, that this assumption is not warranted: a vineyard thought to be the holding of a free peasant was in fact part of a seignorial domain.⁷⁶

Slaves frequently appear in Latin Greece.⁷⁷ The political fragmentation of the area and the frequent warfare were fully exploited by numerous pirates who raided the islands of the Aegean and the coasts of continental Greece. They were joined by Catalans from the duchy of Athens from 1311 to 1329, as well as by Turkish pirates, whose activity in the area steadily increased thereafter.⁷⁸ It is therefore surprising that Greeks constituted a majority among the slaves on the markets of Latin Greece in the first half of the fourteenth century. Gradually the proportion of Slavs from the Morea increased, and for

75. See Thiriet, *La Romanie*, p. 297.

76. See Jacoby, “Les États latins,” pp. 41–42.

77. On the whole subject see Verlinden, *L'Esclavage*, II, 800–884, 974–975, Santschi, “Quelques aspects du statut,” pp. 112, 114–115, 117–118, 120–122, and Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, *passim*.

78. See above, p. 210.

a short period in the late fourteenth century Bulgarians in particular became numerous. In addition to the Black Sea the Turkish emirates of Anatolia constituted an important source of supply. The flow of slaves was considerably reduced by the Ottoman conquest in the following century.

Slaves were to be found in the Morea, in Venetian Messenia, and in the Catalan duchy of Athens, whence many of them were shipped to Crete.⁷⁹ This island was the main emporium for the slave trade to the west, although many slaves remained there. Considered mere chattels, they were owned by Latins and Greeks of all ranks of society engaged in various occupations, by members of the Catholic and Greek clergy, and even by Jews. In spite of his status, even a villein might own a slave,⁸⁰ while the reverse was of course impossible; this is a clear mark of the slave's inferior status, also implied by the *Assizes of Romania* (art. 219). Female slaves were bought for domestic purposes and served in cities as well as in rural areas; we may assume that such was also the case with most male slaves. A shortage of agricultural manpower in the second half of the fourteenth century partly explains a substantial rise in the price of male slaves; it induced the Venetian authorities to promote in 1393 and 1397 their import to Crete, in order to settle them on abandoned land held by Latin feudatories.⁸¹ Even earlier manumitted male slaves were occasionally bound to reside in a village of their former master and to provide some amount of agricultural work for a specified number of years. All of them seem to have paid a yearly sum to their former masters.⁸² In certain cases, slaves were allowed to redeem themselves, although it is not always clear how they managed to gather the means to do so.⁸³ In 1315 the Venetian authorities of Crete decreed that slaves who were taught by their masters the trade of a carpenter or a calker would be freed from servitude; from this text it is not clear whether the commune was opposed to any such training or approved of it. Manumission did not necessarily become effective when granted; its enforcement might be postponed for a specified period, sometimes several years. Slaves could

79. See also Setton, *Catalan Domination*, p. 87, and Santschi, "Quelques aspects du statut," p. 128, on a sale by Catalans around 1345.

80. A case in Crete (1305) in Verlinden, *L'Esclavage*, II, 825.

81. *Ibid.*, II, 877-878. Contrary to Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 314-315, who relies on a shipment which arrived in Crete in August 1301, there is no reason to assume that slaves were imported then for agricultural work.

82. See Santschi, "Quelques aspects du statut," p. 122, note 50, and Verlinden, *L'Esclavage*, II, 828-830.

83. A case in 1364 for 40 hyperpers: see Santschi, *Régestes*, p. 107, no. 63.

be married. An abandoned infant slave became free if not claimed, in conformity with Roman law.⁸⁴ To sum up, although certain rules applied to slave and villein alike, the latter enjoyed a superior status.

Economic factors no doubt played an important role in shaping the pattern of daily coexistence of individuals belonging respectively to the Latin and Greek communities; these factors also generated divergent and even contrasting attitudes and feelings.

Land remained, as before the conquest, the principal source of income in Greece.⁸⁵ Whether held in full ownership or as a conditional tenement, it was mostly in the hands of the Latins, who expropriated the Greeks' land on a large scale and replaced them as landlords. In contrast to the Byzantine period, land became under Latin rule a double source of revenue for the landlords: income deriving from agricultural exploitation and income from what had been public taxes, especially in feudalized areas and, to a lesser degree, in Venetian territories, as a result of the transfer of fiscal state prerogatives into private hands. Land seems to have yielded good returns: it provided knights with means to maintain an appropriate standard of living, and its temporary or permanent acquisition was considered a good investment, as illustrated by the commercialization of military tenements in Crete.⁸⁶ On the whole, Greeks were prevented by social and legal barriers from substantially enlarging their landholding and getting their share of a prosperous agriculture increasingly geared to export. It may be assumed that this situation generated some degree of resentment within the ranks of the Greek elite, further enhanced by its exclusion from the economic benefits deriving from power positions in feudalized areas, as well as from governmental offices in Venetian territories and Catalan cities.

84. Ratti Vidulich, *Duca di Candia, Bandi*, nos. 100 and 153; Santschi, *Régestes*, p. 263, no. 1196: a case of postponement in 1388; *idem*, "Quelques aspects," p. 125, notes 60 and 61, and on the status of offspring in cases of mixed parentage, *ibid.*, pp. 114-115, 117-120.

85. On the economy of Latin Greece see Jacoby, "Les États latins," pp. 42-48. On the Morea in particular see numerous documents in Filangieri, *I Registri*, and Longnon and Topping, *Documents*; also Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp. 320-325; Carile, *La Rendita feudale*, pp. 80-183, and "Rapporti fra signoria rurale e despoteia," pp. 548-570, as well as the reviews by Jacoby of Longnon and Topping, *Documents*, and of Carile's book (see bibliography above). On Venetian territories see Borsari, *Il Dominio*, pp. 67-103, and his *Studi*, pp. 107-132; Laiou, "Quelques observations," pp. 177-198, and her "Observations on the Results of the Fourth Crusade," pp. 47-54, 57; Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 309-349, 410-428. Notarial documents and Venetian complaints about piracy provide evidence of the extensive reliance of Greek traders who were Venetian or foreign subjects on ships belonging to Venetians. On piracy see especially Gareth Morgan, "The Venetian Claims Commission of 1278," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, LXIX (1976), 411-438.

86. Presumably because of the rise in grain prices; some prices paid in the thirteenth century for military tenures are recorded by Borsari, *Il Dominio*, opposite p. 84.

In the Morea the archontes benefitted from grants of land, generally on a moderate scale, and some of them served in the princely and seignorial administration; these two economic facets of integration into the ruling elite provided them with partial compensation for the loss of their social standing.

The holding of large estates by the Latins influenced not only the attitude of the Greek elite toward them, but also that of the peasants. The constant presence of Latin lords on these lands or in their vicinity, or, in the case of Italian landholders in the Morea, of their agents engaged in improving agricultural exploitation, their endeavor to ensure growing profits in a true commercial spirit, and a manpower shortage due to demographic contraction all brought heavy pressure to bear on the dependent peasantry, especially in Crete. The ethnic cleavage in the island was exacerbated by economic factors; it is therefore not surprising that Cretan peasants were often willing to join the archontes and the Greek clergy in opposing Venetian rule.

On the other hand, the expanding demand in Venice for agricultural products from Greece, grain and wine in particular, as well as raisins, cheese, wool, and hides, encouraged the cultivation of numerous plots of land and the raising of animals by landowners, lessees, and sharecroppers belonging to almost all ranks of society. It also afforded seasonal work for hired laborers. Latins and Greeks appear side by side, at times as partners, in numerous business contracts involving investments, loans, and labor in agriculture and the raising of animals.⁸⁷ The same holds true with the manufacturing of goods and the supply of services, as well as local and regional commerce on land and at sea. Greeks, however, suffered from various restrictions in maritime trade. Villeins were not allowed to leave the territory in which they lived. Thus, for instance, those of Crete were barred from traveling outside the island. In addition, Venetians and especially Venetian citizens seem to have acquired since the 1270's at the latest a dominant position in regional maritime transportation. This activity was partly integrated into the pattern of long-distance commerce and transportation dominated by itinerant traders and ships operating from Venice, and enjoying a favored status and the commune's protection. Some members of prominent Venetian families such as the Corners, Ghisi, Morosini, and Sanudos, who had settled in Crete, also participated in regional

87. See above, note 36. The production and trade of Cretan grain was stimulated in 1281 and the following decades by massive purchases made by the commune at guaranteed prices higher than those on the free market.

trade and shipping. In fourteenth-century Morea Florentine and south Italian traders largely monopolized the export of agricultural produce and its transportation to the Angevin kingdom of Sicily.

Activity related to manufacturing, trade, and shipping was mainly concentrated in urban centers. By crossing class and community boundaries, similar or joint economic activity led to social intercourse, tempered ethnic tensions somewhat, and opened the way to accommodation on a daily level between Greek and Latin city-dwellers. It is precisely this phenomenon that so worried the ruling elites in non-feudal territories and prompted them to enforce institutionalized ethnic segregation, as illustrated in Venetian Crete from the thirteenth century on and in the Catalan duchy of Athens in the fourteenth century.

This rapprochement occasionally extended to another sphere of daily life. Within a few years after the conquest, the Greek clergy was deprived of its higher ranks and of educated priests, who fled Latin rule,⁸⁸ yet it displayed a considerable vitality. Two factors explain its influence on the Greek community, especially in rural areas. Greek monks and Greek priests were to be found in cities and villages alike; besides, the latter lived among the laymen and shared their fate, as most priests were villeins.⁸⁹ This situation contrasted sharply with that of the Latin clergy. Catholic priests were not numerous enough to attend to the religious needs of the Latin population, which was scattered all over Latin Greece, often in very small groups: in 1210 Othon de la Roche, the "great lord" of Athens, asked pope Innocent III to provide priests for all castles and villages in which twelve Catholics were settled.⁹⁰ Besides, Latin priests were seldom present in rural areas or inland cities; most of them resided in coastal cities, where the major part of the Latin population dwelt. Finally, members of the higher Latin clergy were often absent from their sees and offices.⁹¹ It is therefore not surprising that growing numbers of Latins turned to Greek priests and attended their religious services. It may safely be assumed, however, that this religious symbiosis was not generalized and occurred only in places where Latins were few. In 1322 pope John XXII com-

88. For continental Greece see Herrin, "Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government," p. 263, and Thiriet, "La Symbiose," pp. 21, 29, 33; for Crete, see Borsari, *Il Dominio*, pp. 105-108.

89. See above, note 51; Thiriet, "La Symbiose," pp. 21-26, and his "Églises, fidèles et clergés," pp. 489-499, as well as Santschi, "Quelques aspects du statut," pp. 121-122 for Crete, and numerous cases in Longnon and Topping, *Documents*.

90. As mentioned in a letter of Innocent III, an. XIII, ep. 16, in *PL*, 216, col. 216.

91. Sathas, *Documents inédits*, II, 236-237, 245; Noiret, *Documents inédits*, pp. 191-192, 267, 305-306; Fedalto, *La Chiesa*, III, nos. 450-451, 512, 558-560, 582, 595, 668; Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 405-406; and his "Églises, fidèles et clergés," pp. 491-493.

plained bitterly that in the Morea Latins mingled with Greeks at religious services.⁹² The same phenomenon is attested in Crete by numerous sources, yet it is significant that a decree issued in 1349 specifically prohibited minor Venetian officials in the inland areas from having recourse to Greek priests.⁹³ It remains to be seen what impact this process had on the relations between the Latins and the Greek population.

The social, legal, and institutional framework established by the Latins in their respective territories shortly after the conquest no doubt conditioned to a large extent the attitudes and behavior of the Latin rulers and settlers toward the indigenous population, and vice versa. In spite of the diversity of regimes, certain basic features were common to all areas of Latin Greece: such were legal and social stratification and, broadly speaking, the deterioration in the status and condition of the Greeks. Daily coexistence affected, however, the pattern of relations between the two communities and their respective members, yet not to the same degree or in the same manner everywhere. In feudalized areas coexistence produced legal and social, but not religious or cultural, integration of the Greek elite into the Latin upper class. In non-feudal areas, even this limited integration remained exceptional. Institutionalized segregation was steadily enforced by Venice in Crete, yet proved effective at the level of the elites only. It seems to have been more successful in the Catalan duchy of Athens. Whatever the case, in the period under consideration here intermarriage seems to have remained a marginal phenomenon in Latin Greece, and coexistence never developed into an assimilation of the Latins to the Greek population.

In the fourteenth century the crossing of religious boundaries occurred in both directions, yet was apparently limited in scope.⁹⁴ More important in this respect was the religious symbiosis spreading in inland areas, which, however, was restricted to common religious practice. It derived no doubt from the practical needs of Latins and did not necessarily imply a change in religious affiliation, nor was it tanta-

92. Letter in Caesar Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici*, XXIV (Bar-le-Duc, 1872), cols. 187-188.

93. See above, note 52. Common religious services in cities were quite exceptional: see Thiriet, "Le Zèle unioniste d'un franciscain crétois et la riposte de Venise (1414)," *Polychronion* (above, note 14), pp. 496-504.

94. See above, notes 51 and 57; also especially Thiriet, "Églises, fidèles et clergés," pp. 493-495, and Laiou, "Quelques observations," pp. 197-198, who refers to mixed marriages which no doubt promoted the Latins' acculturation.

mount to conversion to Orthodoxy. Furthermore, it did not generate mutual accommodation between the Greek and Latin communities at large, nor did the spreading knowledge of the Greek language among Latins or social and economic intercourse between them and the Greeks, attested from the thirteenth century on, achieve this result. About 1220 Greek priests of Latin Morea coöperated with their fellow Greeks of Epirus,⁹⁵ and in 1244 Greek monks living in the duchy of Athens collaborated with those of Epirus or Nicaea.⁹⁶ About 1330, more than a century after the imposition of Latin rule, Marino Sanudo, an acute observer of Latin Greece, described the situation in Cyprus, Crete, Euboea, Rhodes, and other islands, as well as in the Morea, as follows: "Although these places are subjected to the rule of the Franks and obedient to the Roman church, almost all the population is Greek and is inclined toward this sect [the Greek Orthodox church], and their hearts are turned toward Greek matters, and when they can show this freely, they do so."⁹⁷ Venice was perfectly aware of this crucial fact, which explains its segregationist policy and its reluctance to enlist Greeks in the armed forces and navy, unless absolutely necessary, on a temporary basis, and on a limited scale.⁹⁸

It has been claimed that Venice's attitude toward its Greek subjects became more lenient from the late fourteenth century on, against the background of the Ottoman advance in the Balkans.⁹⁹ This statement requires some qualifications. It is true that the commune became somewhat more attentive to the wishes of the Greek population in its territories and adopted a more flexible attitude on practical matters, such as the training of Greek archers in order to ensure the coastal defense of Crete.¹⁰⁰ With that it is significant, as noted above, that it basically maintained its stance on mixed marriages, the participation of Greeks and *vasmuli* in political assemblies, and their holding of high state offices, as well as on religious symbiosis. The anti-Venetian unrest stimulated in Crete and Corfu from the mid-fifteenth century on by the arrival of Greek priests from Byzantine and Turkish territories leads to the conclusion that Sanudo's statement about the Greek attitude towards the Latins remained largely valid in this period. He had rightly

95. See Demetrius Chomatianus, ed. Pitra, VII, cols. 87-98, no. 22.

96. *Les Registres d'Innocent IV*, ed. Élie Berger, I (Paris, 1884), pp. 112-113, no. 657 (April 29, 1244).

97. "Istoria del Regno di Romania," ed. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes*, p. 143.

98. On its vacillating policy on this last matter see Jacoby, "Les États latins," p. 29, and "Les Gens de mer," pp. 181-185, 191; also Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 402-403.

99. Thiriet, *La Romanie*, pp. 301-302, 395 ff.

100. See Jacoby, "Les Gens de mer," p. 185.

perceived that Greek religious affiliation was the source of Greek ethnic awareness.¹⁰¹ It is only later, in the sixteenth century, that Latin acculturation proceeded further, and accommodation between Latins and Greeks emerged in the territories remaining under Venetian rule.

101. For this reason Greek priests may have pretended to know no language other than their own, as suggested by a trial held in Candia in 1410: see Thiriet, "Églises, fidèles et clergés," pp. 495-496.