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INTRODUCTION

The concept of continuity, or in other words the absence of a gap, between the Middle Ages and modern times can be applied to colonial history in the strict sense. (Charles Verlinden, The Beginnings of Modern Colonization, Ithaca, N.Y., and London, 1970, xvi).

The period from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries was a time of significant economic and social progress in the history of Europe. The development of industry and urban growth, the increasing role of trade and the expansion of geographical knowledge led to an époque of colonial expansion for Italy. Its maritime republics, Genoa and Venice, became cradles of commercial development and represent an early modern system of international long-distance trade in the late medieval period. These city-states came to the forefront of world history not only because of their commercial importance and the commercial mechanisms of exchange they introduced and adopted, but also because of their naval importance and the establishment of their overseas settlements. “The eastern Mediterranean region saw the emergence of what must be described not as mere trading posts but as colonies.”1 Moreover, it is plausible that besides being the motherland of the modern commercial techniques, Italy also introduced the phenomenon of colonialism in its early modern form as “one people’s control over another people through the economic, political and ideological exploitation of a development gap between the two”2 into European, and indeed world, history, since the patterns and models established by Italian colonialists later influenced the colonial experiences of other nations in the époque of Great Geographic Discoveries. Belgian scholar Charles Verlinden has noticed that Italy was “the only really colonizing nation during the Middle Ages” and that “many features, characteristic of the economic and colonial activity of the further European colonial experience can only be understood when their connection and resemblance with Italian precedents is kept in mind.”3

The Italians transcended the barriers of locality and parochialism and penetrated parts of the world previously little known to Europeans. Both Genoa and Venice conducted long-

2 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 1.
distance trade, relying on a network of colonies and trading stations, spread mainly across the Levantine and Black Sea area, which were always a crossroads and a contact zone for different civilizations because of its geographical location. The latter was extremely important from a commercial point of view, that is, for the expansion of the Republic of Genoa – this is why Genoa was particularly focused on the region of the Black Sea.⁴

The city of Caffa (now known as Theodosia)⁵ on the Crimean Black Sea coast lay at the centre of the Genoese network of colonies, trading stations and overseas domains situated far from the metropolis. Caffa was the biggest centre of commerce in the Black Sea and was an outpost that played a pivotal role in the Genoese system of international long-distance trade. From its emergence around 1260s–1270s (see below) until it fell to the Ottomans in 1475, the city was a veritable crossroads of cultures.⁶ This resulted in the emergence of a mixed and cosmopolitan ethnic and cultural environment that gave birth to a new multicultural society comprising features characteristic of Western Europe, the Mediterranean area and the Near East as well as those of Central and Eastern Europe. The history of these societies and cultures may be regarded as one of the histories of unrealized potential of intercultural exchange that began with the penetration of Italians to the Black Sea basin and stopped soon after the Ottoman conquest of Crimea. The city of Caffa, which is in the centre of the present study is studied as a frontier zone for Latin Christendom and a contact zone for many civilizations. In this sense the multicultural society of Caffa was a reliable reflection of the essence of the Mediterranean, and from the Caffian perspective we can see the Mediterranean world as a whole in the époque prior to the Age of Discovery. Studying the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea, we are studying the Mediterranean, or, rather, Eastern Mediterranean multiculturality.⁷

---

⁴ Hereafter, with ‘Northern Black Sea coast’ or ‘Black Sea region’, I imply that this geographic area also includes the coasts of Azov Sea.
⁵ Otherwise spelt as Feodosiya or Feodosiia; Феодосія in Ukrainian, Феодосия in Russian, Θεοδοσία in Greek.
⁶ It is also important to mention that Caffa was one of the main connecting points between the European and Asian Christians. See: Tardy, Kaukázusi Magyar tükrő. Kőrösi Csoma Kiskönyvtár 20 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988). 47.
⁷ Applying the concept of ‘multiculturality’ as well as the adjective ‘multicultural’ to the Middle Ages in general and to the colonial situation of Genoese Gazaria in particular unavoidably requires due clarification. The terms ‘multiculturalism’ or ‘multiculturality’ can be used both prescriptively and descriptively. As a prescriptive term, multiculturalism refers to the set of policies and ideologies that aim at promoting, encouraging, and institutionalizing cultural diversity (unlike the policies of assimilation or segregation). As a descriptive term, multiculturalism refers to the mere existing situation of cultural diversity of a certain place; the creation of a demographic landscape of this type is due to a conjunction of different ethnic groups into this place, which in its turn can be either due to planned demographic policy, or stochastic factors determining migration flows. The first, namely prescriptive, usage is a phenomenon of modern or rather contemporary history and its application
Though the Genoese were trading actively in Crimea as early as the thirteenth century, the period during which Caffa flourished (and respectively the trade of its metropolis in the Black Sea area) ran from the fourteenth to (arguably) the fifteenth centuries. As a pivotal point for Genoese trade with the East, Caffa then became a centre of the economic and social life of the Genoese on the Black Sea, as well as the administrative centre of a political unit called Genoese Gazaria. This was a network of Genoese cities, towns and castles, trading stations, landed domains and fortified coastal settlements: in other words, a Genoese colonial empire in the Black Sea basin that provided the Italians with a political and administrative frame for their commercial activity. These settlements began to appear in the thirteenth century all along the coasts of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, connecting Western Europe, Italy, Central Europe, Latin Romania, the Byzantine Empire, the Trebizond Empire, the Muslim Near East, and the entire Eastern Mediterranean with Eastern Europe, Caucasus, steppes of Cumania and the Golden Horde, Middle and Eastern Asia by its traffic routes. Research on the history of Caffa and the impact of Italians on its social life, culture, and mentality also implies studying and narrating the history of Genoese Gazaria as a territorial entity, because the majority of relevant written sources reporting data on other settlements of Gazaria were produced in Caffa. It is clear, then, that although focusing on Caffa in the fifteenth century in the present study, I will not confine myself to within its city walls. My research also comprises an investigation of different aspects of the history of the Genoese overseas empire of Gazaria as a whole; however, because of the limitations imposed by the sources this can only be done through the lense of the sources from Caffa, and focusing mainly on this city. Studying the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea, we study the Mediterranean, looking at Caffa we look at Gazaria as a whole.

---

8 The word ‘Gazaria’ (Greek: Χαζαρία) means the entity constituted by the Genoese possessions in the Black Sea area. The area was called this by the Byzantines or by the Italian newcomers after the ethnonym of the Khazars, a semi-nomadic Turkic folk that lived in the region of the River Volga and the river Don in around the seventh to ninth centuries. See: Szyszman, “Découverte de la Khazarie,” Annales ESC 3 (1970): 818-824.

9 The point of view of the exclusively negative influence of Italian trade on the economy and politics of Byzantine Empire based on the opinions of Greek intellectuals of the late Middle Ages is now more balanced and scholars prefer to speak about the interaction of the Byzantines with the Italians and mutual cultural exchange (including the economic sphere). Oiconomides, Hommes d’affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe-XVe siècles) (Montréal/Paris, 1979).
While Crimea was historically a crossroads of civilizations, in the case of the Italian presence in the East it is in a certain sense unique for the Middle Ages and early modernity. Certainly, in pre-modern or early modern times it was also sometimes possible to see a similarly broad variety of cultures, nations and identities elsewhere all interacting with each other within a fairly limited space, and the same intensive transcultural contacts and commercial networks of such transnational character. For instance, in Spain, Sicily, or Northern Africa, Latin Christians cohabitated with the Arabs and Jews; the Levant was a contact zone for many cultures; the Byzantines were in continuous and close contact with both Westerners and the Turks. The peculiarity of the Crimea, however, lies not in the quantitative fact that it was inhabited by many different peoples, but rather in the fact that all the above-mentioned types of transcultural and interethnic interactions that occurred in the Mediterranean met there together in a single melting pot: the peninsula united Christians and Muslims, Greek

---

Orthodox and Monophysites, Italians and Greeks, Tatars and Armenians, Caucasians and Syrians.\textsuperscript{11}

Another important element (and indeed related to the broader fields of Global History and, in particular, Colonial Studies) was the fact that over the course of time the Italian newcomers settled and began to constitute an integral part of the local population. Thus, we should state the existence of the colonial situation within a multicultural environment. Research on the history of Genoese Gazaria and its political role, trade, and society thus occupies an important place in studies on late medieval history. It allows us to better understand the role of the overseas Italian colonies in a broader context of the history of the Black Sea area, Eastern Europe, Central and Western Europe, and the Middle East, and – finally – in the context of global history in the period, when the world and history started becoming global, at the dawn of the First Age of Globalization.\textsuperscript{12} This research presents the Black Sea region mainly through sources originating from Caffa and it therefore lies thematically somewhere on the border between Frontier Studies and Urban Studies. However, it is not easy to place the field here since the research implies a multidisciplinary study with different and overlapping fields. Caffa cannot, for example, be categorized within recognized urban taxonomies. A provisional definition could therefore instead probably be “a multicultural colonial urban centre,” uniting Latino-Christian, Byzantine-Greek, Slavic and Russian, nomadic Turkic and Tatar, Caucasian, Armenian, Jewish, and Eastern Mediterranean cultures. This multicultural society undoubtedly constituted a bridge between Europe and Asia, just as certain other Mediterranean societies did. What is more, it was not only a crossroads of Eastern Mediterranean cultures, but also a connecting point between the Mediterranean and Central and Eastern Europe. Furthermore, and even more important for us, it was a bridge between the world of the Middle Ages and the modern world of capitalism, colonialism, and globalization.


Research question

There is no lack of studies on either Levantine history or the history of Italian colonies overseas. Numerous general works and more focused studies provide us with a broad historiographical context. In recent decades there has been particular progress in historiography. Nevertheless, a sound understanding and knowledge of the Genoese cities, colonies, and trading stations on the Black Sea coast in the fifteenth century is lacking, and the secondary literature on the subject is neither sufficient nor consistent. The functioning of the colonial system of Gazaria, its administrative and legal framework, hinterland, agriculture, and craftsmanship, aspects of society and ethnicity, urban culture, and transnational interaction have only been superficially studied. Very few large-scale studies focus on Caffa and Genoese Black Sea domains in particular and for their own sake. There is still a certain contradiction between the scale and availability of the source evidence; in particular the history of Caffa in the fifteenth century has been little studied; the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries are much better covered by an influential study by Michel Balard ‘La Romanie Génoise,’ dealing with the three colonial domains of Genoa and relying on a vast amount of the archival sources. In more recent works, the emphasis is still on the earlier period; that is the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. One explanation for this is that there is a greater amount of available sources for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Many of these are published, and today generalizations based on existing published sources and secondary literature without a deep engagement in the archival research are more plausible. Many researchers have studied these published sources (e.g. the statutes or the documents related to the administration), narratives and travelogues (often semi-legendary), and paid little or no attention to the vast amount of notarial deeds and books of accounts preserved from the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.\(^\text{13}\) Moreover, there is a certain bias that I have mentioned before – since the second half of the last century the academic world has been more inclined to treat the fifteenth century (following mostly, though not exclusively, the trend established by R. Lopez) as a period of decline of the Genoese Black Sea trade, or at best its regionalization and reduction. Therefore, the period and the region are disregarded, and the main part of the most relevant evidence, the archival sources for the history of Caffa have neither been published nor thoroughly investigated. At the same time, the point of

decline or increase of the Genoese Black Sea commercial activity is highly questionable. Were the external political (the Ottoman conquest) or internal economic factors the main reason for its cease that led to the transfer of capital to the West, including financing the Hispanic colonial enterprises starting from the colonisation of Northern Africa and the Canary Islands to be continued in the New World? This and many other questions have to be answered. Notwithstanding the fact whether the fifteenth century of Genoese Gazaria was only a depressive period of decay of long-distance trade that began long before a final loss of the colonies to the Ottomans or a spring of the Genoese system of investments that later flourished on the West, in essence a big capitalist venture, or even an energetic trial run for future European colonialism in the Age of Discovery.

In most general terms, the goal of this study is to go deeper into various aspects of the history of Caffa largely based not only on the published sources and secondary literature, but also on the vast amount of original archival sources that have been studied either superficially or not at all (I refer mainly about the books of accounts and the notarial registers of the late fourteenth and fifteenth century, see below for an overview of the sources). There are several substantial historical narratives which focus on Caffa. Indeed, the most pivotal and classical work in this field is the already-mentioned La Romanie Génoise by Balard. This is an histoire totale focusing on Genoese Romania as a whole and thus taking in Chios, Pera, and Caffa. Balard laid a solid foundation with this work and no further research in this area can ignore what he has done. There are also no grounds to reproach him for taking such a broad scope, because his research on Caffa was done as meticulously as on the two remaining colonies and has not yet been superseded, although has been amended in certain points. Nonetheless, the problem remains as Balard’s study largely leaves the post-1400 period untouched and deals mainly with the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries, as do most of the preceding and following general narratives written about Caffa. Previous writers did not focus much on the fifteenth century, and no one has ever tried to focus on a particularly interesting transitional period and to trace the Genoese–Ottoman transformation and continuity after the fall of Gazaria in 1475–1484. Similarly, no one has tried to carry out research within a single study of late Genoese and early Ottoman documents. Thus, the authors who wrote about Caffa did not
undertake a research into a broad variety of the fifteenth-century archival sources covering 1400–1475, and this is exactly what I do in this doctoral thesis.¹⁴

Speaking in more particular terms, the main research question is how Gazaria, the Genoese colonial empire on the shores of the Black Sea, and its multicultural colonial society adapt – or fail to adapt – to the hard political situation of the fifteenth century created by Ottoman expansion and the shifting of trade routes that took place in the second half of the fourteenth century? What was the political and economic importance of Caffa in this rapidly changing world of the Eastern Mediterranean/Black Sea? How did the colonial model change in the course of the 1380s–1470s? How did this multicultural society shaped by the 1380s and relying mainly on a network of urban communities react to the challenges laid before it in the course of the fifteenth century, what was its survival resource in the emergency created by the Ottoman menace, how did the inter-ethnic relations affect Caffa in terms of contributing to its survival against the Ottoman threat or actually contributing to its decay, and how did Caffa transform answering to the above mentioned challenges?

Answering these questions immediately raises certain problems. Time and development of historical knowledge have created a gap in terms of analysis and interpretation of the source data due to the backwardness of the methodological approaches applied in the field so far. Surprisingly, while certain aspects of the (mainly economic) history of Caffa and the entire Black Sea region were seriously and meticulously studied for the last hundred and fifty years or even longer mainly by the generations of scholars working in the positivist or neo-positivist theoretical and conceptual frameworks (and thanks to them we indeed have a general idea of how the Italian overseas colonies and trade functioned), in recent decades this unique situation and this unique region with its most intensive interactions of nations and cultures were almost completely disregarded by scholars working in the theoretical and methodological frameworks of cultural anthropology, the history of mentality, urban history, local social history, frontier studies, colonial studies, and so forth. A possible explanation for this is the Eurocentrism of most of the researchers of the Italian colonies. This is not only due to the limitations imposed by the sources (which obviously reflect the performance of the Italians better than that of the local Orientals),¹⁵ but also due to their own bias they were

¹⁴ The data on the history of Gazaria in thirteenth and fourteenth centuries will be used here as a background, and to compare and trace the dynamics diachronically; however, my independent research focuses on the period between 1400 and 1475.

¹⁵ Balard, *La Romanie Génoise (XIIe–début du XVe siècle)* (Rome/Genoa: École française de Rome, 1978), vol. 1, 269. By using the term ‘Orientals,’ I am following a long-term and well established historiographical
interested mainly in the *Italian presence* on the Black Sea, largely ignoring the issues connected to the other nations. Perhaps it is because the histories of Caffa and of the Italians on the Black Sea bear a theoretical and methodological stamp of the previous age of historiography; it was not until recent times that the interaction of the Italians with the local population provoked any academic interest whatsoever.

Yet another explanation is the political embeddedness of the scholarly discourse on the overseas colonies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The narratives on the ‘Italians overseas’ were to a large extent not the histories of interaction, but the histories of the alleged expansion of a nation. Obviously, these studies were done in the dominating paradigms of national histories. To put it even more sharply, “professional historical scholarship emerged and developed as an intellectual artefact of the national-state era of world history… [it] emerged at a time of intense nationalism and energetic state-building projects in Europe, and historians lavished attention on the national states, which they construed as discrete and internally coherent communities, rather than the many other social, cultural, religious, ethnic, or racial groupings that they might have taken as units of analysis.”\(^ {16}\) Albeit there was no Italian nation-state in the Middle Ages, a large part of the scholarly literature on the Italian colonies was written bearing in mind the nation-state perspective of history.

Another significant problem in this field, as in many others, is the huge gap between the scholars working with the written sources (mainly in the Italian archives) and those working with the material ones (mainly *in situ* in the Black Sea area). This gap is even more problematic given the difference in national scholarly traditions, as well as in cultural and language barriers: most scholars dealing with the archives are from Western Europe\(^ {17}\) (obviously, with certain exceptions, as a strong tradition laid by Kaprov in Lomonosov’s, as well as the Romanian school), while most of the archaeologists and other people working with more ‘material’ things have a Soviet background and are based in Russia and the rest of the post-Soviet area; some of them do not read foreign languages and thus have inadequate access to the unpublished archival sources. Thus notwithstanding that both the research into documental sources (mainly stored in Italy) and the investigation of the material sources

\(^{16}\) Bentley, “Global History and Historicizing Globalization,” 70.

\(^{17}\) And one may suspect that at least some of them have never visited the Black Sea area.
(mainly situated locally) have long-lasting traditions, these two barely overlap and there has been little or no interaction between people working on the same subject, but in different fields. Historians and archaeologists (as well as epigraphists, etc.) still tend to work separately and rarely take into the work of colleagues from a different discipline into account. In the monographs and articles written in Italy or France we rarely find a single reference to a work of some local Crimean archaeologist\(^\text{18}\) (or to any work written in Russian whatsoever), while those same archaeologists are often unaware (or have only a very vague idea) of the material on the history of their own area stored in Italy. There are at least three barriers here: 1. the barrier of type of sources and professional division to those working with the written sources and those dealing with the material ones; 2. language barriers; 3. barriers of space that make the interaction among scholars difficult. As a result, most of the studies ignore to a certain extent the work of other scholars, the results reached by different teams do not overlap, and any kind of interdisciplinary approach is rare. Patrick Manning’s observation that “historians are an omnivorous group, one that eventually consumes the data and the methods of every other investigative group”\(^\text{19}\) is a remote ideal in our field. This is yet another problem that the present study will try to overcome. “Science recognizes no borders and has always striven for universal understanding.”\(^\text{20}\)

The following words were written twenty years ago, but remain relevant today: “Modern historiography investigates with particular interest either the most brilliant or the less studied civilizations. The Black Sea region in the Middle Ages deserves a double interest – it was a part and a crossroad of several great civilizations and it is among the less studied for its own sake.”\(^\text{21}\) The thriving medieval and early modern history and civilization(s) of the Black Sea region are disregarded. That is why we need to investigate the history of this region and address the main aspects of its social and economic life. Based on both published and unpublished original sources, I intend to produce a holistic picture of the life of the city in the context of the functioning of Genoa’s trade system on the Black Sea coast. There are two more important considerations to be taken into account. The first is methodological and

\(^{18}\) Indeed, the richness of the literature in Russian is now largely unavailable and therefore ignored by Western scholars. Those valuable, but not very numerous translations of the works of Prof. Karpov, as well as studies written by him initially in foreign languages cannot compensate for this gap. There is a huge amount of literature on and about Caffa, as well as of the books and articles dealing with different aspects of the Black Sea medieval history (from amateur or popular local history studies to archaeology, art history, epigraphy, etc.).


is connected to the feasibility and perspectives of such genre as *histoire totale*, as well as problems connected to this genre. I believe that *mutatis mutandis* this genre is still feasible and fruitful in the development of historical scholarship, if we take into account all or most of the criticism levelled against it. Having said this, however, we should keep in mind the development of scholarship and the stage of the state of art. Although *histoire totale* as a genre and type of history-writing may remain the same, the studies written in this genre in 1970s and the one written in the 2010s will still differ a great deal. Last, but not least, even though many brilliant works on Caffa have been written, their availability has certain linguistic limitations. Most of these books and articles are written in French, Italian, Russian, and Polish, and there is still no general analytical monograph on Genoese Gazaria and region as a whole in English. Giving a panoramic overview of the history of Caffa to the English-speaking audience is among the aims of the present study. That is why I feel that an effort to write such a history in English will also contribute greatly to the scholarship, because it will bring the knowledge in the field to a wider circle of academics.

It is obvious that the first (and main) condition for a reliable reconstruction of the history and society of Caffa and the domains of Genoese Gazaria is a deep research into the archival (and other) sources. To have a comprehensive set of source evidence we have to do research into exactly those archival sources which have never been published, or have not yet been analysed comprehensively and systematically. This is an ambitious attempt, but still a feasible one. Late medieval and early modern history is unique in two senses: first, we normally have enough source material for a reliable reconstruction (unlike the preceding period), and, second, the set of sources on one particular topic can be huge, but still sufficiently available to cover and comprehend it rather than to sink in it (unlike the following period). Studying Genoese Gazaria we face a large and well-documented period. There are a number of more or less representative serial sources from Caffa; and we also have a huge number of other sources and secondary literature to contextualize the primary data. A scholar dealing with this field is privileged in the sense that he uses new sources in the context of the old historical narratives. Thus, there is both enough of the source data and

---

23 Balard’s study focuses more on the economic history *par excellence* (although it comprises a significant component of economic history of the region). Certainly, as the art of historiography is now on an entirely new level of scholarship, even the data, which Balard interpreted many years ago will look different and lead to different conclusions in the light of what was written since those times.
historiographical background to create some solid ground at the beginning, and at the same time there is enough room left for a researcher aiming to create a holistic picture of life in Gazaria through the analysis and comprehensive study of the sources.

The researcher must be ambitious and bold, and the study must be based on research into the archival sources in the context of already known ones. Such a study must follow a number of other guidelines in order to fill the gaps in the historiography. First, it must be a comprehensive history of Genoese Gazaria, in tune with the main insights and methodological approaches of the *histoire totale* instead of being concentrated on some particular aspect of life. Second, there are available written sources produced in the administrative centre of an entire colonial domain. Naturally, sources from Caffa cover Gazaria as a unit. Therefore, taking Caffa (or rather sources originating from Caffa) as a starting point, I intend to expand my research to the entire Genoese colonial empire in the Northern Black Sea, using additional sources from and studies made of other Genoese settlements. Third, I do not take for granted either of the presuppositions already drawn on the political or economic reasons of the fall of Caffa or on decline, regionalization, or flourishing of the Italian Black Sea trade and urban life in the fifteenth century. I will instead try to approach this issue based on the new source evidence that will enable me to gain new insights and to make new considerations. Furthermore, I will try to overcome at least partially the existing estrangement between the historians who work with the written sources and scholars focused on the material ones. Starting with the archival research and contextualization of the new data into the previous scholarship, I will also try to attract all possible types of sources, including the results of the excavations, numismatics, heraldry, epigraphy, onomastic, etc. Still dependent in a way on my non-material and non-archaeological educational background, I am lucky to be a Crimean aborigine, and familiar with the disciplines in question if not through systematic university training, then at least through constantly being in contact with the specialists in the fields concerned. In addition, I will try insofar as I can to introduce into the field more up-to-date methodological tools and an interdisciplinary approach, which is indispensable for the analysis of the complex reality that we find in medieval Crimea. In the words of Jerry Bentley:

...While the strategy of going local effectively undermines some of the assumptions of Eurocentric history, the strategy of going global by historicizing

---

24 The Genoese settlements on the South of the Black Sea were not managed from Caffa and had a different system of ruling and administration. This study addresses some aspects of their history when needed, but they are not considered to be an object of research here.
globalization offers opportunities to de-center Europe by situating European experience in the larger context of world history.\textsuperscript{25}

Another important issue is the perspective taken by a historian. Much can be written about the Eurocentrism of most previous studies as an issue to be overcome in one way or another. It is obvious that from the first steps the historiography of the Italian colonies on the Black Sea was written mainly by Italians and was mainly interested in the Italian presence on the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{26} It is largely due to the Eurocentric mental frameworks and the legacy of modern colonialism that the role of the local non-Western nations and cultures is still underestimated in the scholarship of the field, and so far an integral study of the region in its diversity has not emerged. This is partially due to the nature of the sources, but it seems to me that neither the superabundance of the sources of Western origin written in Latin and in Italian vernacular, nor the lack of indigenous written sources is the main reason. The main problem is that scholars continue to think of the Black Sea region Eurocentrically. We are doomed to look at the historical process in the region from the prospective given by the European written sources and this situation cannot be changed entirely. It can, however, be improved by going deeper into the research of transnational contacts. My intuition here is to take as a starting point the sources of Italian origin, but to look at them through intercultural and transnational interaction, and to use a limited number of the non-Italian sources that can give a different angle and different prospective. One of the main methodological assumptions is that through the studies of cultural interaction in Crimea I try to move beyond the dominant Eurocentric narratives produced by the scholars who wrote primarily about Genoese or Venetians, and used any other data at best as a context. This does not imply an attempt or acclamation to re-evaluate the contribution of the West into the economic progress that led to the creation of the new world system. What I mean by rejecting Eurocentrism is merely a change in the scope. I am equally interested in the Genoese, Venetians, other Latin people, Greeks, Russians, Armenians, Jews, Tatars, and other components of that multicultural society; and the organization of Gazaria’s rural setting will be examined alongside the interaction between the metropolis and the colonial administration.

Introducing an interdisciplinary approach, overcoming the disconnection between written and material sources and reconsidering the Eurocentric prospective are, however, tools rather than the main agenda of my study. My expected outcome is an overview of the

\textsuperscript{25} Bentley, “Global History and Historicizing Globalization,” 77.
\textsuperscript{26} Probably it would be more correct to call this perspective ‘Italianoncentric’ or even ‘Genoacentric’ and introduce a new concept, but \textit{entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitate}.  
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history of Genoese Gazaria at different levels and in various aspects, considering policies, administration, economy, society, culture, mentality, and so forth. That is, a holistic study that will show based on the analysis of the sources, the main trends in the adaptations and transformations of the Genoese Black Sea colonies in the fifteenth century. I will therefore try to take a closer and more detailed look at different aspects of the life of the Italian settlements during the fifteenth century, and as far as my sources will allow it. Naturally, I will structure this study thematically, so that each chapter deals with a specific objective connected to certain aspect of the settlements’ life or a certain angle of approach.

**Research focus**

The first task was a study of the role of the Genoese domains against the background of the political history and international relations in the region. As in the case with the later colonial experiences, the Italians applied certain political strategies of securing the hegemony. Yet we must, however, keep in mind that Genoese colonization was largely a private undertaking (strikingly, like many other modern ones, managed by companies until the nineteenth century). Furthermore, based on the canvas of events in Eastern Europe and the Near East, and in the context of Italian history in the given period, I expected to draw conclusions as to the nature and modes of application of the above-mentioned strategies. It was once stated that the central point in all Genoese international politics was to secure favourable conditions for commerce. How did this work in practical terms? How did the Italians interact on a high level with the local sovereigns? How much and in what sense were the policies connected with the commercial situation? What can be said on the commercial dimension of these policies? How did Genoa manage its diplomatic network in the region? My first chapter therefore deals with the early stages of the Italian penetration to the Black Sea area, the origins of the Genoese

---

27. Just to recall unequal treaties with Byzantium as one of the first steps of these political strategies.
28. Unlike the Venetians, the Genoese never had a particularly strong feeling of raison d’état. Private interests of families, kin, clans, and corporations prevailed in Genoa over the solidarity and national idea (insofar as the term ‘national’ can be applied to the medieval maritime city-states). Therefore, the colonial activity was mainly held by the groups of merchants, or families (alberghe) of the noblemen. Together, they managed their commercial initiatives, raised funds, sent the ships, hired the mercenaries and the manpower, etc. Genoa was weak as a state, but strong as far as its corporations were concerned. Braudel wrote that the Genoese state was inherently weak, and it had all the time to yield to a foreign authority, either voluntarily, or under the pressure. The Genoese expansion on the Black Sea shores was made possible because of an efficient system of the trading companies. However, one can see here a feature that puts the colonial experience of the Genoese in one line with the Hispanic, Dutch, and English colonisations with their famous companies like the British, French, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish West India Companies, the British, French, Austrian, Dutch, Danish, Portuguese, and Swedish East India Companies, or the South Sea Company.
29. Including the Genoese-Venetian competition, wars, and so forth.
colonies, and the colonial system in its formation. The technical chronological end of the first chapter is 1400; however, reading the present study, we should constantly keep in mind a much more important landmark – the 1380s – which is the time of the final shaping of the Genoese colonial domain, and, at the same time, the point from which we have more abundant and more reliable serial source material. Thus, in general terms it makes sense to divide the history of Gazaria into:

1. From the thirteenth century until the 1380s (the final shaping of the Genoese Black Sea colonial system);
2. From the 1380s until 1453 (the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans, the closure of the Straits, the transition of the colonies to the Bank of Saint George and a growing, although never absolute, isolation of the colonies from the metropolis);
3. From 1453 until 1475 (the fall of Caffa and most of other colonies).

The following chapters are dedicated to the evolution and transformation of different dimensions of life in the Genoese Caffa and Gazaria in the period following the 1380s. In order to understand these developments I had to constantly present the background in a broader chronological perspective. The physical layout of the region in question (including the urban environment of Caffa) is another integral part of this study, alongside the topography and physical conditions of the colonies, as well as different aspects which can best be described as ‘spatial’. Research into the urban and rural layout can give important evidence on the intensiveness of connections between the urban Italian settlements and their hinterland. This should answer the question: How deep did Genoese colonization go, and was it really limited to a network of coastal towns? It is obvious that the Crimea’s involvement into the Italians’ long-distance trade provoked profound changes in the urban environment, presumably affecting most of the Greek towns of the Northern Black Sea, even those which were relatively isolated. The scale of the Italian trade’s impact was certainly greater in places such as Caffa, Soldaia, or Tana, more modest in the case of smaller coastal towns and villages, and even smaller in the case of other places situated alongside the main regional commercial routes. But how deep did Italian expansion go? Was it restricted by the walls of their fortresses and urban settlements, independent or semi-independent trading stations, or was the interaction between the cities and towns intensive and did the Genoese also penetrate into the rural area in terms of exploitation of their colonies? I use as a starting point the

---

30 Casa delle compere e dei banchi di San Giorgio founded in 1407.
sources written in the urban environment and by Westerners; however, they also reflect, albeit to a lesser extent, the life of the hinterland. Thus, a study of the agricultural life and the rural layout will also be an integral part of this study.

Administration and law normally indicate a connection between the metropolis and its colonies, and this field has been studied relatively well in the previous scholarship. However, a close look is needed in order to draw conclusions about the work of colonial administration maintained by the Republic of Genoa and afterwards by the Bank of Saint George. Another interesting issue would be to examine the connections between Genoa and Gazaria and among different cities and settlements within Genoese Gazaria, especially — among the administrative centre (Caffa) and the periphery (the rest). Was it really just a constellation of loosely connected trading stations, or a centrally managed and more or less consolidated territorial domain with an effective centre in Caffa?

The interaction of people of different identities in a mixed and indeed, entangled, society raises a number of issues. How intensive was this interaction, on what kind of level did it take place, and can we trace any dynamics of social transformation? Furthermore (and this is connected to overcoming Eurocentrism), while the percentage of Italian population in Gazaria grew over time, it is questionable whether they ever became the majority; in any case, a study of local ethnic and religious groups deserves a careful and meticulous scholarly approach. It was also not the case that the Italians absolutely dominated the Black Sea commerce, while the local people with their allegedly inferior culture remained in the total obscurity, backwardness and irrevocable stagnation. The reality was that the Italians’ commercial success was reached not only thanks to the advances made in navigation and their new commercial tools that they spread throughout the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, but also because they strongly relied on the local networks of merchants (mostly Greek and Armenian), which existed before the Italian penetration to the Mare Maius and were therefore deeply rooted in the local realities. As in the future history of colonial expansion, the help of local brokers and go-betweens must have played a crucial role, but this question has never been sufficiently studied. To put it more generally — we have still a lot to understand in order to have a clear picture of Caffa and to answer the question: how did this multicultural society work?

This research also comprises a close look at the society of Genoese Gazaria. I have focused on the demography, aggregation of different social groups, interconnectivity, social
structure and stratification, geographical mobility, social mobility and its strategies, vertical and horizontal social ties, patron-client relations, brokerage, social networks, norms of social comportment, the behaviour of individuals within the social structure, their relationships, sociability, and other aspects of the urban population. Special attention has been paid to examining the ethnic and confessional structure of the society, interethnic marriages, the legal standing of various ethnic groups, multiple identities, religious affiliation, proselytizing, etc. The predominantly ‘oppressionist’ vision of the Genoese activity on the Black Sea was balanced out in the recent decades by highlighting the facts of collaboration, cooperation, and cultural exchange between the Italians and the Greeks.

Shifting from the social history to the economic one, by investigating the issues of commerce and economy in general, I will reveal new data for estimating (and reconsidering) the economic role of Caffa in international trade, commerce in the Black Sea region, and the slave trade with Europe and Egypt. What I will question here are the decline of long-distance trade and the regionalization of commercial activity. Both remain controversial issues. Indeed, the routes of the European trade with Eastern Asia shifted in the fourteenth century towards the Levantine ports, while the Black Sea ports ceased to be a major intermediary in spice and silk trade. This led to a drop of profitability rates of luxury goods on the Black Sea. However, the drop in profits which happened after the crisis of trade of the fourteenth century does not per se mean the decline of trade; it may simply be evidence of the shifts in the trade’s structure which can be compensated by an increase of scale. The problem of ‘regionalisation or long-distance trade’ leads me to another question: were the patterns of commercial exchange similar to the previous experience of medieval trade, or did it have features of modern capitalism alongside its colonial trade patterns? After the mid-fourteenth century the silk and spices trade decreased and a new pattern seems to have been established. This new pattern implied an export of the raw materials (furs, food, and timber) from the Black Sea region in exchange for the textiles and other products from Italy and the West, which looks more like a modern colonial model characteristic of a new world system.

Another issue to be treated specially is the institution of slavery and the slave trade. Finally, there is an important historiographical problem that cannot be resolved in the present study

31 It would be particularly productive to investigate the intensiveness of the centre-periphery connections. This investigation must be twofold: 1. Genoa (center) – colonies (periphery), and 2. Caffa (center) – rest of Gazaria (periphery).
32 See, for instance Oikonomides, Hommes d’affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIIIe-XVe siècle) (Montréal, 1980).
(first, because of the geographical limits chosen), but it cannot be disregarded either. This problem is connected to the scale and the results of Italian trade’s influence on the regional economy of the late Byzantine/circum-Byzantine urban environment and on the activity of the local entrepreneurial class. This problem is not at all a recent invention,\textsuperscript{33} and I doubt whether even the abundant source material from Caffa can ever resolve it; however, I expect that my research will produce some evidence of the commercial activity (or conversely passiveness) of the local people, and thus make a contribution to this larger-scale debate.

Finally, we should not forget that the economic, social and cultural rise of Caffa provided a nurturing environment for a cosmopolitan culture and society diverse in terms of ethnicity, religion, and language. Balard suggested the term ‘Latino-Oriental culture’, comprising linguistic, legal, and even religious aspects.\textsuperscript{34} Was the Latin culture simply brought from Italy, imposed in Crimea, and thereafter existed in a vacuum, or was there a synthesis? What exactly was multiculturality of the society of Caffa; the mere coexistence of several different cultures, or their contact, exchange, and/or merging? In any case, the issues of intercultural exchange and transformation of culture and of mentality require an especially close and accurate look. An important role must be given here to brokerage,\textsuperscript{35} namely the networks of local intermediaries and go-betweens (particularly Greeks and Armenians), who helped Italians in their dealings with different languages, traditions, and indigenous peculiarities. Their role was particularly important when they acted as translators and interpreters and assisted the Italian newcomers to navigate in the indigenous society.\textsuperscript{36}

**Territorial and chronological frames**

I should say a few words here about the territorial boundaries to justify the scope of my research. I would willingly write about the whole of Genoese Gazaria within the framework of *histoire totale*. Unfortunately, this is hardly possible because of the heterogeneity of the extant sources. While there is an enormous amount of material from Caffa, the centre of

\textsuperscript{33} Carile, Oikonomides, Tinnefeld, Laiou-Thomadakis, and Balard claim the negative effects of the Italian activity on the Greek merchant class, while scholars like Zakythinos, Hendy, Lilie, Matschke, Gjuselev, and Karpov hold a more balanced view.

\textsuperscript{34} Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, 8.

\textsuperscript{35} The studies of cultural brokerage and go-betweens became recently a fashionable area, see, for example, Cohn, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge. The British in India* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).

\textsuperscript{36} Additionally, since the Black Sea region was a crossroads of cultures, this research can provide new data on the cultural history of the whole Eastern Mediterranean as well as of the territory of contemporary Russia and Ukraine.
Genoese Gazaria, the sources from all other settlements are fragmental, scarce, or (most often) not preserved at all. I can, for instance, draw a picture of the society and economy of Caffa based on an abundance of the notarial registers and accounts of massariae. Doing the same thing for a settlement like Cembalo, from which almost no documents are preserved whatsoever would only be possible with the help of some wizardry. For some other settlements (like Chilia or Tana) some source data (notarial deeds) is preserved, but it barely covers several years. We do, however, possess some systematic knowledge about other Genoese towns – the sources originated from Caffa reflect them inasmuch as they were all parts of the same administrative unit ruled from Caffa, and were all connected with their ruling city by the commercial connections. Thus, in most of my study I speak about Caffa rather than Gazaria, having in mind that all other Genoese Black Sea settlements were ruled from Caffa and traded mostly through Caffa. I will try to present them here, especially as far as the topography and colonial administration are concerned; I will often use data on these towns to contextualize the history of Caffa; I will not, however, attempt to undertake a reconstruction of the society, economy, and ethnic composition etc. of each of these settlements. Their histories are only used as a background for a history of their mother-city. In a sense this research is a history of the entire Genoese Gazaria – but seen through the lens of Caffa – and, which is more important, it is a history of Caffa, and not of all Genoese settlements of Gazaria.

As regards chronology, I will try to provide enough data on the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries inasmuch as this is needed to create the general background and contextualize the data I have taken from the archives. A comprehensive study of the early period and the so-called ‘golden age’ of Caffa is necessary here to compare it with the following period and to trace the dynamics, transition, and transformation. However, I decided to focus mainly on the period between 1380s and 1475. Since I explained why exactly this period is particularly interesting, I must now justify why I cannot, on the one hand, focus on the fifteenth century exclusively and have to go back two preceding centuries, and, on the other, why I am not doing any original research on the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The explanation is simple. The source material from the early period is more compact and very well researched, while the sources of the fifteenth century are abundant and
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37 Moreover, unlike the sources from Caffa of the fifteenth century, these sources from minor settlements are published, well researched, and even had there been more of such sources and an histoire totale of the whole Genoese Gazaria would have been a more feasible task, in this case my study would have been a compilation of what was already known before rather than to an independent research, which it attempts to be.
unstudied. Thus, published sources of the earlier period and secondary literature around them give a starting point for a study of the fifteenth century Caffa. However, this material from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is very relevant not only for the purposes of creating a background, contextualizing, or giving to the reader the idea of ‘how it all began’. The point is that most of the existing problematique in the field that I have mentioned above can be more or less reduced to a single and more general question, or at least necessarily has something to do with it: how deep was the transformation of the Italian presence and the Italian colonies on the Black Sea caused by the commercial crisis of the fourteenth century, and to which exactly qualitative and quantitative shifts did it lead? Today, with our certain knowledge about the ‘golden age’ of trade, this keynote question would be a leitmotif permeating every study on Genoese Gazaria during the fifteenth century. A researcher has to put the data of the earlier period against the background of the previous one, and to define changes and/or continuity. Our acquaintance with the studies that give a picture of Caffa in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries provide us with a starting point for a general account; the archival sources of the fifteenth century are a challenge for an independent study, the results of which can answer this question, being compared to earlier scholarship. Problematizing the historical contexts, tracing the structural changes in the diachronic prospective, analysing the logic and the factors underlying the dynamics, and incorporating the contextual elements into a broader scope are all done in this study in the history of a late medieval (or should we call it ‘early modern’?) experience of commercial and colonial expansion of the Genoese colony on the periphery of Latin Christendom in the context of the Italian cities and trading stations on the Black Sea coast, which will give a solid basis for further study of the Italian presence in the East. Another important result of my study is an MS-Excel database which can be used in future research. I also aim to place the role of the analysis of archival documents more precisely in contemporary historical methodologies as far as the reconstruction of medieval urban societies is concerned. Based on a massive archival work I have tried to provide a panoramic overview of the history of the Genoese Black Sea colonies to the English-speaking audience and also to see how these colonies and their multicultural societies functioned, adapted, and transformed on the actual dawn of capitalism and colonialism.
CHAPTER 1. OVERVIEW OF HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Historiography

Research into Italian trade and its presence on the Black Sea in the Middle Ages is by no means a recent invention and has a considerable historiographical tradition, boasting hundreds of books and articles. This tradition provides current scholarship with a number of long-existing problems (in addition to the new ones which it will encounter) and, on the other hand, it restrains from superficial and hasty assertions. As it would be difficult to cover the entire historiography and debate that emerged in and around this field, but I will give a brief overview which traces the studies marking the major trends and mainstreams in the field.

The beginnings of this history-writing can be dated to the fourteenth and sixteenth century, when we have the first accounts of the Italians’ deeds and settlements for the Levant and Crimea. Naturally, it would normally have been the descendants of the settlers in the metropolis to have written the history of their ancestors’ presence in the East. These historical narratives stand in our perception on the border between sources and historiography, combining the features of a primary source and of secondary literature. Besides the writings of the Italian chroniclers (such as Giorgio Stella), there are notices on Caffa in the Byzantine historiography (e.g. Nicephorus Gregoras, John Cantacuzenus, Michael Panaretos, etc.).

In the Renaissance, accounts describing the Genoese Caffa were marked by an interest in classical antiquity; and were also described in terms of their continuity and connection with it. Thus, Uberto Folieta saw the origins of Caffa as lying in ancient Theodosia. However, later on, in the seventeenth century, the history of Crimea was not conceived of as a field of primary importance for the Italian history. It was therefore generally disregarded by scholars (apart from a small number of works where it appeared in connection to Byzantine history), and was only briefly and occasionally mentioned in historical overviews. The seventeenth century was, however, a period of greater precision and analysis, even though myths and legends deriving from word of mouth were still abundant in the historical narratives of the time. Among the most significant accounts were those written by Anselmo Banduri in Latin, Andrej Lyzlov in Russian, Evliya Çelebi in Ottoman, and David

Krimetsi in Armenian (*non vidi*). Nevertheless, their writings were full of unreliable data often adopted uncritically by subsequent historiography.

Perhaps the first embryo of what was to later become a scholarly approach can be traced to the work of Marco Foscarini, a Venetian doge who wrote about the Venetian and Genoese presence on the Black Sea in the mid-eighteenth century. It was the landmark in historiography, since from that time on, historians began to consult archival documents more regularly than before. Among other writers interested in Caffa, we should mention Becattini for Italy and Narushevich for Russia. What is more important, M. Le Quien used the critical analysis of sources in his *Oriens Christianus*, in which he tried to speculate on the origins and topography of Caffa. Furthermore, Vincenzo Formaleoni’s *Storia filosofica e politica*, notably, with a panegyric to Empress Catherine II of Russia, introduced a romanticized view of Italian colonization in the region and included a clear admonition to develop trade in the same way in order to reach the same levels of prosperity.

Naturally, the acquisition of the Crimean peninsula by the Russian Empire in 1783 provoked a genuine interest by Russian academics in the history of the Italian presence on the Black Sea. Here, the Russian scholarly discourse was heavily embedded in politics and ideology, especially when stressing the Byzantine-Russian succession and continuity. That said, ideology was, however, not the sole motivation for the Russian history-writers. Russian scholars became a part of the community researching the region’s history, since these studies allowed a reconstruction of a period of Russian history for which there is very little source evidence of indigenously Russian origin. Indeed, the study of Genoese Gazaria and the trading stations of other Italian maritime republics in the Black Sea area made, and still makes up for a significant lack of source evidence on the Southern and South-Western Russian lands, where most of the manuscripts were destroyed during the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century and other Tatar raids. Italian Caffa was also included in Russian
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41 Foscarini, *Della letteratura veneziana ed altri scritti intorno ad essa* (Venice: Teresa Gattei, 1854).
43 Нарушевич, *Таврикия* (Кiev, 1788).
44 Formaleoni, *Storia filosofica*. 
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historiography in the following decades. For example, Petr Keppen studied the relations between the Genoese and the Tatars, using documental sources.  

“Nineteenth-century thinkers dissented from one another on many fundamental issues, yet they were nevertheless in remarkable agreement in viewing Europe (including the Mediterranean basin) as the dynamic core of world history.” History of the Italian settlements overseas was therefore particularly and crucially important for the nineteenth century Italian and French scholars, as well as for the general public of both countries, because it allowed the origins of the entire system of European colonialism to be traced during the period when Westerners were building up their own colonial empires. This was particularly important ideologically as it allowed them to justify the modern understanding of the ‘civilizing mission’ through the lenses of the historical example of earlier colonial experience of the Italian merchants and seafarers in the Black Sea area (particularly in the case of Michele Giuseppe da Canale, who wrote his Della Crimea in the immediate wake of the Crimean war (1853–1856), as did Sainte-Marie Mevil) – an issue which I will address repeatedly in the course of this study. Canale underlined many aspects of the economic activity of Italians; he was, however, mistaken about the early timing of foundation of Caffa by a certain Caffaro in 1130, which was reassessed later on. Canale’s mistaken view was not unique; even when the historians put aside the most obvious myths they were commonly mistaken about either the early penetration of the Italians in the Black Sea area or about the early foundation of Caffa, while these affirmations had very poor (if any) foundations. Italian (especially Genoese) historians tended to make this kind of mistake, even though Agostino
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47 Canale, Della Crimea, del suo commercio e dei suoi dominatori dalle origini fino ai di nostri. Commentari storici (Genoa: co’ tipi delr. i. de’ sordo-muti, 1855). See about the political implications: Karpov, Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII–XV вв.: проблемы торговли [The Italian maritime republic and the southern Black Sea coast in thirteenth to fifteenth centuries: The problems of trade] (Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 1990), 23.
48 Sainte-Marie Mevil, La Mer Noire au moyen âge: Caffa et les colonies génoises de la Crimée (Paris, 1856).
49 Canale used a great many archival documents, including Caffae Massaria.
50 Canale, Della Crimea, 142-159. He also erroneously wrote that the Genoese first appeared in Crimea in the times of the First Crusade, had by the twelfth century an army capable of fighting the Russian Vladimir Monomach’s force, and managed there domains as a seigneury, the lords being Caffaro, del Orto, etc.

Giustiniani had already noted the lack of any verifiable knowledge on the earliest period of the history of Caffa as far back as/as early on as the sixteenth century.\(^{51}\)

The basis for strictly scholarly research only arose with the emergence of economic and social history as a branch of historical scholarship and the beginning of the critical study of sources in the second half of nineteenth century and early twentieth century.\(^{52}\) Among the earliest studies, we can mention the first critical editions of the Genoese\(^ {53}\) and Venetian\(^ {54}\) sources. Thanks to the works by Luigi Belgrano,\(^ {55}\) Cornelio Desimoni,\(^ {56}\) Georges Bernard Depping,\(^ {57}\) Lodovico Sauli,\(^ {58}\) Élie de la Primauaide,\(^ {59}\) Gottlieb Lukas Friedrich Tafel and

---


53 See, for example, Vigna, “Codice diplomatico delle colonie tauro-liguri durante la signoria dell’Ufficio di San Giorgio (1453–1475),” *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria* 5, 6, 7 (Genoa, 1868–1879).


Georg Martin Thomas, G. B. Dal Lago, Girolamo Serra, Wilhelm Heyd, Georg Caro, Camillo Manfroni, Joseph Delaville Le Roulx, and others, the nineteenth century became a period during which a solid basis for future research was founded and a discourse on the Italian colonies overseas was introduced into the community of scholars.

In terms of the approaches, perspectives and paradigms used, the second half of the nineteenth century was marked by a spread of the positivist episteme, approaches and methodologies. The result was a body of deeper and relatively unbiased source analysis and criticism, together with a significant increase in the publications of the documental sources. Today, the work done in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is particularly important due to the sheer amount of source material that has been identified, mapped and published. This was also a time when the very character of research was becoming much less a private undertaking by university professors, civil and military officials, or amateur enthusiasts of the antiquities: historical research was taking on more organized and institutionalized forms. In the second half of the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, there was a peak of activity among societies committed to the scholarly research of history. Among the primary institutional actors of this process we find the Genoese Società Ligure di Storia Patria and the Russian Society of History and Antiquities of Odessa (ZOOID), as well as several other learned societies, to which we now owe the opportunity to interpret the sources instead of trying to find them.

In general, this period was marked by many notable works dealing with particular aspects of the Italian presence in the area by both European and Russian scholars, just as it was marked by the growing interest in archaeology, epigraphy, palaeography, heraldry, and numismatics. Alongside all this we find some general works on the history of the Levantine trade. Perhaps one of the major achievements in this field at that time was a pioneering work by the Genoese publisher G.L. Tafel, G.M. Thomas, Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit Besonderer Beziehungen auf Byzanz und die Levante (Vienna, 1856-1857; republished: Amsterdam, 1964).

This work was unfortunately limited to the early fourteenth century.

60 The two great publishers of the sources. G.L. Tafel, G.M. Thomas, Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig mit Besonderer Beziehungen auf Byzanz und die Levante (Vienna, 1856-1857; republished: Amsterdam, 1964).

61 Who was among the first to introduce the data of Russian historiography to the European audience. G. Serra, Storia della antica Liguria e di Genova, vol. 4 (Capolago: Gelvetica, 1834).


65 Delaville Le Roulx, La France en Orient au XVe siècle (Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1886).
panoramic study by Wilhelm Heyd, *History of Medieval Levantine Trade*, published in German and French, and still referred to today as an important general work that is still relevant. Long before this book was published, Heyd produced another study on the Italian trading stations in the East which was highly appreciated by his Italian colleagues. An iconic figure of his time, Heyd rejected the romanticist approach of the authors of the early and mid-nineteenth century and fully adopted the assumptions of the positivist approach. He disseminated the mistaken view of Canale on the early foundation of Caffa and dated it to around 1265–1266, also tracing the early steps of its history. After Heyd, two mainstreams highlighting European scholarly interest in the area can be identified: first, medieval trade history (in its legal, institutional, and financial aspects) and, second, political history, often comprising studies of the Genoese-Venetian competition in the Levant and in the Black Sea area, as well as the emergence of the Ottoman threat.

The gradual movement towards using sources more critically was supported by the establishment of the Society of History and Antiquities of Odessa in 1839. In particular, more accurate research was carried out on the late period of the history of Caffa and the management of the Crimean possessions and domains of the leading Genoese Bank of St. George. Academics such as Filipp K. Brun, M. Volkov, Maxim M. Kovalevsky,
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69 Heyd was one of the founders of the scholarly study of Mediterranean trade in the Middle Ages, and his writings served as the basis for further research on this subject and are still recognized today as unmatched for breadth and quality of factual material. Having used in his History most of the sources available and published by that time, Heyd was the first to feature the Black Sea colonies to a broad audience. Publishing his history of medieval Levantine trade, Heyd did not try to present himself as an absolute pioneer, although he had almost no one to refer to, aside of maybe a monograph by Daru, one of the first scholarly works that addressed the issues of the Italian trade in the Black Sea and introduced the problems connected to them, see: Daru, *Histoire de la Republique de Venise*, 2nd ed., vols. 1-8 (Paris: Didot, 1821). All the authors whom Heyd mentions and thanks in his work were engaged chiefly in the publication of the sources. One should say that so far the research into the history of trade in the Mediterranean and Black Seas in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries still often begins with an investigation of new original sources. See: Ievgen A. Khvalkov, *Tana, a Venetian and Genoese Black Sea Trading Station in the 1430s: A Social and Economic History* (MA thesis in Medieval Studies, CEU, Budapest, 2011).
70 Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Dessau, 1885-1886), 163. In fact, Heyd did not deny existence of Caffa prior to 1265–1266; he admitted that there was continuity between ancient Theodosia and a medieval settlement connecting Cherson and Bosporus, but possibly felt into decline by the times of Genoese. Heyd also declined the previous view on the character of initial foundation of Caffa as a seigneury, conceiving of it as of a commune.
Wladislaw N. Yurgevich, Ludwig P. Kolley, and Nikolaj N. Murzakevitch have written widely on the history of Genoese politics and colonization in the Black Sea basin. As elsewhere, Russia scholarly interest in the époque of positivism focused mainly on empirical studies – archaeology, cartography (Filipp K. Brun and Alexander L. Berthier-Delagarde), toponymics (studies by Filipp K. Brun, one of them in collaboration with Desimoni and Belgrano), heraldry, epigraphy, and numismatics were all part this focus. Documental archival sources were not, however, entirely disregarded, and in the early twentieth century a new period of intensive work on the editions of new sources was carried out. A prominent Russian scholar and liberal politician, Maxim Kovalevsky, was among those who worked a
great deal on Italian archival documents. He published two discourses on Tana, which became the basis for his three-volume work on economic growth in Europe. Another book written by Kovalevsky entitled *On the Russian and other Orthodox Slaves in Spain* Where he argued, on the basis of a large number of sources, that Orthodox servants entered Spain through Europe from the Black Sea basin.78 Finally, there appeared a number of less empirical and more general and theoretical works affected by problems of medieval economic history and commerce, such as those written by Alexey K. Dzhivelegov79 and Joseph M. Kulisher.80 Obviously, the outbreak of the First World War lent a new sharpness to the old Eastern Question and therefore increased the need for a historical legitimization of the Russian dominance over the Black Sea and the ambitions to control the Turkish Straits.81 Furthermore, in 1937 a prominent Byzantinist, Alexander A. Vasiliev, published abroad his monograph on the Goths in Crimea and their survival up to early modernity.

The changes in the world after 1918, the emergence of fascism in Italy, and the domination of militarist ideas in Italian society in the interwar period all gave rise to military expansionism and to the rebirth of the ‘colonialist’ paradigm in historiography. As a result the Italian domains on the Black Sea coast again were once more part of a heavily ideological scholarly discourse. However, unlike the ‘imperialistic’ period of the nineteenth century, when scholars supported the colonial expansion of the European powers with their discourse, the authors writing at this time did not contribute much to a promotion of expansionism through either more profound source studies or the sphere of theoretical and methodological novelty.82

By contrast, many studies in both Western countries and the Soviet Union in the first half of the twentieth century were influenced by the Marxist paradigm, and scholars tended to stress the capitalist nature of economic relations in the Black Sea region and the bilateral
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79 Dzhivelegov, *Средневековые города в Западной Европе* [Medieval Cities in Western Europe]. (Moscow: Knizhnaya nakhodka, 2002).
80 Kulisher, *Эволюция прибыли с капитала в связи с развитием промышленности и торговли в Западной Европе* [The evolution of the profit on capital in connection with the development of industry and commerce in Western Europe], Vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1906).
81 These political events led to a natural explosion of Byzantine studies and attempts to justify the political ambitions through the historical ties; notably, the last part of the F. I. Uspenskij’s “History of the Byzantine Empire” bears the title “The Eastern Question.”
82 One can mention the works of B. Dudan, C. Manfroni, N. Naldoni, and M. Nani Mocenigo. See the bibliography for respective authors.
connection between the economic growth of Europe and Italian commercial activity in the region. A seminal Romanian author, Nicolae Iorga, focused on the publication of the sources of the archival documents.\(^83\) His successor, Gheorghe I. Brătianu, was among the first to publish the Italian notarial documents from the Black Sea region, while his general *Recherches sur le commerce Genoise dans la Mer Noire au XIIIe siècle*\(^84\) opened up new perspectives for the study of the Italian presence overseas. Moreover, he was the first scholar to discover the potential of the notarial documents as a source for historians. Brătianu also discussed the early period of the history of Caffa, its administration, topography, trade structure, and numismatics. What is more important for the present study is that he analysed shifts in trade in the late fourteenth century as a transition from commercial expansion to colonial imperialism.\(^85\) In fact, he introduced a number of new issues to the study of political and economic history of the areas under Italian influence.\(^86\) He was later criticized for his ‘modern’ approach: following Henri Pirenne in his theoretical and methodological approaches, he considered Italian trade as capitalist in nature, and used such terms as ‘mercantilism’ and ‘protectionism’ to describe it.\(^87\) Whether these terms are applicable or not still remains a problem in historiography, and I am inclined to side with Brătianu in his views on the capitalist nature of Italian trade. I hope that this study will contribute to an on-going and critical reconsideration of this point in historiography, and help re-evaluate the role of Italy in the formative process of pre-industrial capitalism.

In the post-war period, interest in economic history increased enormously, first of all thanks to the publication of new source material (diplomatic, administrative, institutional and notarial documents) and, second, to the emergence of new disciplines and trends in the source studies and historiography. In addition to the more empirical studies, Gino Luzzatto’s key


\(^{87}\) Капров, *Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII–XV вв.: проблемы торговли* [The Italian maritime republic and the southern Black Sea coast in thirteenth to fifteenth centuries: The problems of trade]. (Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 1990). 27.
general work on the history of the Italian economy was published. Another important contribution was the book by Federigo Melis, researching the sources for Italian trade. However, most important in the field of empirical research as well as in the synthesis and conceptualization of Genoese colonial history was the work by Geo Pistarino, who led the work of the Institute of Medieval Studies (established at the University of Genoa in 1963) until recently and set up the first international collaboration in the field together with his Soviet, Bulgarian, and Romanian colleagues. If earlier scholarly studies of the Levantine commerce had often implied collective work and the engagement of a broad circle of specialists from different countries, in the last decades of the previous century this collaboration became virtually indispensable. Pistarino linked the commercial growth on the Black Sea with the appearance of the Genoese thanks to the Treaty of Nymphaeum, the loss of the Genoese positions in Syria, and the emergence of the Mongol empire. He also highlighted the transnational and cosmopolitan character of Caffa, and wrote about the institutional, administrative, and organizational aspects of the Genoese colonization, considering both the measure of dependence/autonomy of Caffa from Genoa and the amount of private and governmental initiative in this colonization in different periods.

Alongside the more empirical works of published sources and source criticism, new areas of interest and approaches have opened up, and, consequently, more general studies have appeared, treating the Levant and the Black Sea region as a unit with historical continuity in a broader context of the social and economic history of Mediterranean and addressing more complex theoretical and methodological problems than the scholarship of this field had done before. This was the époque of the emergence of the histoire totale, and probably the most productive period in terms of writing history. This historiography largely developed the principles laid down by Marc Bloch, Lucien Febvre, and Fernand Braudel. Not surprisingly, French scholars were the leading figures here. Freddy E. Thiriet produced a book on the Venetian overseas domains, in which he also gave some space to Venetian trade in the Black Sea region. Jacques Heers wrote a comprehensive general monograph on
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90 As for the conceptual frameworks, his definition of Caffa as a ‘polyethnic metropolis’ is generally accepted and used up to the present moment. See: Pistarino, *I Gin dell’Oltremare, Studie e Testi*. Serie Storica. Ed. Geo Pistarino (Genoa: Civico Istituto Colombiano, 1988), 211.
the social and economic development of Genoa in the fifteenth century\textsuperscript{94} using the new approaches of the \textit{Annales} School and argued that the Genoese economy was structurally entirely capitalist (a point not unanimously accepted in the community of scholars, but in my view a fairly plausible one). Another study by Heers, \textit{Le clan familial au Moyen Age}, discussed the relations between the city and the hinterland, as well as the connection of fixed assets, political power and personal networks in Genoa.

Another prominent historian, Roberto S. Lopez, thoroughly researched the place and role of Genoese entrepreneurial activity in the broader context of Mediterranean history. His joint study (with Irving W. Raymond)\textsuperscript{95} became a classical work on Mediterranean commerce. It is particularly interesting for my own research, because it hypothesized a place for the Genoese Black Sea colonies in the commercial revolution\textsuperscript{96} in Europe and attempted to establish a connection between economic prosperity and social life. According to Lopez, it was due to this revolution that Caffa progressed so rapidly in developing navigation and commerce, the relative overpopulation of Europe and colonization overseas, the accumulation of capital, demand for raw materials and the need for markets to allocate the products of the growing European industry which all contributed to its development. Lopez also argued, however, that Genoese trade in the Black Sea region declined throughout the fifteenth century, thus denying that political reasons were responsible for this decline (that is, the Ottoman conquest of the Bosporus) and arguing instead in favour of exclusively economic factors, claiming that the Black Sea was accessible for European merchants and highlighting that the Genoese Black Sea trade decreased because on account of economic changes. While Jacques Heers claimed that the fifteenth century was a peak time for Genoese commercial activity on the Black Sea, Lopez held the view that commerce had already peaked in the second half of the thirteenth century, while in the second half of the fourteenth century it faced serious problems and was in decline. I agree with Lopez as far as the crisis events of the second half of the fourteenth century are concerned, in my view a satisfactory agreement in this regard has not yet been reached. There was a recovery from crisis, and the reduced profit rates in the fifteenth century (compared to the thirteenth to early fourteenth centuries) might be deceptive, because the issues of trade were already different (and indeed unable to provide high profits), but this is not in itself a reason to infer a lowering of the scale

\textsuperscript{96} See also: Lopez, \textit{The Commercial Revolution of the Middle Ages. 950-1350} (Cambridge: CUP, 1976).
of commerce. Generally speaking, the decrease in Genoese economic activity in the first half of the fifteenth century does not seem plausible and remains a highly controversial point, as I will demonstrate in this study.

Another area of historiographical research that became, and remains, very fashionable was the history of slavery and the slave trade. Domenico Gioffrè represent this trend in Italian historiography, while a prolific Belgian scholar Charles Verlinden, whom I quoted above in a different context, has addressed the issues of the Mediterranean and Black Sea slave trade and slavery in a number of different studies that are still relevant today.\textsuperscript{97} I do not want to suggest that these works are no longer important, since they are in fact seminal in the history of slavery, but I would claim that world scholarship is indebted to Verlinden for one idea that is even more important. I am speaking now about his brilliant intuition concerning the genetic continuity between medieval Italian and early modern Iberian colonialism. In the article quoted above, Verlinden addressed the issue of the Italian penetration the Iberian Peninsula and the role they played in integrating Spain and Portugal into the network of international trade, animating an economic revival there and introducing long-distance sea trade. He also underlined the period when this process became most significant (“the Italian influence in Iberian colonization starts with the period during which Italian convoy navigation was growing really important, i.e. the fourteenth century”) and admonished the scholarly community for having ignored the problems connected herewith, highlighting the key role of a thorough scholarly investigation of the Italian archives, and in the first place those of the notaries.\textsuperscript{98} However, Verlinden did not go beyond stating that the Italians contributed to Iberian colonial expansion: he left virtually un-researched the problem of the structural influence, taxonomy and continuity that was so important in regard to the continuity between the colonial experiences; neither did he address the important theoretical problem of the nature of late medieval and early modern colonialism. In 1953, he wrote that the problem of the Italian influence on the Iberian colonization had not yet been sufficiently


\textsuperscript{98}Verlinden, “Italian Influence in Iberian Colonization,” The Hispanic American Historical Review 33, no. 2 (1953): 200, 203.
studied; in his view, “many questions arise about it and are crying for the solution.” Now in 2015, I must add that the questions are still relevant. Apart from a few studies, which treat the problem as peripheral, the influence of the Italian colonial experience on the Iberian one, in the sense of the transmission of patterns and frameworks of expansion and domination, has been largely disregarded. Tracing this influence is a task that is still awaiting its Columbus; while do not focus on it in this study, I will, nevertheless, frequently address it from a reverse perspective, that is, by looking at Italian colonialism in the light of further European colonial experiences.

The second half of the twentieth century was also important in terms of economic history. A German scholar, Peter Schreiner, discussed a variety of problems pertaining to the Italian trade in Byzantium. Other important scholarly figures, Frederic Ch. Lane and Reinhold Ch. Müller, focused on the field of the medieval Italian economy, trade, navigation, monetary circulation, and market issues (although both were more interested in Venice than in Genoa). Several works have been written on the history of different Italian Black Sea trading stations of secondary importance. In addition, a number of scholars developed theories on the problems of the economic history of the region; the most widely praised among these probably being the study by Angeliki Laiou-Thomadakis. Outside economic history, a general work written by Donald Nichol mainly on the Venetian-Byzantine relations gave a broad account and a detailed description of international relations in the region as a whole.

104 Nicol, Byzantium and Venice: A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations (Cambridge: CUP, 1988). This book often lacks an in-depth analysis of socio-economic causes of certain processes, but it is highly informative and pays careful attention to the history of international relations in the Middle Ages.
With regard to the studies on the Genoese presence, trade and settlements on the Levant and Black Sea, the leading figure in Western historiography was (and is) Michel Balard, who carried out major programs of research on the Italian colonization in this area. He is probably among the best representatives of the trend of Annales: in his monograph on Genoese Romania, he did not confine himself to the economy or trade, but instead engaged in an ambitious undertaking of histoire totale. Therefore, his study reflects proportionally the historical background of the Genoese colonial expansion, the emergence, functioning, and administration of the colonies, the directions, structure, issues, character, and profitability of trade, the mechanisms of commerce, and other aspects of life of the Italian settlements overseas. Discussing three Genoese centres (Pera, Caffa, and Chios) and covering the whole system of Genoese commerce in the East, ‘La Romanie Génoise’, however, did not focus particularly on the pivotal domain belonging to the Republic of Genoa, that is, Crimea and, more generally, Gazaria, and left almost all the fifteenth century of Genoese colonial history out of the study. This certainly leaves space for a researcher who wants to repeat Balard’s attempt in its essence on a seemingly smaller Black Sea scale, but a closer look into a broader variety of sources of different origin, as well as with newer and more elaborate methodological tools and approaches. Although now that more than sixty years have passed, and the state of art in the field has been raised to an entirely new level, ‘La Romanie Génoise’ can still however provide a rich, voluminous and stimulating framework for a new histoire totale writer aiming to focus on Caffa, who has at his disposal more useful sources (both published and unpublished) and a more up-to-date secondary literature.

I will now give a brief description of some of the conclusions reached in this book in the context of several particular contextual issues. The first is the date of the founding of Genoese Caffa, which Balard put at around 1270 (therefore slightly correcting Heyd’s date of 1266). Balard also proposed an image of Caffa as ‘another Genoa’ (alongside Pera and Chios), which is rather contradictory, because at the same time he also proposed the concept of a new Latino-Oriental culture, to which the Genoese expansion gave rise, and which then implies that the colonies were something other than a simple copy of the metropolis. However, he admitted that the Orientals participated in Italian trade as junior partners.

were incorporated into the colonial administration in lower-ranking positions, and had same legal rights as the Genoese basically without any discrimination. Based on the material he studied, Balard implied that the way in which the Genoese domains overseas were exploited was a colonial way.

This conclusion was a part of an on-going debate on whether or not we can use the term ‘colony’ to the Genoese settlements overseas. In his ‘A Short History of Colonialism’, Wolfgang Reinhard defines the colony as “one people’s control over another people through the economic, political and ideological exploitation of a development gap between the two,”

adding thereafter that “extremely important for a definition of colonialism are the components of alterity and differential development. To be colonialist, rule must be experienced as alien rule; complete assimilation ends its colonialist character… But not all rule, and not all foreign rule is colonialist, and the notion of the ‘development gap’ allows us to distinguish conceptually between a colonialist and a non-colonialist exercise of power.”

My working hypothesis is that we can accept this definition of colony and should apply this ‘colonial’ terminology, but – on the other hand – we should not neglect the specific political and legal standing of Caffa or diminish the role of craftsmanship and agriculture in favour of trade (vice versa, in certain cases the expansion into the hinterland can actually be seen as a sign of deeper colonization). Furthermore, Balard stressed what subsequently became a commonplace in historiography: a structural shift in commerce from luxury goods to the export of local goods from the Black Sea to the West and the importation of textiles. While this gave other scholars firmer ground from which to speak about the decline or regionalization of the Genoese Black Sea trade, Balard himself conceives of Genoese Gazaria as part of the Mediterranean, connected by the routes to Flanders and England and largely contributing to the economic and capitalist development of Western Europe together with its metropolises. Finally, Balard refused to call the Genoese domains in Romania ‘colonies’ since he believed that their administrations were different to the rigid and centralized pattern of the Venetian model. While those applying the term ‘colony’ to medieval history are now sometimes accused of ‘modernization’, Balard’s conclusion was itself a step towards modernization. Looking at the Genoese colonies retrospectively, he projected the notion of exchange. Some made money out of it, but they did not control it; their economic activities were secondary and tied to the dominant Italian merchant capital”. Laiou-Thomadakis, “The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System: Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries,” DOP 34/35 (1980/81), 216.

107 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 1.
108 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 1.
colonialism which emerged in the nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries European colonial experience, which was also not characteristic of earlier centuries of the modern period. Thus, one of Balard’s main arguments against the colonial nature of the Genoese possessions was the fact that these entities often acted independently, sometimes contrary to the policy of the metropolis (especially when Genoa lost its independence). But can we be sure that this is an argument in favour of the ‘anti-colonial’ side? Is not the ability to act independently rather the result of the continuous evolution of a colonial society, marking its maturity and a sign of the multiple loyalties and identities of the people, among which – a colonial one (as long as they remain colonies before gaining independence)?

Let us turn back to the state of the art in our field. Genoese scholars have been particularly prolific in recent decades. Laura Balletto has published the archival material and written monographs and articles on the Black Sea history, proposing the image of Caffa as ‘another Genoa’ in tune with Balard’s writings, but focusing more on its capacity for independent action as stressed above. Gabriella Airaldi has researched the Genoese legislation in the context of the interaction between the Latins and Orientals. Sandra Origo has studied the grain supply to Genoa from the Black Sea and the functioning of the officium victualium. Enrico Basso has studied the political strategies of the Genoese on the Black Sea, which were in line with the context of the political tradition they faced, and has written a monograph on the Genoese overseas empire, focused predominantly on its social and ethnic aspects.109 Among the prominent Byzantinists we should name Hélène Ahrweiler and her book on the naval history of late Byzantium.110

Polish historiography has had a long-term engagement with Crimean history and archaeology. Although it is often of a somewhat compilative nature, it provides general, systematic, exhaustive and comprehensive accounts on the region’s history or more detailed aspects of this. For this reason I should cite a handful of Polish scholars, starting with Marian Małowist.111 In addition, Danuta Quririni-Poplawska wrote an ambitious history of slavery in

---

the region based on the previous works of Charles Verlinden, and achieving a new level of development in the field.\textsuperscript{112} Her book was invaluable for my study given its abundance of material. Finally, Rafał Hryszko produced a monograph on the Genoese presence on the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{113} His bibliography includes an enormous amount of secondary literature and can be considered one of the most comprehensive for virtually any topic in the field. The only criticism is that the book is lacking in empirical archival research. Notwithstanding the fact that the author consulted a rich abundance of published sources and secondary literature for his \textit{opus magnum}, he did not use a single unpublished archival source, which is indispensable for any serious study of the medieval history of the Black Sea.

The Eastern European scholars working \textit{in situ} in the Black Sea region, are undoubtedly the most useful when it comes to archaeological research. Anatolij L. Jakobson discussed the international connections of Crimea and its urban history based on his material. He also applied the Marxist paradigm to the Genoese exploitation of the Orientals, which a good dozen other Soviet authors also did, some highlighting more the capitalist exploitations and some focusing more on the attempts to find a model exemplary feudalism in the Genoese domains. Among the Soviet and post-Soviet scholars addressing the general problems of the Black Sea and Crimean medieval history in the context of the Italian colonial expansion, we should mention N. M. Bogdanova and Alla I. Romanchuk, who researched the connections between medieval Cherson and the Italians. A study of the nature of Venetian commercial activity in Byzantium was also carried out by Mikhail M. Shitikov, while the countless studies on the physical layout of Caffa (e.g. Bocharov being the most recent example) and other Genoese settlements, as well as on their Greek, Armenian and Tatar surroundings done by local scholars, are too numerous to mention. It suffices to say that the traditions in the fields of archaeology, history of architecture and art, epigraphy,\textsuperscript{114} heraldry, and numismatics continue, and almost each year historians and archaeologists working locally produce new discoveries, allowing elaborations in the existing pool of knowledge as well as provoking

\textsuperscript{112} Danuta Quirini-Popławska, \textit{Włoski Handel Czarnomorskimi Niewolnikami w Późnym Średniowieczu} (Kraków: Universitet Jagiellonski, 2002).

\textsuperscript{113} Hryszko, \textit{Genui nad Morze Czarne. Z kart genueńskiej obecności gospodarczej na północno-zachodnich wybrzeżach Morza Czarnego u schyłku średniowiecza} (Kraków, 2004).

\textsuperscript{114} See, for example, Skrzhinskaja, who carried out research in the 1920s-1950s the Italian presence in the Black Sea basin and published a corpus of the Genoese inscriptions, as well as did many valuable observations on the Genoese politics in the area. The analysis of these inscriptions afterwards attracted, and still attracts the interest of the historians.
As regards the need to combine the data of the written sources with the data of the material ones (though I would methodologically stand for the primary importance of the documental evidence as a starting point in our field, leaving the material sources an auxiliary role). However, as far as Eastern Europe is concerned, the main bulk of recent research on the Italian presence on the Black Sea coast was carried out in Lomonosov’s Moscow State University, which boasts the most important school for medieval history of the Northern Black Sea region in Russian historiography.

A number of monographs and articles written in recent decades in Lomonosov’s university on the Genoese and Venetian trading stations in the Black Sea basin were based on evidence from the archives of Italy, and covered various aspects of the history of the region. First of all, we should mention a prolific author, Sergey P. Karpov, the first among this community of scholars, as well as at the start of my own involvement with the medieval history of the Black Sea and Italian documentary sources. We cannot overlook the anthology *The Black Sea in the Middle Ages* by Prof. Karpov, which became one of the major editions in the field, comprising methodological findings and curiosities, case studies, general accounts, articles on the auxiliary historical disciplines, etc. The works of Karpov, as well as the studies done by other representatives of the Moscow school such as Andrey L. Ponomarev, Rustam M. Shukurov, Anna A. Talyzina, N. D. Prokofieva, and Svetlana V. Bliznjuk have been published in the volumes of *The Black Sea* and various periodicals. Prof. Karpov was himself an author of several general monographs.\(^{116}\) *The Italian Maritime Republics and the Southern Black Sea Coast in the Thirteenth to Fifteenth Centuries: The Problems of Trade*,\(^{117}\) is a seminal work, and its conclusions have contributed significantly to the development of the present study. Another monograph by Karpov, better known

---

115 As regards the need to combine the data of the written sources with the data of the material ones (though I would methodologically stand for the primary importance of the documental evidence as a starting point in our field, leaving the material sources an auxiliary role).

116 The main one known to the Western audience is perhaps the following: S. Karpov, *La Navigazione Veneziana nel Mar Nero XIII-XV sec.* (Ravenna, 2000). The author was dealing with the types of the vessels, conditions of navigation, the types of ships and navigation conditions, Black Sea piracy and cursary, routes of the navigation, and the crews of the ships. The monograph has tables and graphs with all the basic parameters of the navigation which are an accurate indicator of trade relations in the region.

117 S. Karpov, *Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII–XV вв.: проблемы торговли* [The Italian maritime republics and the Southern Black Sea coast in thirteenth to fifteenth centuries: The problems of trade] (Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 1990). This was the first book in Russian on this topic, presenting the Genoese and Venetian trade based on a vast amount of sources. Dealing with the balance of payments of the Italian maritime republics, Karpov inferred that the sustainable deficit of the precious metals in their Black Sea trade was fully compensated by the re-sale of the goods from this area to Western Europe.
internationally in its Italian version, deals with Venetian navigation. His first monograph on the Trebizond empire became a basis for a more general account of the history of this state, addressing the issues of the political and economic relations in the Eastern Mediterranean, and discussing many aspects of the Genoese and Venetian activity in the Black Sea region that must be taken into account while researching the life of their settlements. What is especially important is that Karpov traced connections between the processes in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, the Near East, and Central Asia. Last, but not the least, I must mention the studies by Ponomarev, who focused on numismatic material and monetary circulation, but also applied his clever quantitative methods of mathematical analysis to one of the main and most perspective sources on Caffa, that is the massariae, correcting many incorrect points of previous scholarship and opening new horizons for future research.

Overview of the sources

The source material on Caffa and other Genoese Black Sea domains is rich and extremely diverse in terms of source types and languages. There are, however, two problems, both connected to the heterogeneity and diversity of source material. The first is that certain source can be theoretically a serial and a representative one, but in reality it is only partially extant and covers only a certain period (sometimes a very short one), lacking data for other years. Another problem (which is also an obstacle for a researcher) is the superabundance of certain types of sources. While all work with some of the narrative sources (e.g. a Byzantine chronicle) may take a few minutes (going to the index, locating ‘Caffa’ or ‘the Genoese’,
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120 Idem, История Трапезундской империи [The history of the Trebizond Empire] (St. Petersburg: 2007).
121 For a more comprehensive list of works written by Karpov see the bibliography.
123 For an expanded overview of the Genoese sources see: Geo Pistarino, Le fonti genovesi per la storia del Mar Nero. I largely relied on the list of sources of different types provided by Pistarino.
looking through two pages where the author of the source mentioned them and adding some small, but valuable piece of information), sources such as accounting books\textsuperscript{124} and notarial deeds\textsuperscript{125} are much less available. Dozens of volumes of unpublished registers (in case of the accounts books – huge heavy volumes) are ideal for composing databases and using their factual data both in case studies and within the frame of quantitative statistical analysis;\textsuperscript{126} however, doing it might take a single researcher up to a couple of decades. That is why, dealing with these sources, I have to limit myself to a selection of evidence, hoping that within a certain longer period a piece of source evidence covering a year can represent and show mutatis mutandis the processes characteristic for a period as a whole. I will briefly present the main sources used, following in there systematics the principle of source taxonomy and typology rather than such principles as language, period, area of origin, etc.

The state papers of diplomatic origin show the interaction between Genoa and other Black Sea and Mediterranean political subjects. This group comprises the treaties between Genoa and Venice,\textsuperscript{127} Byzantine chrysobulls,\textsuperscript{128} chrysobulls given by the Emperors of the Empire of Trebizond,\textsuperscript{129} other grants of privileges, charters, and agreements,\textsuperscript{130} treaties with Tatars and khans’ jarligs,\textsuperscript{131} and other documents. Most of the Genoese international treaties with the foreign powers reside in \textit{Materie Politiche}.\textsuperscript{132} Another group are the petitions, protests, enquiries, and various other forms of diplomatic correspondence, can be found alongside a number of private letters in \textit{Litterarum Comunis Janue}.\textsuperscript{133} This group comprises letters of the authorities of Genoa (often reflecting the complaints of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{124} See below on Caffa massaria.
\item \textsuperscript{125} See below; for the notarial deeds a starting point of my source analysis in this study was a set of the notarial documents and letters produced by a Genoese notary in Caffa Antonio Torriglia. These sources have never been published previously and have never been the subject a comprehensive study.
\item \textsuperscript{126} For the later see the works by Ponomarev; also: Л. И. Бородкин, ed. Математические модели исторических процессов (Moscow, 1996), 236-244.
\item \textsuperscript{127} An important group of sources allowing to see the dynamics of the political and economic rise of Caffa. Particularly the treaty of 1344 in the face of threat by Janibeck who conducted war against both republics; the treaty of 1345 reflecting the rise of Caffa; the treaty of Milan of 1355 and the treaty of Turin 1381 closing access to Tana in favour of Caffa; the treaty of 1406.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Not only those given to Genoa (like the treaty of Nymphaeum 1261 that opened to the Genoese there way to the Black Sea, or the chrysobulls that followed it), but also the privileges given to Venice, Florence, Cataluña, Aragon, Valencia, Dubrovnik.
\item \textsuperscript{129} Zakythinos, \textit{Le Chrysobulle}... Geo Pistarino, \textit{Le fonti genovesi}...
\item \textsuperscript{130} Unfortunately, numerous agreements of the authorities of Caffa with the principality of Theodoro, lords of Wallachian, Moldavian, and Caucasian realms are mostly not available.
\item \textsuperscript{131} Jarligs are the grants of the Tatar khans. The chronicles mention the first treaty of the early fourteenth century, which is not extant; further there was khan Uzbeck’s grant of 1333; agreements with the Solkhat Tatars of 1356 and 1358; treaties of 1380–1381; treaty of 1387.
\item \textsuperscript{132} ASG, AS, \textit{Materie Politiche}. I used a following publication of the regests: Lisciandrelli, \textit{Trattati e negoziazione politiche della Repubblica di Genova} (958 - 1797). \textit{Regesti}. (Genoa: 1960).
\item \textsuperscript{133} ASG, AS, No. 1777-1797, \textit{Litterarum Comunis Janue}, reg. 1-21 (1411-1464).
\end{itemize}
Caffiotes) and Caffa,\textsuperscript{134} and the correspondence of the Venetian, Byzantine, Trebizond, and Holy Roman Empire authorities. We should also mention the internal diplomatic correspondence among the Genoese officials, including the texts of the instructions to the envoys (both Genoese and Venetian),\textsuperscript{135} as well as the letters and reports of ambassadors to the metropolis (in our case the Venetian ones are better preserved). Some diplomatic documents of the Republic of Venice were also taken into account.\textsuperscript{136}

As well as the diplomatic papers, public law documents are almost all published and thoroughly studied. Among them we should mention the codes of Genoese and Venetian laws, the statutes of Caffa (1290, \textit{Ordo de Caffa} and \textit{Certus ordo de Caffa} of 1316,\textsuperscript{137} 1449),\textsuperscript{138} the decisions and regulations ruled by the high Genoese and Venetian authorities, and other documents of law and legislation, including norms applicable to the overseas Genoese colonies and other sources containing legislation. Statutes of \textit{Officium Gazarie} are among those of primary importance;\textsuperscript{139} there are also a number of Venetian documents regulating the overseas issues.\textsuperscript{140} The Genoese laws (\textit{Regulae Communis Ianuae} and \textit{Statutorum Civilib})\textsuperscript{141} were applicable in the colonies, and should be taken into account as codes that provided social life with a legal framework (see the respective chapter/s). Registers of \textit{Officium Romaniae} are also used,\textsuperscript{142} as well as the documents of some Genoese officia

\begin{itemize}
  \item The treaties, agreements, and letters drawn by the consul of Caffa allow us in a sense to conceive of him as a semi-sovereign head, at least often acting in the state capacity.
  \item For instance instructions to the Venetian envoys going to negotiate with the commune of Caffa, the Golden Horde khans, and the Solkhat vicegerents of Crimea.
  \item Tafel and Thomas... \textit{Urkunden; Diplomatarium}...
  \item Lodovico Sauli, ed., “Ordo de Caffa/Certus Ordo de Caffa,” In \textit{Monumenta Historiae Patriae. Leges Municipales. Imposicio Officii Gazarie} (Turin: Regio typographo, 1838), col. 377-417. This text is divided into two parts – Ordo de Caffa and Certus Ordo de Caffa. The first one explains administrative issues, election of the officers, salaries and rewards, taxation, tolls, regulations imposed on the port, etc. The later amplifies it and discusses the issues of real estate and navigation.
  \item Impositio Officii Gazarie. Ed. L. Sauli... \textit{Regulae Officii Gazarie}. Ed. Poggi... Pardessus, \textit{Collection des lois maritime}. Vol. 4. 458-524... Also see: Rossi, \textit{Gli Statuti... Forcheri, Navi e navigazione a Genova}...
  \item ASV, Cinque Savi alla Mercanzia, I Serie, Capitolari degli Ufficiali all’Estraordinario, 22bis (1302-1512), 22 Ter (1302-1528), 25 (1363-XVI).
related to Tana. The Genoese governmental materials are mainly stored in Archivio Segreto. A part called Diversorum Comunis Janue comprises the records of the decisions of doges, the Council, and the governors of Genoa in the periods of dependence, as well as some minutes on minor paperwork of the chancery. The documents of Officium Provisionis Romanae provide us with the bulk of administrative correspondence. As in 1452–1475 all Genoese Black Sea colonial domains were managed by the Genoese Bank of Saint George, its documentation is indispensable for the reconstruction of that period. We should also take into account a number of judicial documents. Since Venetians were almost constantly present in one way or another in Genoese Gazaria, I consulted a number of the sectors of the Venetian archive containing the decisions of various high authorities of Serenissima (Maggior Consiglio, Senato). Besides the Genoese and the Venetian public law documents we should also consider the paperwork of the chancery of Caffa, where the notaries often combined drawing up private deeds and managing the daily curial routine. Among these documents there are the acts drawn up by Niccolò Beltrame (1343–1344), Niccolò de Bellignano (1381–1382), and Raffaele Musso (1398), as well as the documentation of different officia of Caffa (first of all Officium Victualium), and some other letters and reports. Finally, in order to trace the transformation of Genoese Caffa to Ottoman...

“Prima Serie di documenti.” ASLSP (1877): 97-317. Agostino Agosto, “Nuovi reperti archivistici genovesi,” Byzantino-bulgarica 7 (1981): 103–108. Most often, these are the decisions of the provveditors of Romania to the consuls, sometimes also confirmed by the doge and the councils.


[147] ASG, San Giorgio (hereafter - SG), Primi Cancellieri, Membranacei e Manoscritti, busta 88: Oriente e colonie: Ms. 849. Also published materials in: Codice diplomatico...


Kefe and of the whole unit of Genoese Gazaria into Kefe sancağı (Kefe sancağı), which later became Kefe eyalet (Kefe beylerbeyliği), I use a number of early Ottoman sources.\(^{151}\)

The Genoese documents of taxation are represented by the *Liber institutionum cabellarum veterum*\(^{152}\) published by Gioffré and containing excerpts from the decisions listing the rates of taxation, fiscal incomes, types of taxes and tolls on different goods, materials of taxation on different transactions and on revenues from holding some position, etc. Venetian tax documents,\(^{153}\) although much less important, provide some valuable and interesting data.

The documents containing financial reports are the main source for research in my thesis. The public books of accounts of the Commune of Caffa were called massarie, while the annually rotated officials in charge of these books were called massarii. Two massarii were send from Genoa to Caffa every year with the new consul to work in the colony as chief accountants (they also have to make an inspection and check their predecessors’ work), and their massarie reflected all money transactions and operations, in which the administration of the Commune of Caffa was involved in one way or another, in the double-entry bookkeeping system. After the term of office of massarii expired, they had to send the duplicates of their books of accounts for revision and control to Genoa (while the original ones remained in Caffa). Thanks to this system of administrative transparency, we now have extant copies of massarie, notwithstanding the fact that the originals stored in Caffa were probably destroyed during the Ottoman conquest in 1475.\(^{154}\) *Caffae Massariae* are stored in the archival section of the Bank of Saint George,\(^{155}\) although some of them are stored in the

---


\(^{153}\) *Bilanci generali della Repubblica di Venezia*, ed. F. Besta (Venice, 1912).


archive separately from the main bulk. In addition to Caffa Massaria, I also use the massaria of Pera as auxiliary sources (though Pera never belonged to Genoese Gazaria, the ships going to Crimea had to pass through the Bosporus, and therefore the data originated from Pera can help in contextualizing the evidence from the Crimean sources). The sources of this type were often praised for authenticity and reliability, but to date have not been much studied. These sources are detailed, logically structured, serial, and available for statistical analysis. Nonetheless, most massariae unfortunately remained only a supplementary source for the historiography, though they stand above all other sources from Genoese Caffa in respect of the richness of their material (moreover, since it is a serial source, it makes statistical analysis possible). The books are preserved for certain years and lacking for the others. The massariae are preserved for the following years: 1374, 1381, 1410, 1420-I (containing also the entries for 1441, 1458, and 1470–1471), 1420-II, 1422, 1423, 1424 (containing also the entries for 1420–1421), 1441, 1446-II, 1454, 1455, 1456-I, 1456-II, 1458-I, 1461. Massariae are written in Latin, with quite an amount of diverse typical and individual contractions, often making reading pretty difficult. In Russia, S. P. Karpov based a number of his works on massariae. A. L. Ponomarev has worked extensively with the massaria of 1381, composing a comprehensive MS Excel database and applying in many cases specific statistical methods to solve a number of methodological problems, calculating

156 ASG, Sala 34/67, MC 1386 (containing also the entries for 1387). ASG, SG, Compera Medii pro centenario Caffe 1428 - 1429, f. 1r - 207 r (fragments of MC for 1424 - 1426).
157 ASG, SG, Peire Massaria, ad annum 1390 (I), 1390 (II), 1402. ASG, Antico Comune, 22, Peire Massaria 1391.
the urban population of Caffa,\textsuperscript{160} and making a guide with an index of personal names and other words/terms in this \textit{massaria}.\textsuperscript{161} His seminal work largely laid down the methodological foundations for the present study of massariae. The \textit{massariae} for 1374, 1381, 1424 years are uploaded on the site of the Faculty of History of Lomonosov University.\textsuperscript{162} Obviously, we can reconstruct the incomes and expenses of the administration based on the \textit{massaria}; obviously, it contains some useful data on the economic history of Caffa otherwise. However, the most interesting point is to find the data on social, cultural, religious, ethnic, and professional interaction. \textit{Massariae} are a source that is especially promising in all respects, and I am going to use it extensively; however, here we face two problems already mentioned. First, going through all the books and building a database on the entire set is a ten-year task at the very least. Therefore, for the time being I limited myself to a selection of the available evidence.

I have proposed periodization of the history of Caffa divided into three periods, separated from each other by two major turning points:

1. before 1380s,
2. 1380s–1453, and
3. 1453–1475.

According to this periodization, I decided to select three massariae with a roughly forty years distance (the lifetime of a single generation), consequently from the 1380s, 1420s, and 1460s to contrast their data to each other and see the dynamics. This choice is justifiable and methodologically sound, since these three represent different periods in the history of Caffa:

1. \textit{Caffae Massaria} 1381 is best known and studied from the fourteenth century – the end of ‘the golden age’ of commerce and the crisis of European trade, but on the other hand the époque of the formation of the Genoese colonial system on the Black Sea, the massaria of the 1381 was studied in detail by the Russian scholar Andrey L. Ponomarev, and one of the two first existing massariae (1374 and 1381), establishing a pattern of research of the others and representing Caffa at the point of formation of the Genoese colonial territorial domain in 1370s–1380s (I)

\textsuperscript{162} See: http://www.hist.msu.ru/Departments/Medieval/studio.htm
paralleled by the crisis of the fourteenth century and the decline of long-distance Silk Road trade and of trade with Central and Eastern Asia (II) and the growing importance of the regional commercial connections within the Black Sea (III) and the export of local goods to Western Europe that won over the sottile Eastern commodities.

2. Caffae Massaria 1423 from the first half of the fifteenth century. This was a period of overcoming the effects of the crisis of the second half of the fourteenth century, and relative stability following the battle of Ankara (20 July 1402) that postponed the Ottoman expansion and the fall of the Byzantine Empire, structural transformation of Genoese Black Sea trade and Caffa’s role in it in the period of relative stabilization prior to the conquest of Constantinople and the closure of the straits. It is also a period of the development of established traits and of final transformation of the former network of transit trading stations in the system of long-distance trade focused around the Silk Road into a colonial unit with relative economic autonomy from Genoa, effective independence of the formal Tatar sovereigns of Crimea, and a predominant role of ‘heavy’ commodities in trade.

3. Caffae Massaria 1461 from the last period of life of Genoese Caffa in 1453–1475, after the fall of Constantinople and the transmission of the Black Sea colonies to the Bank of Saint George in 1453 and before the Ottoman conquest of Caffa and most of the other colonies in 1475. Massaria Caffae 1461 reflects the state of things after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and before the conquest of Caffa and most of the settlements of Genoese Gazaria in 1475; a period par excellence characterized by the threat of the Ottoman conquest and the growing hardships in communications between the colonies and the metropolis.

An important limitation in these sources is that though they are serial and good for statistical analysis, they do not cover a long period. It is easy to notice that a long interim of 1425–1441 (apart from the shorter ones) is not covered by Caffa Massaria. Moreover, I have limited my research to a certain selection even from the available sources, keeping the rest of the massariae for future research. Thus, I will mainly use the data covering only three years. How can we solve these problems? We can use the documents of private non-governmental origin – both private books of accounts and notarial deeds made on different occasions for private individuals (indeed the latter, especially those of notary Antonio Torriglia, are particularly
important, because they often give valuable information on the periods that are not covered by *massariae*.

The private documents of financial statements and reports stand taxonomically together with the public ones such as *massariae* and are structured in the same double-entry book-keeping system. The ledgers report on a daily basis the activities of a merchant in a given period, with information on his business connections, and the range of products in the trade between Italy and the East.\(^{163}\) These are the ledgers of individual merchants, trading families, or companies written either by the merchants themselves, or by their hired scribes. Perhaps the most famous source in this group is a ledger of a Venetian merchant, Giacomo Badoer,\(^{164}\) who traded in Constantinople in the period 1436 to 1439.\(^{165}\) Naturally, some of the entries reflect trade with Caffa. Another similar ledger of a Venetian *fraterna* of Sorranzo\(^{166}\) is also useful for a present study. Additionally, we find Greek ledgers, one of them presumably written by a Venetian citizen of Greek origin in Paphlagonia in the mid-fourteenth century,\(^{167}\) but also containing information on the Northern Black Sea trade. Jacoby thinks that the author lived and traded in the Venetian quarter of Constantinople.\(^ {168}\)

Documents of private law are mainly represented by notarial deeds. These are the documents drawn up by a notary or his scribe on behalf of a private individual and notarized in the presence of witnesses. The notarial deeds have long been considered a good source for reconstructing the history of the Black Sea region; and as pivotal for the economic, social, political, ethnic, and legal history of the Italian colonies and attracted the attention of the scholars from a variety of backgrounds. Each document is normally composed in two copies – an *instrumentum* (original document for the client) and an *imbreiviatura* (an entry in a notary’s cartulary, a full or abridged text of *instrumentum*). Later acts, in contrast to earlier


\(^{164}\) *Il Libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer*, ed. U. Dorini, T. Bartele (Rome: Istituto Poligraphico dello Stato, 1956). This ledger reflects transactions for over 450,000yperpera or 140,000 ducats over 3.5 years. See М. М. Шитиков, “Константинополь и венецианская торговля в первой половине XV в. по данным книги счетов Джакомо Бадоера,” [Constantinople and Venetian trade in the first half of the fifteenth century according to the book of accounts of Giacomo Badoer], *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 30(1969): 50.


ones, survived not as instrumentae, but as im breviaturae.\textsuperscript{169} So far, the scholars indicated 1508 notarial deeds drawn up by the 205 known by name Genoese notaries in Caffa, and 5 deeds drawn up by Venetian notaries.\textsuperscript{170} A detailed taxonomy of the notarial documents is very complex, so I will not deal with it here specifically.\textsuperscript{171} The first notary to mention Caffa in 1281 was Gabriele di Predono who worked in Pera. The first (and by far the best studied) notarial register originated from Caffa is the cartulary of Lamberto di Sambucetto (in Caffa 1289–1290),\textsuperscript{172} followed by the deeds of Simone Vataccio and Camuglio Damiani (both in 1290). For the fourteenth century, we also have some notarial deeds of the Genoese notaries in Caffa available. Those of Niccolò Beltrame (1343-1344) were published by Giovanna Balbi;\textsuperscript{173} they mainly contain procurationes, emphiteusis, freight, etc. Some other deeds by Niccolò de Bozzolo were drawn up in Caffa in 1371. The documents of Niccolò de Bellignano (1381–1382) were published by Gabriella Airaldi.\textsuperscript{174} There are also a number of single deeds published by Laura Balletto.\textsuperscript{175} Among the unpublished Genoese notarial sources, I should mention the registers of a notary in Caffa Antonio Torriglia\textsuperscript{176} and a number of others.\textsuperscript{177} There are also a number of published Venetian documents,\textsuperscript{178} highly useful and


\textsuperscript{170} Karpov, New archival discoveries... In earlier articles by the same author the figures were different: 1459 acts and 184 scribes known by name. Karpov, Mixed Marriages in the Polyethnic society, 208. Karpov, Tana una grande zone, 77.


\textsuperscript{174} Airaldi, Studi e documenti su Genova e Oltremare, Collana storica di fonti e studi diretta da Geo Pistarino 19 (Genoa: Istituto di paleografia e storia medievale, 1974).


\textsuperscript{176} ASG, Notai antichi, 845, 846, Antonio Torriglia.

\textsuperscript{177} Giovanni Pinetto...

sometimes necessary for a study of the Black Sea area (obviously with a focus on Tana, which was a priority for the Venetians). Besides that, there are some unpublished Venetian notarial registers, which I am currently preparing for critical edition. For the sake of context, and because they often provide additional information on persons and processes, I will also use the published notarial documents from other Genoese towns: Pera, Licostomo, Chilia, Chios, Mytilene, and Cyprus (series *Notai genovesi in Oltremare*, see bibliography). The Italian trade with the Byzantine Empire, the Russian principalities, the Golden Horde, and the states of the East was very intensive, and this accounts for the large amount of notarial documents. Unfortunately, most of the archives of the colonies were destroyed during the Ottoman conquest in 1475. The notarial deeds (as well as *massariae* etc.) have obvious source limitations – they were written by the Italians and in Latin, and obviously the Latin population of colonies is reflected in these sources better than the local Orientals (the latter being reflected mostly in the cases when they interacted with the Italians).

Ecclesiastical documents are another important group of sources including proceedings of the councils, papal bulls, documents of *Curia Romana*, material from the chapters of *fratres minores* and *predicatores* and the epistles of their generals on the Latin Catholic side. Among the sources of Greek Orthodox origin we have the Acts of the Patriarchate of Constantinople and other documents from the patriarchal chancery. In addition there are a small amount of supplementary sources of ecclesiastical or religious origin that cannot be classified separately. The Greek Synaxarion from Soldaia is particularly interesting for the purposes of onomastics because of its *marginalia*. We can obtain some idea of the cultural life in Caffa looking at the Armenian and Jewish illuminated sacred texts produced in the


180 ASV. Cancelleria Inferior. Notai. b. 231, Nicolaus de Varsis. ASV. Notaril Testamenti. b. 750, Nicolaus de Varsis. ASV. Notaril Testamenti. b. 917, Benedictus de Smeritis.


city’s scriptoria, and from the Latin-Kypchak translations of Luke’s Gospel, several patristic texts, hymns, and prayers preserved in the ‘Codex Cumanicus’. The latter is also interesting for a linguistic reconstruction, as it includes a Latin-Turkic-Persian dictionary and a Kypchak grammar composed in Latin probably around 1292-1294 in Caffa. In around 1300–1303, it was amplified by a Kypchak-German dictionary. Though not of religious origin, the letters of Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq are close to this source, as they contain a list of Gothic words and allow a reconstruction of history of communication, topography, mentality, and so forth.

Private correspondence constitutes another key group of sources. They can touch upon the commercial issues or the personal ones, but they are all aimed at the exchange of information and addressed to a single person rather than to a group of people. Alongside a number of earlier letters, we should mention the correspondence of a military commander Carlo Lomellini, of a notary Antonio Torriglia, and some other letters. Among the Greek epistolography, which is of more general character for our topic, we should focus on the pieces presenting at least some data about the culture of the Greek population of Caffa. I will use the letters of a Byzantine intellectual Demetrios Cydones (1324–1398), on the political situation in Crimea.

The travel guides, trade guides, and manuals of commercial activity are another type of source used by everybody dealing with the Eastern trade of Italians. These sources were a peculiarity of the late medieval and early modern commerce and are based on the commercial experience and a vast knowledge gained from the word of mouth, and contain information on the markets, currencies, systems of measures, tolls, as well as practical recommendations for travellers (e.g. on servants or clothes). The most famous is obviously a work by Francesco
Balducci Pegolotti, written around 1330s–1340s. We should also take into account a guidance written by Antonio da Uzzano (1442), and some other guides and manuals. A number of chronicles and historical narratives should also be included. We can mention Genoese narrative sources written by Caffaro and his continuations, Uberto Folieta, the *Annales* of Giorgio and Giovanni Stella, Agostino Giustiniani, and others. Among the Venetian narrators we find Marino Sanuto, Andrea Dandolo, Daniele di Chinazzo, and also *Historia Turchescha* by Da Lezze and Caroldo’s Chronicle. The chroniclers and historians of Florence and Tuscany showed particular interest in the Black Sea events, and the narratives by Giovanni and Mateo Villani are particularly useful, though there are some others (e.g. Benedetto Dei and Gianotto Manetti, *non vidit*). Medieval French historiography offers us the figures of Joinville and Vincent of Beauvais, though the writing of Jehan de Wawrin, though French from Artois by birth, should be considered rather as a piece of English (or Anglo-Burgundy) narrative sources, revealing the events of the Burgundy expedition to the Black Sea in 1443–1445. I would expect that a number of Flemish narrative sources, as well as Hispanic ones (Castilian, Aragonese, Catalan, and Mallorquin) also contain interesting data on the history of Black Sea. Limiting the scope only to the narrative

---

189 Pegolotti, *La Pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy, 1936). One should remember that Pegolotti gives some outdated information. This has led scholars of the twelfth century to the misrepresentation of data and then to accusations of forgery (see Bischoff, “Pegolotti: An Honest Merchant?” *Journal of European Economic History* 6 (1977): 103-108, although in reality some parts are correct, but for an earlier period. Pegolotti is still reliable even in the subsequent period, as found by S. Karpov while researching the “Instructions on the trip to Tana” of the merchant Giacomo Bragad addressed to his nephew, Andriolo Malipiero ([Karpov] C. P. Капров, “Из Таны в Ургенч” [From Tana to Urgench], *Srednie veka* 61 (2000): 223). This demonstrates the relevance of Pegolotti’s data at least throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Surely there was continuity in the functioning of the economy, so in some cases one may use the trading manuals of the fourteenth century *mutatis mutandis* as a source for the history of the fifteenth century, providing exceptionally useful information about the prices, comparative tables of coins, weights and measures, etc. See also: Khvalkov, *Tana, a Venetian and Genoese Black Sea Trading Station in the 1430s: A Social and Economic History* (MA thesis in Medieval Studies, CUP, Budapest, 2011).

190 Antonio da Uzzano, *Pratica della mercatura*...

191 Borlandi, El Libro de mercantantie... C. Ciano, La “Pratica di Mercatura” Datiniana... Bartholomeo di Pasi da Venezia, Tariffa de i pesi... G. Pagnini, Della Decima... Zibaldone da Canal, Manoscritto Mercantile... 

192 Annali Genovesi di Caffaro... Bizzari Senatus Populique Genuensis Rerum Domi... Uberti Folieta Patricii Genuensis Historiae Genuensium Libri XII... Agostino Giustiniani, Annali della Repubblica di Genova... Interiano Ristretto delle Historie Genovesi... J. Promontorio Die Aufzeichnungen des Genuesen... Georgii et Iohannes Stellae, Annales Genuenses... Iacopo da Varagine e la sua Cronaca di Genova... 


194 Villani, *Historia universalis*... Villani Matthei ejusque filii Philippus Historia... 

195 Joinville, *Histoire de Saint Louis*... 

196 de Beauvais, *Speculum Majus*... 

197 de Wawrin, *Anciennes chroniques d’Angleterre*...
sources of Western origin would unavoidably narrow the prospective and lead to certain biases; I will therefore use Byzantine (and other Greek) historical accounts as George Pachymeres, Nicephorus Gregoras, Michael Panaretos, George Sphrantzes, Laonikos Chalkokondyles, and also ‘Kleinchroniken,’ ‘Ecthesis chronica,’ and a number of other writings. A number of Slavic, Russian, Georgian, Armenian and otherwise native Caucasian sources are also useful for certain (otherwise unknown) pieces of data. There is obviously a vast Eastern historiography around the region, but going through it all would be an impossible task and many items are unavailable in a European language; I have chosen the most well-known and available sources from Muslim East, scilicet of Ottoman, Arabian, and Persian origin. We can also use some fictional narratives and rhetorical orations as a source alongside the historiography. They can be placed alongside the travelogues and historical narratives, and it is difficult to classify the separately.

Travelogues, accounts of voyages, diaries of travellers, and geographical descriptions are perhaps the most fascinating sources. We should recall the earliest travelogues of Marco


199 Bogdan, Ein Beitrag zur bulgarischen und serbischen Geschichtsschreibung...

200 Полное собрание русских летописей [Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles], Vol. 1-43 (Moscow: 1962).

201 Halton. La flor des estoires de la Terre d'Orient... A. Sanjian, Colophones of Armenian manuscripts, 130 -1480...

202 Аşılpaşaşade, Vom Hirtelzelt zur Hohen... Tursun Beg, The History of Mehmed the Conqueror... Hadji Khalifa, Kiatib Tchelebi. Dijan-Numa, ou miroir du monde...

203 Geographie d’Aboulfeda... (Al Umari). Notice de l’ouvrage qui a pour titre Mesalek... Extrait de la Chronique intitulée Kamel - Altevarkh... Ibn Battuta, The Travels of Ibn Battuta... Ibn Hauql, Configuration de la Terre... Ibn Khordadhbeh, Abu’l - Kasim Kitab... La Geographie d’Edrisi... Juvaini’ Ala’ al-Din, Ta’rikh-i Jahan Gushat... The History of the World Conqueror... Les Prairies d’or de Mas’udi... The Geographical part of the Nuzhat-al Qulub, composed by Hand-allah Mustawfi of Qazwin...

204 Из «Истории» Хайдера Рази. Сборник материалов, относящихся к истории Золотой Орды. Том II. Извлечения из персидских сочинений, собранные В. Г. Тизенгаузеном. [From the “History” of the Haider Razi; Collection of materials relating to the history of the Golden Horde, volume 2. Excerpts from Persian writings collected by G. Tizengauzen]. Moscow, 1941, 213 – 215; from the “Places of the rise of two lucky stars, and of the confluence of two seas” by Abd al-Razzak Samarkandi Ibid., 190 – 201; from “The List of the Organizer of the world” by Ghaffari. Ibid., 210 – 212. Cahen C. Quelques textes négliges concernant les Turcosmans de Roum au moment de l’invasion mongole... H. Duda, Die Selschukengeschichte des Ibn Bibl... Histoire des Seljoukides d’Asie Mineure...

Polo and Guillaume Rubruck. We should also consider the following European travellers who left us their accounts: an unknown fourteenth-century monk; the so-called John Mandeville, who wrote his book around 1357–1371; John de Gallonifontibus, a bishop of Sultania, who visited Crimea and wrote his book in 1404; Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo, an envoy of the king of Castile Enrique to Tamerlane who wrote his book in 1403–1406; Emmanueile Piloti, who justified a crusade to Egypt; Schiltberger, who wrote his diaries whilst a captive in 1394–1427; Antonio Usodimare (1416–1462), who was a trade agent of one of Florentine trading houses in Caffa; Pero Tafur, who visited Tana in January 1438, being in 1435–1439 a head of the embassy of the king of Castile to the Timurid court; Giosafat Barbaro (1413–1494), who wrote A Journey to Tana reflecting the events of 1430s, and Ambrogio Contarini (1420–1480), who also visited Tana and left his accounts. We should also mention two Russian travelogues: a diary of Ignaty Smol’njanin, who accompanied in 1389–1405 metropolitan Pimen, and the famous accounts of Afanasy Nikitin, whose travel happened around 1468–1474, or perhaps around 1466–1472. Among the Eastern authors, we should mention Al-Idrisi and Ibn Battuta (other Eastern sources containing geographical descriptions can be better classified as historical narratives). I would both agree and disagree with the words of Jerry Bentley:

Since remote antiquity, migrants, merchants, explorers, soldiers, administrators, diplomats, missionarles, pilgrims, and other travelers have ventured forth from their own societies and returned with information and lore about distant lands. However, knowledge about the larger world has always been highly problematic.

---

206 Marco Polo...
207 de Rubruck, ed. Van Den Wingaert, Sinica Franciscana, Quaracchi, 1929.
208 Book of the knowledge of all the kingdoms, lands and lordships that are in the world...
209 Mandeville’s travels, texts and translations...
211 Clavijo, ed. Cl. R. Markham (London, 1859).
213 Schiltberger, Traveling through Europe, Asia and Africa since 1394 to 1427 (Baku: Elm., 1984).
215 Tafur, Wanderings and Travels, Translation and comments by L. C. Maciel Sanchez (Moscow: Indrik, 2006).
218 Хождение за три моря Афанасия Никитина, 1466-1472 (Moscow/Leningrad, 1948).
The nature of interest was commonly determined, if not to say narrowed by the filter of the practical needs and interests of commerce or colonization. The information we get from the travelogues always bears a print of...

This was true for many of the medieval travelogues, produced for some kind of practical necessity, be it political, diplomatic, military, commercial, or religious. On the other hand, a large part of this literature was aimed at a broader audience that did not need precise information about the faraway lands for practical purposes; therefore the authors sometimes mixed reality with legend or left inaccurate accounts. Nevertheless, these travelogues are important in many respects, such as factual data, mentality, history of knowledge, and a geographical vision of the world.

Maps and portolani are another group of sources connected to the travels, though much more reliable than the travelogues. They stand in a sense between the written sources and the material ones, describing sailing directions, spatial distances, landmarks, and ports. They also provide information on the topography of Crimea, and occasionally even on the urban topography of Caffa. We possess summary tables composed by Igor Fomenko based on various medieval portolani.

Numismatics is a field where I am not an expert, but I have nevertheless attempted to use this source. There were many studies both of the Genoese colonies and the Golden Horde in previous Russian scholarship. At this point the numismatic material was analysed mostly in the prospective and for the sake of the political history of the region; in recent years, however, it has also been used more extensively for reconstructing economic issues.

Sigillography can be used contextually to date certain events, and for prosopography. We should consider the seals of the bishops of Caffa, and those from Sudak.

---

221 Bentley, “Global History and Historicizing Globalization,” 71.
223 See bibliography for Grigoriev, Kozubovsky, Retovsky, Fomichev, and Yurgevich.
Art history is another useful field. Unfortunately, here we are mainly limited to the medieval architecture of Caffa (that is, fortification and religious buildings, the later comprising the Genoese, Greek Orthodox, Armenian, and Jewish/Karaite). There are also some Greek frescoes in Crimea, but they do not tell us much in our field. Architecture, however, taken together with the data on written sources, helps us to reconstruct the urban landscape and environment.

Latin, Greek, Armenian, Jewish, and Muslim epigraphy in Crimea is among the most important material source. This is mostly represented by the epitaphs or inscriptions in honour of some event (most often the completion of a building such as a tower, gates, or a church). These lapidary monuments help us reconstruct political and social history, and their relevance for studying the Genoese presence in Crimea has often been emphasized.\(^ {226} \) Its potential is high and far from exhausted.\(^ {227} \) Most of the inscriptions were published by Elena Skrzinskaia, and there have been a number of other works on them,\(^ {228} \) and they were often used to date the consulates and various events.\(^ {229} \) Besides the Latin epigraphy there are interesting inscriptions in Greek necropolis of Soldaia,\(^ {230} \) which are a good source for the

---

226 [Klimanov] Л. Г. Климов, “Крымские памятники средневековой генуэзской лапидарной эпиграфики: возможности источника” [Crimean monuments of medieval Genoese lapidary epigraphy: a possible source], *Sugdea Collection* 2 (2005): 454. [V. Yurgevich] В. Юргевич, “Genoese inscriptions in the Crimea,” *ZOOID* 5 (1863): 157-177. The importance of these medieval inscriptions is slightly reduced by the fact that they were created in a world filled with written sources. Therefore, in the Middle Ages, there are almost no inscriptions-documents. Nevertheless, perhaps precisely for these reasons, there have been almost no attempts to forge the European epigraphic monuments from the Middle Ages (as contrasted to those from antiquity).


229 The inscriptions in memory of some event are particularly important, as they often mention the date and the name of consul, making possible the dating of consulates when no data is extant in written sources. (Е. А. Яровая, “О новых идентификациях гербов на закладных плитах из Судака,” *Причерноморье, Крым, Русь в истории и культуре. Материалы II Судакской международной научной конференции* (12-16 сентября 2004 г.). Часть II. Киев и Судак, “Академпериодика”, 2004, 247).

Oriental religious and ethnic groups and help compensate for an imbalance in favour of Latins which is present in both epigraphy and the written sources.

Other archaeological sources often help us learn more not only about the material culture, but also about the trade, its routes, directions, and objectives. The traditions of excavations in Crimea were already established in the early nineteenth century, and are successfully continued today. Moreover, for societies such as the Golden Horde, archaeology is the main source of information when written sources are missing. Obviously, I will not carry out any independent archaeological research myself, but the rich data from numerous reports on the excavations, monographs, articles, and dissertation abstracts with data on archaeological finds in the region for the period in question will obviously contribute to my study, and will help me to overcome at least partly the gap between the ‘archival’ and the ‘material’ researches and researchers.

The sources listed here, both the serial ones\textsuperscript{231} concerned predominantly with Caffa and the ones to be used contextually for smaller items of information all together seem to be enough to provide a panoramic view of the Genoese presence on the Black Sea, there colonies, and, first of all, their pivot – the city of Caffa, as well as to address the problems I defined for the present study. Scholars began since long ago trying to build up a comprehensive analysis of a variety of sources to create a ‘thick description’ of any society or community. Nonetheless, it is obvious that they will not all be used at the same extent. The main original contribution that I hope to make to the scholarship is based mostly on a study of such archival documents as \textit{Caffa Massaria}, unpublished notarial registers, and personal letters written in the fifteenth century. The research into these sources and the contextualization of its outcomes promises a fruitful study, credible generalizations, and a reliable reconstruction of history of Caffa.

\textsuperscript{231} They can be called ‘serial’, even though most of these sources cover our period very irregularly.
CHAPTER 2. TO THE ORIGINS OF THE GENOSE BLACK SEA COLONIZATION: THE COLONIAL EMPIRE OF GAZARIA IN ITS GENESIS AND SHAPING, XIII–XIV CENTURIES

In this chapter I discuss the origins of the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea and illustrate how a network of small and loosely connected settlements evolved from the second half of the thirteenth century to the 1380s into a colonial empire of the Ligurian Republic of St. George. After a general presentation of the area of Crimea where the colonies appeared, and which the colonizers must have found strikingly similar to their Ligurian motherland, I will provide a background of political history in the broader Northern Black Sea region. Thus this chapter shows Genoese Gazaria shaping against the political events in the Crimea and its surroundings, and finishes when the colonial domain of the Republic of St. George became a single formed unit.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Genoese settlement of Caffa was the largest medieval Italian settlement in the East. It was situated on the south-eastern coast of the Crimean peninsula, and was a fortification in the *extremo Oriente* not only for Genoese possessions, but also for the universe of Latin Christendom and the Western world in general. Far away from the centre of the world to which it had once belonged, the Latin inhabitants of the colony had to rely on themselves not only to withstand the constant threat from the nomadic Tatars, but also to survive in Caffa’s tangled world of complex and multiple identities, with its cosmopolitan eclecticism.\(^{232}\) Before going on to discuss the changes that took place in the Genoese domains in the East during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, I will give a brief general presentation of Caffa, its geographical location,\(^{233}\) and describe how a Genoese colony came to be established there. That is, I will present the main milestones of the history of Gazaria, the name given to the Genoese colonies in the Crimea, in its political and international dimension together with the general politics of the political actors in, and often beyond, the Black Sea region. In so doing, I will deal successively with the first stages of Genoese penetration of Gazaria, the formation of the Genoese colonial empire from the 1360s to the late 1380s, and – beyond the limits of this chapter, its evolution and decline by the 1470s.

---


\(^{233}\) The urban and rural physical layout of Genoese Gazaria in its anthropogenic dimension is discussed in following chapter.
The core of the Genoese possessions roughly coincided with the naturally limited geographical area today called the Southern coast of Crimea, i.e. the Crimean Riviera stretching from west to east from Fiolent to Kara Dag volcanic rock formation, and the coastal territories to the East (hereafter, South-Eastern coast, including the place where Caffa was situated). This area has the Black Sea in the South and the South-East, and is limited by a chain of mountains and hills from the West and North-West. The range of the orographic formation of the Crimean Mountains running parallel to the South-Eastern coast of Crimea therefore forms a natural border separating the relatively narrow (five to eight miles) strip of Riviera from the rest of the Crimean plains called steppe. The mountains encompass three ridges: the Outer Ridge reaching at its highest 1,148 feet, the Inner Ridge reaching at its highest 2,461 feet, and the Main Ridge of Crimean Mountains with its highest peak Roman-Kosh being 5,069 feet. These mountains are barely passable with a series of mountain passes, whereas the Riviera is more accessible from the area of Baydar Valley in the South-West and from the area of Kara Dag in the North-East, which are easy to control and guard; therefore the ancient and medieval settlements of the narrow strip of the coastal area enjoyed relative natural protection from the nomadic raids from the steppe. The terrain of the Southern and South-Eastern coast of Crimea, hereafter referred to as Gazaria, in the Genoese style, is composed of mountainous slopes that become hills of shale and limestone descending towards the sea. From the North, its border runs along the main ridge of the Crimean Mountains, which protects it from the cold northern winds in the winter. There is an abundance of Mediterranean plants, most of which have only been cultivated since fairly recently. In the past the flora was much poorer than today and mainly composed of beeches, oaks, junipers, and Crimean pines. In the South-Eastern region the slopes of the mountains are less steep than in the South, the mountains are lower, the coastline between the ridge and the sea broadens out and is hilly with a number of small rivers (Ulu-Uzen, Bijuk-Uzen, Sudak, etc.). The Crimean Mountains are a fairly ‘young’ Cænozoic formation with somewhat intensive seismic activity, but the strong earthquakes are rather rare and exceptional.

In the Mediterranean terms, Crimea was considered in antiquity and in the Middle Ages as a rather cold zone; this must have been enhanced in the late thirteenth to fifteenth centuries by the Little Ice Age, which followed the Medieval Climate Optimum. In general, however, if we consider that from the climatological point of view Crimea is composed of three macro-
zones (encompassing in their turn twenty climatic sub-regions), i.e. the steppe plains, the mountains, and the Riviera, we can easily see that the latter is the most climatically privileged area. Today, the climate of the Southern and South-Eastern coast is subtropical Mediterranean with an average temperature ranging from 0°C in January to 25°C in July. The average precipitation is 600 mm/year, most of it, namely two-thirds, between November and March, and only about one third between April and October. The winters are mild but windy, with some rain and little or no snowfall (average temperature 4°C, which can rise to 15–20°C). The frosts are rare and short, and the winter is the period with maximum precipitation; the relative humidity is 72%, and in some days there is a strong wind from the sea (15 m/sec). In spring, the average day temperature is 14°C, relative humidity is 69%. The springs tend to be rainy and are sometimes stormy with fairly unstable weather and occasional slight frosts happening until late March, while the summers are long, sunny, and very dry, although the coastal area is slightly milder on account of incoming sea wind. The average temperature is 24°C, often reaching 28°C with a maximum of 39°C; the relative humidity is 55%. The autumns are dry, warm, and sunny with the average day temperature around 19°C and relative humidity 62%.

The region where Caffa is situated lies on the eastern point of the South-Eastern coast, bordering with the Peninsula of Kerch (Eastern Crimea). This area is less mountainous than the rest of the Southern and South-Eastern coast, facing the hills and the plains on the east and is hilly. The weather here is drier and hotter in the summer than elsewhere in Crimea, and colder in the winter, but less like an oceanic climate and similar to a continental one than the Southern coast of Crimea. The vegetation is nonetheless lush and very diverse, especially in the areas of Kara Dag and Koktebel. The climate favours viticulture and horticulture rather than the cultivation of crops, whereas the hills’ and mountains’ pastures give good opportunities for animal husbandry. On the other hand, beyond the Crimean Mountains and therefore in the immediate proximity was the ancient wheat-producing region of the Crimean plains, which served as a granary even for Mediterranean cities, so in the times of political stability the population of the coastal zone could benefit from the trade with their neighbours from the steppe.

Focusing on the particular location of Caffa in the Crimea, I will try to show what it looked like before the city and colony came into being. The shores of the bay are situated between the mountains and the plains of Crimea. In this area the forests of the Southern
coast, rich in flora and fauna, with fertile soil and mountain springs which become small rivers, change into a hilly steppe with sparse bushes and saline areas. The climate of the steppe is generally drier than the milder and more humid climate of the Southern coast. Today the plants in the area are more abundant, but this is a relatively recent change brought about artificially by populations in the last two centuries. Although poor in respect of plants and mammals, the area offers good fishing for mullet, European anchovy, bluefish, Black Sea turbot, etc. At the same time, Caffa is located in an ideal position for navigation and maritime trade. The gulf is large and deep, and ships can approach the coast safely, while the cycles of winds change only mildly and the hills, together with a breakwater, protect the haven against winds coming from all sides. Moreover, there is a sea current flowing in the direction of Asia Minor, while another Black Sea current flows Northwards and situated in the Western part of the Black Sea is not far away Westwards from the area of the gulf of modern-day Feodosia. These two currents were discovered by the ancient seafarers and used extensively for the fastest crossing of the *Pontos Euxeinos* since late fifth and early fourth centuries BC and throughout the Middle Ages. The sea routes were often more convenient than those over land. The mountainous terrain of Crimea created certain difficulties for communication by land and favoured the naval connections over the land travel; moreover, the travellers on the land routes were at the mercy of robbers and wild beasts; thus, even before the Genoese came, the costal settlements of Crimea were strongly linked with each other and with the rest of the Black Sea cities by the maritime routes, which, nonetheless, does not exclude the land connections, which became of crucial importance because of the shift of the Silk Route. Navigation was seasonal: intensive in spring, summer, and autumn, it stopped in the winter due to the winds.

The geographical placing of Crimea determined its political, strategic, and commercial importance. From time immemorial it was a crossroads of cultures and civilizations. In times of antiquity, it became one of the main areas of Greek colonization, playing an important role in the politics and economy of the Roman and Byzantine empires, especially as a granary. However, the highest point of its importance in international commercial exchanges came after the Mongol expansion and the consolidation of the so-called *Pax mongolica* in the thirteenth century. “The thirteenth century *Pax Mongolica*, opening to economic and cultural exchange a vast space stretching from Yellow Sea to the Hungarian plain, constituted a form of Eurasian globalization. It probably brought about the ‘microbial unification’ of Eurasia,
but it proved too transient and fragile to have the ‘lasting impact’, essential to Flynn and Giraldez’s definitions of globalization.”234 What is even more specifically important in our case, they allowed a trade model now described as “Italy’s thirteenth century global trading system”.235

The disasters that the Mongol conquest wreaked on Europe and Asia thus soon changed into commercial benefits, created by the stability of the caravan trade routes within the empire of the Genghisids, which Italian merchants soon began to exploit. Crimea thus became part of the famous Silk Road, connecting Europe with Asia and the Mediterranean with the areas of Central and Eastern Europe. Politically, Crimea became an area of intensive interaction between several different polities – Byzantium, the Trebizond Empire, Genoa, Venice, the Sultanate of Rum, the Golden Horde, the Principality of Moldova, the Crimean Khanate, and the Ottoman Empire.236 The development of the international long-distance trade led to a considerable urban growth in the Black Sea area. New cities appeared, and some old ones regained their previous vitality.237 Besides being a transit point for the trade on the Silk Road, the medieval cities of Crimea were significant exporters themselves, trading in slaves, grain, fish, caviar, timber, salt, flax, hemp, leather, meat, etc.238 they were also a point of interest for overseas Italian merchants. “During the late Middle Ages the Italian city-states emerged as the leading centres for long-distance trade in the Mediterranean, in the Black Sea, and along the Atlantic coasts of north-western Europe. This hegemony was the outcome of a long historical process and linked Italy’s destiny with developments in Europe north of the Alps, in the Middle East, and in Asia.”239 It is not surprising, therefore, that as soon as the citizens of the Republic of Genoa, one of the major maritime trading republics of the Middle
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237 Although we can hardly speak about the ‘new’ ones, as only few of them were entirely new; the locations of Caffa, Tana, Vosphoro, Cembalo, and others were inhabited at least as early as in antiquity.


Ages, managed to penetrate the Black Sea region, they tried their best to monopolize the commerce on the Black Sea, securing the best trading conditions from the local powers and attempting to displace their main rivals – the Venetians.

The history of the early stages of this Genoese penetration into the Black Sea basin and the setting up of the first colonies on its shores is vague and obscure. It was closely connected to the entangled relations of the Italian merchant republics with the Byzantine Empire, which controlled the Black Sea as its inner lake prior to the thirteenth century. Based on Italian archival data we can, albeit only partly, try to reconstruct the course of events as well as the interaction between the Italians and the Byzantines.240 Some scholars have claimed, for example, that the Italians started sailing to the Black Sea as early as the eleventh and twelfth centuries.241 Formally, it was already the Emperor Isaac II Angelos (1185–1195, 1203–1204) who allowed the Genoese to sail down the Bosphorus to the shores of the Black Sea. Nevertheless, there is now a general consensus that under the Byzantine dynasties of Komnenoi and Angeloi, the Black Sea was exclusively dominated by the Byzantines, and that attempts made by Westerners to penetrate there before the Fourth Crusade (if such attempts were ever made) were not systematic.242 Moreover, it is believed that even after 1204 the Italians did not begin to colonize the Black Sea immediately. This was because, initially, at the beginning of the thirteenth century the main trade route went through Bagdad, and the flow of trade shifted to Crimea no earlier than after the Mongol conquest. Following this, after 1204, Westerners, particularly the Venetians, were endowed with a huge domain as a result of the partitio terrarum imperii Romanae (they obtained a quarter and an eighth of the former Byzantine Empire); thus, Venice was too busy with these new acquisitions to pay any attention to Crimea. Even after the Mongol conquest, in fact, it took Crimea some time to recover from the destruction and form part of the huge new space connecting Europe with Eastern Asia.

There is, finally, one more reason for the relatively late penetration of the Genoese to the Black Sea. It is often believed that 1204 was a victory of the West over Byzantium. However, not all Western powers benefitted from this conquest. Venice received a lot after 1204, as the puppeteer of the whole crusade, but Genoa, which already enjoyed a privileged position, faced a strong – and in the new situation indeed, more privileged rival. So in
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comparison with its positions under the Angeloi dynasty, Genoa was a loser after the Fourth Crusade. This crusade, otherwise favourable and advantageous for many European powers, ruined the positions of the Genoese, enabling the trade in Latin Romania to pass into the hands of the Venetians, and none of the various means available – neither the wars, nor piracy, nor the treaties, nor the alliances – helped the Genoese re-establish the balance as per before 1204.

After the Fourth Crusade, the Venetians became the effective masters of the Black Sea. In the course of time, they established a number of merchants’ offices there, chiefly in Soldaia (modern Sudak), which was perhaps the most developed Crimean urban centre in the eleventh to thirteenth centuries. The Venetian merchants frequented the Crimean ports and the earliest known Venetian commercial contract with Soldaia as final destination of commerce forged between Zaccaria Stagnoria and Pietro Ferraguto is dated as early as 1206. The Venetian merchants kept sailing to the Black Sea in 1212–1232. Together with the Venetians, other Italian merchants appeared in the area, among them the Pisans, Florentines, and, finally the Genoese. Soon the influence in this area became a matter of political importance, which is reflected in the first notice of the Black Sea trade in the diplomatic documentation, namely a treaty between Genoa and Venice of 1238.

However, the turbulent times were not yet over. In 1217, Seljuk armies attacked Soldaia, subsequently followed by an even larger and more destructive force, that is – the Mongols. Led by Subutai and Jebe, they assaulted Soldaia for the first time on January 27, 1223. The city was taken by the Mongol armies, which soon had to leave and move against an alliance of Russian and Kypchak princes after the battle of the River Kalka where Russian and Kypchak armies were defeated. In 1239, the city was taken by the Mongols for the second time and remained under their direct rule until 1249. In 1243, after his expedition to Europe, Batu Khan (a Mongol ruler, a son of Jochi and grandson of Genghis Khan) finally shaped a new Mongol state – the Golden Horde, a sub-khanate of the Mongol Empire also
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known as ulus of Jochi – the Batu’s father and the Genghis’s son. This political formation appeared as an *ulus* (i.e. appanage) in 1224, when the Genghis’s empire was divided among his sons and Jochi received this area. It expanded westwards after the Mongol invasion of Europe lead by Batu (1236–1242), and Crimea became therefore part of one of the Mongol states.

The losses and destruction in the wake of the Mongol raids were devastating, but eventually the creation of the Mongol empire provided merchants with the opportunity to travel comfortably from Europe to as far as China, Crimea being one of the main stops on this route. From then on, we find the first clear reports of Italians who had settled in Crimea. Thus, Giovanni Plano Carpini in 1247 found Italian merchants as far as in Kyiv, which implies that Crimea was already their fortress and avant-post.  
250 Rubruck also reported the presence of Italian merchants in Soldaia in 1253 (though these were regularly resident in Constantinople), paying tribute to the Mongols.  
251 In 1255, when Marco Polo’s father and the uncle came to Soldaia, they found that their brother already had his own house and a merchant’s office.  
252 Thus, we can infer that the Mongol conquest of 1236–1243 brought new power to the Black Sea, and that this space was consolidated and stabilized in the 1250s under the fourth Great Khan of the Mongol Empire Möngke (1251–1259). The following years saw the empire flourish under the fourth Great Khan and the founder of the China’s Yuan Dynasty Kublay (1260–1294) and the sixth Great Khan Temür Öljeytü (1294–1307). This flourishing allowed the stable trade connections on this space. Although the Golden Horde became an independent khanate and began to live its own life since the times of the Khan of the Golden Horde Möngke Temür (1266–1280), this did not infringe the commercial stability, while the Crimea secured its important position in international trade, making it a key point of access into the huge space created by the *Pax Mongolica*,  
253 the geographical embodiment of the Mongols’ cultural brokerage. The division of the empire into appanages did not stop intensive communication from taking place in this large new space. Indeed, the meeting that occurred between the Mongols and the Italians on the Black Sea helped broaden
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the borders of Western trade, and eventually of what we can call the proto-global world. Thanks to the Mongol conquest, the world became more open, remote lands more accessible, and knowledge increased as a result of travel and cultural exchange.

All these processes meant that the Italian merchants, previously scarce in the Black Sea area, now had the grounds and interest to colonize the Black Sea shores in a manner similar to that applied in the Eastern Mediterranean. The charters and letters patent issued by the monarchs of the Byzantine Empire, the Empire of Trebizond, the earlier grants of the Holy Roman Empire, and the jarligs of the Mongol-Tatar Khans legitimized the Genoese presence in Eastern Mediterranean and on the Black Sea. As cited above, after 1204 the Venetians became actual hegemons in Romania, but they were not very swift to expand in the Black Sea, being already quite busy and satisfied with their domains in the Latin Romania. On the other hand, while Constantinople was dominated by the Latin Empire and, consequently, while Venetians had an important position there, the Genoese had little chance to profit from a shift of the international trade routes to the Black Sea region. Yet they must have felt a pressing need to do so, since their position in Palestine was becoming increasingly weak. In 1258, the Genoese were defeated in Syria by the Venetians and Pisans, and this finally forced them to turn their attention northwards and to side with the Empire of Nicaea.

In order to secure the military help against the Latin Empire and Venice, its head and the future restorer of the Byzantine Empire Michael VIII Palaeologos felt that he needed an ally such as the Republic of Genoa, and it was for this reason that he therefore drew up the Treaty of Nymphaeum in 1261, giving to the Genoese – along with many other privileges – the exclusive rights of sailing to the Black Sea in exchange for their help in re-conquering the capital of Byzantium. Not giving any benefits to Byzantium, this treaty triggered an extraordinary spurt of growth to the Genoese expansion on the Black Sea. It was a revanche of the Genoese over the Venetians and initiated a new page in Byzantine history.

---
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from which the domination of the Italians over the Byzantine economy began to progressively increase. The treaty led to the economic weakening of Byzantium and promoted the rivalry between Genoa and Venice. The Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in 1261 robbed Venice of its dominant and privileged position in the city and generated a massive exodus of Venetians, though it seems that not all of them left.\footnote{Jacoby, “Venetian Settlers,” 188–89. Jacoby, “Foreigners and the Urban Economy in Thessalonike, ca. 1150–ca. 1450”. Geanakoplos, \textit{Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282: A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations} (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 113–14.} The Black Sea, an area which they had previously dominated, was now becoming an area of the Genoese monopoly,\footnote{Брун, “Etudes sur le commerce au moyen-âge. Histoire du commerce de la mer Noire et des colonies Génoises de la Crimée, par F. de la Primandaie,” \textit{ZOOID} 2 (1848): 715.} and the question of the Black Sea was thereafter at the core of all the clashes between Genoa and Venice.\footnote{Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise}, 14.}

Eventually, however, the re-conquest of Constantinople and the restoration of the Byzantine Empire took place without any help from the Genoese.\footnote{Chapman, \textit{Michel Paléologue restaurateur de l’empire byzantin 1261–1282} (Paris, 1926).} On July 25, 1261, Alexios Strategopoulos entered the city, and on August 15, Michael VIII was crowned again in Hagia Sophia. Constantinople became, once again, the focal point of the imperial court and the orthodox patriarchate.\footnote{Matschke, \textit{The Late Byzantine Urban Economy, Thirteenth–Fifteenth Centuries}, 464.} This victory did not cost Genoa anything; nonetheless, it gave the Republic of St. George the position of hegemon of Romania and the Black Sea that Venice had previously occupied and now lost. Together with access to Central and Eastern Asia, the Black Sea was at the disposal of the Genoese, which soon made another treaty with the Tatar authorities enabling them to settle in Crimea and conduct trade there. By the same token, however, the Venetians, after their great fiasco of 1261 and after losing privileged access to the Black Sea, established a trading station in Trebizond\footnote{On this station see Карпов, \textit{Трапезундская империя} (St. Petersburg, 2007): 229-235.} and, in 1265, another one in Soldaia,\footnote{Фирсов, \textit{Исары: Очерки истории средневековых крепостей Южного берега Крыма} (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1990), 52.} which became their main fortress in Crimea. At the same time, the Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologos expelled the Genoese from Constantinople because of the involvement of some of their officers in a plot preparing a \textit{coup d’état}, and he subsequently re-approached the Venetians in 1265, aiming to make another treaty with them. This initially unsuccessful attempt to renegotiate relationships with the Republic of San Marco was pushed forward partly as a result of the idleness and anti-Byzantine intrigues of the Genoese, and partly as a result of the emergence of a new and dangerous enemy for Byzantium – Charles I
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of Naples (Charles of Anjou), the new King of Sicily after its conquest in 1266. The king spearheaded a new anti-Byzantine coalition aimed against Michael VIII. However, the latter was too a keen diplomat to lose his crown and capital city so easily. Some work on his part in the ecclesiastic sphere led to the Union of Lyons with the Catholic Church at the Second Council of Lyons in 1274. This union was not recognized in Byzantium, but Michael VIII gained some respite thanks to the papal ban on Charles I to attack Byzantium. It is important to understand that during the reign of Michael VIII the perspectives of the Italian presence on the Black Sea were, on the one hand, an issue with a big question mark and certainly not something stable and guaranteed. On the other hand, the Emperor needed diplomatic and military support against his enemies, and therefore constantly tried to forge an alliance with either Venice, or Genoa. This gave both republics the chance to commence their plans of colonization.

Although Genoese penetration into the Black Sea was not halted during the course of these events, the relations of the Genoese with Byzantium were damaged. Nonetheless, neither the Venetians nor the Pisans (defeated near Soldaia in 1277) were able to overcome the Genoese on the Black Sea by themselves. This is why Venice ended up taking sides with the Khan of Kypchak Teleboga and Emir Nogaj in the war against the Il-Khan, who ruled over Persia and supported the Genoese; the victory of the Golden Horde and the Mamluks of Egypt created for Genoa heavy problems in its Black Sea expansion, which however continued.

From the years 1275-1280, the Genoese again challenged the activity of their Venetian rivals in the colony of Soldaia. The balance of power or, more correctly, the alignment of forces that existed at that point in the Mediterranean, indirectly helped Genoa, which had again allied with Byzantium, in the 1280s. In response to this alliance, Charles I set up a new anti-Byzantine coalition, not abandoning his hope of winning back the Byzantine capital, Constantinople back for the Latins. Nevertheless, Charles’s enemy was apparently smart and cynical. The intrigues of Michael VIII and his constant ally king Pedro of Aragon prepared the rebellion known as Sicilian Vespers of 1282 and supported it in the following war. This
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was an excellent example of stabbing a rival in the back exactly before he attacks you. At the end of the day, the efforts of Michael VIII and Pedro of Aragon brought perhaps more success than the two monarchs expected – Charles I lost Sicily during the Vespers, and was clearly no longer in any position to attack Byzantium. Nicephorus Gregoras wrote about Michael VIII, that the empire would have fallen under the domination of Charles, king of Italy, had the emperor not governed its affairs.\(^{271}\) This indeed looks more like a truth of the international relations of the day rather than a piece of Byzantine courtly rhetoric flattery.

All these chiefly political, diplomatic and military events had, however, another dimension: the continuous enhancement of the Genoese positions in Byzantium and, consequently, on the Black Sea. There can be no doubt about the increasing dependence of Byzantium on Genoa during the times of Andronikos II (1272–1328).\(^{272}\) Just to give one example, in 1284, the Genoese provided Byzantium with three armed galleys to transport Andronikos II’s new bride to Constantinople (after the death of his wife Anna in 1281) – Yolanda, daughter of Guglielmo, Marquis of Montferrat. This demonstrates the growing significance of Genoa in Byzantine affairs – it also shows that the Byzantines became increasingly dependent on the Genoese military fleet, lacking their own. The Byzantine Empire did not, however, benefit much from the alliance with Genoa in the late thirteenth century: first, the Genoese were rather unreliable allies; second, the Genoese vessels often took part in private piratic expeditions against the Byzantines, plundering their ships with grain and wine and not hesitating to kill the Greek merchants.\(^{273}\) The Genoese, however, were those who benefited most from the alliance with the Byzantine Empire and the privileges pertaining herewith, strengthening their commercial and political positions on the Black Sea.

One sign of such strengthening of the Genoese positions in the Black Sea area was a gradual shift of commercial importance from Soldaia, which was then still nominally controlled by the Venetians, to the newly-emerged Caffa, founded by the Genoese. It would

\(^{272}\) Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328* (Cambridge (Mass.), 1972), 68-69. Lamma, “Un discorso inedito per l’incoronazione di Michele IX Paleologo,” in *Oriente e Occidente nell’alto Medio Evo* (Padua, 1968), 419. Andronikos II also tried to be in good terms with the Golden Horde, having his two daughters married to the khans Toqta and Özbeg. Nonetheless, by 1320s the relations went worse, and around 1320–1324 the Mongols plundered Thrace. After the death of Abu Sa’id Bahadur Khan (1335) and the disintegration of the Il-Khanate the Empire lost its main eastern ally. Later on, in 1341, the Mongols were even aiming at besieging Constantinople, but Andronicus III managed to send ambassadors to them and to solve the problem diplomatically.

obviously not be correct to say that the Venetians lost all their positions in Constantinople and the Black Sea after 1261. However, it looks as if Soldaia’s importance as a centre of trade was declining, despite the fact that a consul was appointed there in 1287, and responsible for ruling all the Venetian affairs in Gazaria\(^274\) – a weak attempt to keep their positions and to continue exercising some kind of control over the Crimean routes of trade, which the Venetians repeated several times later on. Venetians were still trading in Soldaia;\(^275\) however, it was no longer a pivot for the Venetian commercial activities, given that it was dangerously close to the Genoese settlements. It was for this reason that the Venetians began to show an interest towards Trebizond and Tana (indeed both trading stations outside Crimea), which were deemed to become their only bulwarks on the Black and Azov Sea for two centuries. A long struggle between the Republic of St. Mark and the Republic of St. George was yet to follow; however, it was already in the late thirteenth century that the Genoese outplaced the Venetians on the Crimean Peninsula, which became their bulwark on the Black Sea.

Having provided a certain amount of background to the international relations in the Black Sea region in the thirteenth century, we can now ask two of the most important questions concerning Caffa: when and how was it founded? Or, more precisely: when and how did the Genoese Caffa appear? Perhaps a settlement with this name (Καφᾶς) existed nearby before the penetration of Genoese into the Black Sea; it is even more likely that Kaphas was simply the name of the area around this settlement, comprising the neighbouring villages and hamlets. The question of the origins of the Genoese Caffa is however a long-debated issue. In the fourteenth century, Nicephorus Gregoras wrote that the Genoese had only recently founded their settlement in Caffa.\(^276\) In the early fifteenth century, Giorgio Stella wrote in his chronicle about the semi-legendary first settler in Caffa, Baldo Doria;\(^277\) the same name was mentioned in the chronicle by Giustiniani, although local legends suggest another name – that of Antonio dell’Orto.\(^278\) In the late eighteenth century, Oderico wrote that Caffa had been given to the Genoese by the Tatars prior to 1250.\(^279\) Canale wrote that the

\(^{274}\) Canale, _Della Crimea_, vol. 2, 441. We do not know much about the pre-Genoese use of the word “Gazaria.” Vasiliev thought that it meant Crimea as a whole, while Bayer thought that it was meant to designate the mountainous part of Crimea (which is closer to the Genoese use). Байер, История крымских готов. 171.

\(^{275}\) Aboulfeda, II, 319.


\(^{277}\) Stella, _Annales Genuenses_, 156.

\(^{278}\) Giustiniani. _Castigarissimi annali..._ (Genova, 1537), 136.

\(^{279}\) Oderico, _Lettere linguistiche_ (Bassano, 1792).
Genoese first came to Crimea at the time of the First Crusade, and that they settled in Caffa in the early thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{280} Manfroni proposed a dating around 1267–1268, after the contact between Michael VIII and the Genoese ambassador Franceschino de Camilla had been signed.\textsuperscript{281} What we know is that in 1268 or slightly later, the Genoese settled down in Pera (or Galata), their trading station in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{282} As already stated, they did not have to make much effort to gain privileges from Michael VIII, who tried his best to detach them from the party of Charles I. Pachymeres wrote that the emperor took the guarantees from the Genoese settlers in Pera that they would be faithful to their treaty and would not join the attacking side.\textsuperscript{283} We can therefore assume 1268 as \textit{terminus post quem} for the foundation of Caffa. In the existing documents, the Genoese are first mentioned in Crimea as early as in 1274. In that year a Genoese notary, Federico di Piazzalunga, produced in Soldaia an \textit{instrumentum} for the Genoese merchants; thus the existence of a notary settled there implies that there was already some kind of a Genoese settlement.\textsuperscript{284} The most accurate and widely accepted chronology on the origins of Caffa is believed, however, to be that proposed by Heyd, who suggested that they first settled in Caffa in 1266 or several years later. In this year, the Republic of Genoa acquired Crimean lands on the South-Eastern coast from Möngke Temür, the khan of the Golden Horde, and the foundation of Caffa probably followed soon after this.\textsuperscript{285}

However, since the documents probably no longer exist we cannot be sure under which supreme ruler of the Golden Horde the foundation of Caffa took place: this could be Berke (khan of the Golden Horde in 1257–1266) or Möngke Temür (khan of the Golden Horde in 1266-1280). The local ruler of Crimea who formally agreed ceding of the lands could be either Uran Temür, son of Toka Temür and grandson of Jochi, or the Seljuk sultan Îzzeddin Keykavus II, who settled in Crimea, married a Mongol woman and obtained an appanage from Berke.
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We know that the existence of the Ancient Greek settlement of Theodosia was intermittent through the Middle Ages, and we also know that whether Greek Kaphas was a single settlement or an umbrella name for the area, before the arrival of the Genoese it had been a rural community rather than an urban one. The archaeological evidence shows that the area did not drop to zero in the Middle Ages, but that it became completely agrarian, and unlike places such as Chersonesos, there was no continuity of urban development. Perhaps, the ancient town was devastated and shrank to a tiny village or group of villages\textsuperscript{286} – there are almost no traces of building activity on the location of the acropolis and only a few pre-Genoese building remains are scattered over the area. There are also several medieval churches in the area, dating from the times of Late Antiquity/Early Middle Ages, and all of them were already located outside the ancient Theodosia. This may mean that the Christians followed the common patterns of building churches outside the city walls on the outskirts of the ancient city (e.g. in Rome); nonetheless, the fact that the population simply abandoned the old acropolis and did not build anything on the site of Theodosia, preferring the area around it, is clear evidence of the fact that the ancient city was sacrificed together with its urban way of life for the sake of a rural and agrarian development.\textsuperscript{287} There must have been a small local Greek population, both \textit{in situ} and in the neighbouring settlements. Most probably, there were some Cumans and Goths alongside the Greek component, and by the 1270s perhaps some Tatars and Armenians.\textsuperscript{288} However, while we do know that, for example, Soldaia was a large and prosperous Greek city, we do not know what the Greek Kaphas of the early thirteenth century was like – a fisherman’s village, an anchorage, or perhaps wasteland bearing the name of former settlement and surrounded by villages.

Neither do we know much about the nature of the initiative of foundation of the Genoese Caffa. We do know that its urban development was a result of the Genoese long-

\textsuperscript{287} The word Theodosia was no longer in use, and the excavations discovered in the pre-Genoese layers only revealed tools for agriculture and fishing, ceramics, some primitive jewellery and ritual objects. Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos knew about Kaphas, but rather about some area than a settlement. Other medieval sources that appeared prior to the thirteenth century do not mention any urban settlement in this area.
\textsuperscript{288} We can speak about some amount of Armenians from the earliest times, since there were the Armenian churches. Unlike the ancient city, the churches survived until the Genoese expansion and afterwards. The document dated August 30, 1315, and called “Certus Ordo de Caffa” confirmed that two Greek and three (two normal and one destroyed) Armenian churches existed since times immemorial, and the lands that they occupied could not be sold in public auction (Lodovico Sauli, \textit{Imposicio Officii Gazariae}, in \textit{Monumenta Historiae Patriae}, vol. 2 (Turin, 1838), col. 407).
distance trade, and we also know that it is initially mentioned in the sources under the general names of *villa*, *locus*, *portus*, and that in around late thirteenth–early fourteenth centuries it acquired the names of *civitas* or even *res publica*. However, was the city founded on a public or a private initiative? Did the Commune of Genoese or maybe one or several *alberghi* decide to build a settlement there? What legal basis did this initiative have – the right of the Commune, or of the group of people, or perhaps a private seigneur on feudal right, since many Italian patrician trading families established in many parts of the Eastern Mediterranean purely feudal system that they never had before in their merchants’ metropolis, becoming dukes, counts, and barons, enjoying the power that they never could have reach in their Italian trading republics? Or did this initiative take the form of a stochastic occupation of a piece of land by the low-ranking newcomers – merchants, artisans, members of mendicant orders, and sailors. Did the latter form an urban Commune following the patterns brought from their motherland and copying the Italian social and political order, but in a more democratic and egalitarian way, being less restricted by the oligarchy of the patricians?

There is no reliable evidence of the existence of any urban, quasi-urban, or proto-urban community, and there is no reliable data on any embryos of an urban settlement in the area of Caffa prior to the arrival of the Genoese. The Italian migrants were the first after a gap of at least six or seven centuries to establish a city on the shores of this bay, and although the local rural population was involved in the process of shaping of this new urban centre from the very first steps in around 1270s, the city of Caffa was imposed on the local rural landscape as a new Genoese urban formation. Caffa as a city, as a community, and as a colony (rather than as a geographical name for the area with some villages) was exclusively Genoese

289 An Il-Khans’ historian Rashid-al-Din Hamadani thought that there was in fact a strong connection between Caffa and the local Tatar urban centre Solkhat, which was situated in the inland. He knew that well in advance before the Genoese colonization (i.e. at least in the mid-thirteenth century) these places were frequented by the Western European and Eastern Muslim merchant importers. Berke Khan, the fifth ruler of the Golden Horde, indeed appreciated the Crimean importance in terms of the opportunities allowed by foreign navigation, whether it was done by the Latins, Greeks of Asia Minor, or merchants of the Mamluk Egypt or Persia. (Рашид ал-Дин, Сборник летописей, ed. B.B. Струве, С.П. Толстов, vol. 2 (Moscow/Leningrad, 1960), 197. В.П. Лебедев, “К нумизматике Крыма золотоордынского периода...” 126-129).

290 As already mentioned, the source data convinces me that although the local population played a big role in the formation of a multicultural environment of Caffa, the initiative of establishing the settlement goes to the Genoese. Furthermore, the Greeks, Armenians, Cumans, Goths, Alans, and Jews from the neighbourhood, interested in trading and craftsmanship, were being incorporated into the Genoese foundation. There is evidence of growing importance of commercial significance of Caffa in the thirteenth century, and there must have been an anchorage visited by the Westerners before the Genoese colonization, but its importance should not been overestimated. At the same time (see above) the settlements in this area, notwithstanding the gradually intensifying trade, were rural in nature.
phenomenon in its essence – it was established as a Commune by the Genoese and it incorporated the local population. What do we mean in fact by this ‘local population’? Most of the pre-Genoese ruins discovered by archaeologists are not far from the centre of Genoese Caffa. Thus the question is whether the Genoese established their settlement on a place where they lived and worked side by side with local people, or - more likely - the local Greek, Armenian, Turkic, etc. population was attracted from the immediate neighbourhood by the Genoese trading urban centre\(^{291}\) that was slowly turning into Caffa?

Perhaps the most realistic assumption is that the Genoese Caffa was initially formed in a relatively stochastic way. This process should not be understood as totally random, but as a lack of state initiative. The merchants from Genoa were spontaneously attracted by the new opportunities offered by the Crimean trade routes. Having established a settlement there, they brought their own Genoese legislation, and reproduced the patterns of the administrative structure of Genoa in one way or another.\(^{292}\) At first, the status of the Genoese Caffa was not defined or regulated by the Genoese metropolis – these settlements on the Black Sea coast only became permanent colonies with all the characteristics of the Genoese administration later on.\(^{293}\) The first steps in this evolutionary process from a temporary settlement housing a Genoese community into a proper Commune are obscure. However, already by 1281 Caffa had an established status, administration, and a Genoese consul.\(^{294}\) Such a rapid transition from a recently and probably stochastically emerging settlement into an administratively framed one is proof that Caffa was neither a private seigneury nor the result of social contract and equal collaboration of the newcomers with local people right from the start. It was a Genoese colony, and it appeared more or less spontaneously thanks to a private, or more correctly, collective initiative probably a combined enterprise of several \textit{alberghi}, which was soon supported and legally framed by the Republic of St. George – the colonists’ Ligurian metropolis.

Besides acquiring a consulate, which is a status that could have been equally given to a modest fondaco, anchorage, or an Italian quarter within a foreign city, Caffa soon grew in

\(^{291}\) Also from the old urban centres of Crimea; population from Chersonesos, Soldaia, etc. was often attracted by the commercial activity of the Genoese.


\(^{294}\) There is a notarial deed drawn in Liguria in 1258 and mentioning a certain Guido from Caffa. Pistarino suggested that it could be evidence of early foundation of the Genoese Caffa (even before the Treaty of Nymphaeum) However, in fact it only means that some Ligurians sailed to the area at that point and one of them could already be a permanent resident of the rural area known as “Kaphas” for centuries.
status towards becoming a city in legal terms. We do not know exactly when Caffa was given the status of a city, but there is indirect evidence that gives us some first indications. Caffa is first mentioned as a civitas in the *Imposicio Officii Gazariae* (1313), and since bishoprics could only be founded in the urban centres that were already legally acknowledged as cities, this is evidence of the moment at which it began to be recognized as one. This recognition was almost immediately followed by the appointment of a bishop, whose name was Geronimo. It is unclear when exactly he was appointed, because in 1316 his name was already mentioned in the Genoese documents (he lived in Caffa and built a church there), in 1317 he participated in a theological dispute in Constantinople and signed himself as the bishop of Caffa, but it was only in 1318 that he was officially appointed by Pope John XXII, and the bull of the same pontiff dated February 1322 states that only the pope could elevate the villa of Caffa into a civitas by giving it a bishop. It would be mistaken, however, to consider these words of the papal bull as anything but a rhetorical exaggeration, since from the point of view of the Genoese government in the metropolis Caffa already had the status of a civitas in 1313. It is clear then, that the Roman curia, taking into account its uneasy relations with the Republic of St George, tried to minimize the role of the Genoa in Crimea and the role of the Genoese in Gazaria and to place itself at the forefront of the city-foundation process. However, we should not be overestimate the significance of the appointment of Fra Geronimo and to see it as a decisive point when a settlement becomes a city; in the same way we should accept that for its metropolis Caffa was a Genoese city and colony as far back as 1313 or even earlier.

The solemn rhetoric of papal curia in the documents saying that Caffa was ‘elevated’ to the status of a city by the appointment of a bishop is in fact nothing else then a common formula used in the curial paperwork. In this sense it means nothing regarding the status of Caffa. Same was said when the Catholic bishopric of Chersonesos was established: “*Eundem locum Cersone de novo in civitatem erigimus, et civitatis vocabulo insignimus, auctoritate apoctolica ordinantes, ut in dicta civitate sub vocabulo beati Clementis fundari et construi debeat ecclesia cathedralis.*” However, Chersonesos had happily existed as a city and a large urban centre for 2,000 years before the Roman pope ‘elevated’ it to the rank of the city.

---

296 Fedalto, *La chiesa latina in Oriente*, vol.1, 442.
without any break in urban continuity. Albeit with a much shorter time span, the same was true for Caffa; it gained the status of a city from its metropolis Genoa before 1313, which was later on confirmed by the creation of a diocese.

At the same time, the bull of 1322, pretending to give to Caffa what the city already legally had, considerably elevated the status of the city in another sense: previously, all the land from China to the Balkans were a single diocese of Khanbalik with a see in modern Beijing, functioning as the diocese for the entire empire of Mongols. However, with the bull of 1322 John XXII transferred all the land from Varna in the West to Saraj in the East and from the Black Sea on the South to Russia in the North under the authority of bishop of Caffa. What we can infer from this is that Caffa was legally elevated to the rank and dignity of a city and that it was acknowledged as such by its Genoese metropolis before 1313 and, as a consequence, became a Roman Catholic diocese before 1318.

In the late thirteenth century, Caffa was mainly, albeit not exclusively, designated on the terminological level as a locus. It is understandable since the Genoese settlement probably developed from an anchorage, which gained increasing commercial importance and due to the shift of trade routes and finally led to the creation of an urban centre. Alternatively to locus Caffa was called on the early stage hosteum (‘port’), and indeed even some later documents prefer in their word use the term applied to Caffa. However, if the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuco in the late thirteenth century, and even some fourteenth-century documents call Caffa locus rather than civitas, in the early fourteenth century the word was generally used according to the new urban status of this Genoese colony. More evidence of the recognition of the legal status of Caffa as an urban centre in a certain sense similar to the Italian city-states is the use of the word Commune (comunis). The Commune was an Italian invention, and in this context both words (civitas and comunis) meant in a legal sense

301 Thus Caffa combined the rule from metropolis and subjection to the authorities of Genoa, which appointed the authorities of Caffa, with a certain measure of autonomy.
302 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, vol.1, No. 585, 611, 615-617, 626, 629, 632, 646, 657, 664, 668, 671, 677, 687, 688, 693, 715, 720, 721, 724. In fact, there were two ports in Caffa – hosteum parvum (presumably, the older one) and hosteum magnum (presumably the newer one respectively), see: Balard, La Romanie génoise, 205.
303 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, vol.1, No. 617, 724, 891.
304 Balbi and Raiteri No. 15. In fact the text says civitas sive locus de Caffa, thus not opposing these two notions to each other.
305 Although the same documents can also call the inhabitants burgenses, which implies an existence of a burg as opposed to the central citadel, and thus an urban status of a settlement.
first of all, if not exclusively, the city and the Commune of the Genoese, who were the only fully-fledged citizens of Caffa. The local Orientals who were assimilated and incorporated into the Genoese city in a subordinate position and who began to live in the respective quarters or outside them constituted indirectly part of the Commune and were perhaps similar to the metics (μέτοικοι) of Ancient Greece, while canluchi of the hinterland (see below) could be compared to the perioeci of Sparta (περίοικοι), subject to the collective seignior – the Genoese Commune of Caffa – by the ties of vassalage, or perhaps better to say, as seigneurial domains. From the outset the Genoese consul in Caffa was a representative of the metropolis in Genoa, the head of the local Genoese community (consul januensium in Caffa), and effectively a supreme ruler of Caffa (consul civitatis Caffae, consul universitatis Caffae) he was also a representative of the collective feudal seignior for the local subjects. The constant inequality in the relations between the Genoese and the Orientals which goes as a leitmotif through the whole history of Genoese Caffa and Genoese Gazaria is per se a persuasive argument to conceive of the Italian foundations in the Black Sea area using the term ‘colonies’ in the sense with which it is applied to other similar phenomena in the early modern history.

Why did Caffa grow from a minor settlement, perhaps not more than a Genoese anchorage surrounded by the local rural population in 1270s, to a large city and the ecclesiastical centre for Catholics in all of South-Eastern and Eastern Europe in the 1320s? First of all, it was thanks to the shifts in the routes of international trade leading to the emergence of the Silk Road, which I will discuss later. Second, the entrepreneurial spirit of the Genoese and commercial techniques that they brought from Italy contributed greatly into the development of trade via this area, and this led to the influx of population and urban development. Third, Caffa as a city and as a commercial centre was a purely Genoese foundation and, unlike much more developed initially city centres of Crimea, it began its development from zero, without being burdened by any previous tradition of urban life or by the local population whose competition could be an obstacle for the Genoese in Chersonesos or Soldaia, but which was completely lacking in Caffa, where the Greeks and other Orientals from the immediate rural surroundings could only play the role of service staff such as artisans etc. That is why the Genoese occupied the ancient acropolis (the territory which

307 The Genoese traded in Soldaia and the city was familiar to them (G. Brătianu, Recherches, No. 4, 6-9), but Soldaia at that point was predominantly Venetian, while Caffa was better situated and not yet occupied by any Western merchants.
was not used by the local population that lived in the nearby villages) and developing a new settlement – a Genoese and Latin Christian bulwark in **extremo Oriente**.308

The Genoese began to set up a colonial administration. The sources (namely, notarial deeds from Pera) first mention Caffa as a regular Genoese settlement having a consul (**dominus consul de Caffa**) in 1281,309 and the first mentioning in chronicles is dated 1289 (Giacomo Doria wrote in his annals that in that year Caffa expedited and sent to Tripoli a galley against the Saracens besieging the Genoese settlement).310 In 1284, there is another mention of the consul of Caffa Luchetto Gambono.311 Thus, already in early 1280s or in fact perhaps earlier Caffa already had administration appointed from Genoa, vested with public power, and surrounded by at least a modest number of functionaries of a second rank (curial scribes etc.). In 1286, Benedetto and Manuel Zaccaria received in Genoa money that they promised to bring to Caffa.312 From 1287, we have plenty of contracts of money exchange mentioning Caffa, and from the same year there are a great many Genoese notarial deeds connected to the grain trade with the colony.313 The sign of the growing significance of Caffa is the fact that already in the 1280s we find first notarial registers composed there. The first curial officer we know by name was Lamberto di Sambuceto, a notary who probably began working in the curia of Caffa in 1287, since the later preserved documents refer to this and the following year. However, the existing deeds drawn by Sambuceto are dated 1289–1290.314 The set of deeds comprise testaments, sales and purchases etc. and provides first serial information on the life of the city; thus this is the first period of the history of Caffa covered by abundant documental sources (and perhaps one of the best documented periods).
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308 Jorga, “Notes et extraites,” *Revue de l’Orient latin* (1897): 128. The text extols Caffa as a part of the body of the Republic of Genoa, highlighting the city’s importance in the whole context of the Genoese possessions; another issue to be underlined is that for those who wrote the text Caffa was a bulwark of “Christianity” in **extremo Oriente**.

309 Brătianu, *Actes des notaires génois de Pera et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle* (1281-1290), (Bucharest, 1927), No. 1, 2, 12, 16, 45, 57, 60, 83, 91-93, 95, 96, 99, 125. Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, 114-118. A certain Angelino and Daniele Guecio were to present to the consul a plea against Raffaele Embriaco. *Actes des notaires génois de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du XIIIe siècle* (1281-1290), ed. Brătianu (Bucharest, 1927), No. XII, 79.


311 ASG, Not. cart. No. 128, f. 86-r-v.

312 ASG, Not. cart. No. 41, ff. 26-r-v, 27r.

313 ASG, Not. cart. No. 9/II, f. 45v; cart. No. 71, ff. 103 r, 119v; cart. No. 74, ff. 145v, 146r, 148v, 149-r-v, 154v, 225r; Not. ign., Busta 4, fragment 55, f. 4r. ASG, Not. cart. No. 74, ff. 145 r-v, 220v.

In the late thirteenth century Caffa seem to have been a small settlement without great fortifications, apart from a fosse mentioned by Grégoras, and a rampart with a palisade. There was only one gate, facing the house of a certain Baaderi. There were a few buildings and a slaughterhouse situated outside the line of the fosse and rampart, next to a mill and a forest. The town was divided in the same way as the metropolis, with contrade based on the principle of ethnicity and religion. Thus, the Genoese lived with other Genoese, other groups mentioned by Sambuceto and almost certainly Armenians, Greeks, Syrians, etc. were also living together. Although with the urban growth the Latins began to settle even in the quarters for the other nations, buying houses there or even sometimes settling down outside the fosse and rampart. It is important to note that the opposite, i.e. Orientals settling down in Latin premises, is documented only once, which reveals the greater relative growth of the Latin population compared to the Oriental population. Some of the houses were clearly more than mere lodgings, and had facilities for trade and storage, as the prices on the houses were quite different, and moreover the notary, Lamberto di Sambuceto, himself mentioned warehouses. The notary also mentioned some of the public buildings: the Franciscan convent of St Francis with an attached hospital of St John and the house of the administration, where the consul lived, situated on the main square. The welfare of the colony was largely dependent on relations with the Khans and their representatives in Solkhat, and the consuls had to consider that, receiving either poor or irregular support from Genoa they were largely obliged to act independently. The Genoese administration had to apply a cunning policy of a trade-off to survive in the world essentially alien to Westerners. Therefore, as any emerging colony, Caffa adopted based on case by case basis such strategies of dealing with the local authorities, which were suitable in its position – and we should remember that it was exactly this astonishing pragmatism, poorly appreciated by the other Latins, that allowed the Genoese to stay in the Orient for so long.

Having said this, we should also take into account that Caffa appeared in a period of difficult international relations. Late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries were a tough period for the Genoese colonies on the East. A new conflict between Genoa and Venice arose in 1296, when a Venetian Ruggiero Morosini plundered the Genoese Galata, which did not have walls according to the treaty with Byzantium. The Genoese fled to Constantinople, and the emperor ordered the arrest all Venetians, thus being drawn against his will into a war on
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the Genoese side. In the same year, the Venetian fleet under the command of G. Soranzo occupied Caffa. In these years of turbulence, Genoa could not provide appropriate support to its Crimean domains; as a result, in 1299 Nogai Khan plundered Caffa and Soldaia. By 1299, however, Genoa and Venice reached the agreement, according to which Genoa remained dominating on the Bosphorus and the Black Sea, having however to rebuild Caffa and Pera devastated during the war, while Venice kept controlling the trade with Alexandria and retained several Mediterranean islands. In fact, for the maritime republics this meant preserving their status quo with some minor changes, while Byzantium had to take part in a war without having any interest in it. Moreover, the treaty made between Venice and Byzantium as of 1285 was finished in 1290 without prolongation; thus even after 1299 the empire was in the state of war with the Venetians (a peace treaty was only signed in 1303, and then a new one, similar to the previous ones – in 1310). The Empire was also weakened by the raids of the Catalans, meaning that the positions of the Genoese as its chief allies were to become even stronger, even notwithstanding some conflicts of these years. The emperor presented the Genoese with a list of their faults and violations, and on March 22, 1308, Opicino Spinola with his council confirmed that the complaints were just and charged Bernabo Spinola to honour the emperor and to re-establish the alliance. This mutual interest is understandable, because Byzantium needed the Genoese a great deal at that point, since a new anti-byzantine league had emerged in the West. This time the author of the plan was Charles de Valois, husband of Catherine de Courtenay, titular heir of the Latin empire. In around 1306 he began trying to put his plans to work, but although he never succeeded, his alliance with Venice made a forthcoming war a matter of defence of its own domains on the Black Sea for Genoa. Moreover, the Byzantine-Venetian relations became extremely strained in this period.

319 Andronikos II tried to resist the Turks plundering Asia Minor and hired in 1303 a Catalan mercenary troop known as “Catalan Company” headed by Roger de Flor. However, after Roger de Flor was killed in 1305 by the Alan mercenaries according to Michael IX order, the Catalans united with the Turks, settled in Kallioupolis, and began plundering and occupying Thrace and other Byzantine lands. Michael IX attempted to displace them, but was betrayed by the tourkopoloi (baptized Turks) during the decisive battle and fled. After the Catalans left in 1308, the Turks began plundering Thrace in their turn. Michael IX tried to fight again and initially had some success. However, during a battle the recruited peasants left the army, which also finally led to a retreat.
321 There was quite a number of Byzantine-Venetian conflicts in the 1310s – 1320s, most of them centred on the issues of taxation, since the politics of the Italian trading maritime republics especially aimed at securing a
Although secure in Constantinople, the positions of the Genoese remained shaky in Crimea, especially after the ravage of 1299. In 1307 or 1308 Tokhtu Khan from Sarai captured all the Genoese merchants he could lay his hands on, confiscated their possessions, and besieged Caffa. According to the Italian chronicles, this was because the Genoese sold Tatar children as slaves. After eight months’ siege, already in 1308, the Genoese and the Greeks had to embark on ships and leave the city, previously putting fire on it. For several years, the Genoese stopped visiting the Black Sea coast and any mention of Caffa disappears from the Genoese documents. However, Crimea attracted the Genoese too much and had to be regained. Tokhtu Khan died in August 9, 1312, and Genoa sent ambassadors to his heir Özbek (1313–1341), who allowed them to return and settle in Crimea.

As the city was destroyed, it was rebuilt without the limitations that previous planning could have imposed. If in the thirteenth century Caffa had a prospective collaboration between the Latin newcomers and the Orientals in shaping the urban layout could work, it no longer applied in fourteenth century Caffa, which was a Genoese colonial foundation imposed to the local Crimean environment not only in its legal and administrative basis, but also in its city landscape. The reconstruction or rather the new construction of Caffa was based on a general plan of urban development provided by a special development office called *Officium Gazariae*, created in 1313 and composed of eight members. The first known *Ordo Caffae*, which was also dealt with many other issues, chiefly commercial and fiscal ones, meant that the city has to be not only rebuilt, but also significantly strengthened and fortified. The instructions which the consul of Caffa received in 1316 implied that he should destroy the previously constructed temporary buildings and sell the land for the houses by auction to individuals, except those reserved for streets, squares, churches (a Franciscan and a Dominican convent, a hospital, two Greek churches, etc.), and public

maximum of fiscal privileges to their subjects, reimbursement of damages and material losses caused to them, entrusting the control over tax collection to the Italians themselves, limiting the violations made by the alien tax-collectors, and unification of the standards of measures and weights used in tax collection. After Andronikos III replaced his father thanks to a revolt, he finally put the economy of Byzantium under the Italian dependence. С. П. Карпов, *Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII - XV вв. Проблемы торговли*, 312.

322 Heyd, vol. 1, 170.
324 Notably, the treaties with Tatars also included an issue of capturing and returning the runaway slaves to both sides. Desimoni, “*Trattato dei genovesi col Khan dei Tartari, 1380,*” *Archivio Storico Italiano* 22 (1887).
325 *Imposicio Officii Gazarie*, col. 406-408.
326 The building of urban walls and towers was finished around 1352.
327 Who were obliged to build their houses on the new land before 1320, while the earlier dispositions gave to the inhabitants even less time.
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The document also mentions that the city was divided into two zones: an intramural town (equal to the old territory of Caffa before 1308) and the city territory outside the walls (presumably limited by Özbek Khan), with different requirements concerning the buildings. Thus, Ordo Caffae revealed an issue essential in our understanding of Caffa – it was established as a city and as a Genoese colony regulated and administered from the metropolis.

The following years brought new unrest to the new Genoese colonies on the East; however, they also brought new opportunities for strengthening the Genoese domination on the Black Sea. In 1318, Andronikos II sided with the Ghibelline league (the Genoese government was then Guelfic), and in 1321 in Byzantium began a civil war between Andronikos II and his grandson, later Andronikos III. The first meant that Byzantium was again drawn into a new conflict on the side of the Ghibelline league. It did not bring any visible benefits to the empire, but instead exhausted it in a useless fight. The civil war between Andronicus II and his grandson, which lasted intermittently for seven years, from April 1321 until May 1328, and destroyed the old emperor’s careful plans for the reconstruction of his state. The discord in the emperor’s family resulted in a series of civil wars, in which the Genoese often played a double game trying to profit from both sides. In 1321 three Genoese provided young Andronikos and his accomplices John Cantacuzenos, Synadenos, and Syrgiannes with the ships to revolt against his grandfather and to leave Constantinople for Christopolis. There the party of young Andronikos began a rebellion. Some of the members of the oligarchy of Pera supported his claims, the leader of the party of Latins friendly to him being Pietro di Pinerolo from the lineage of Montferrat. However difficult the time of the civil wars was for everybody, we can safely say that by that time the Genoese secured to themselves strong positions on the shores of the Black Sea; moreover, playing on both sides, the Genoese were only strengthening the dependence of the Byzantium and their positions in the Empire.

328 Imposicio Officii Gazarie, col. 406-408.
329 While the plots of land inside the city walls had to be sold immediately, the extramural land was given into leasehold with an obligation to construct on it the buildings within the term of two years.
330 In November 1317, the heads of two most prominent Guelfic families in Genoa Carlo Fieschi and Gaspare Grimaldi, deposed the Ghibelline rule with the help of the Pope John XXII and Robert de Naples. T.O. De Negri, Storia di Genova, 438-445.
331 Laiou, Constantinople and the Latins, 284.
333 Cantacuzene, vol. 1, 38-100.
In 1322, the Tatars plundered Soldaia, but this actually boosted the development of Genoese Gazaria rather than slowing it down, since thanks to the decline of Soldaia Caffa finally became the main pivot of the Genoese settlements and acquired a role of the primary commercial centre in Crimea.\textsuperscript{334} A fire in Tana that occurred in 1327\textsuperscript{335} resulted in fact in the same thing (moreover, the Venetian trading station in Tana was formally allowed there only in 1332–1333 by the treaty with Özbeg Khan confirmed by his son Janibeg Khan in 1342).\textsuperscript{336} After the Catholic diocese appeared in Caffa in 1310s, the new dioceses in Vosporo and Chersonesos were established in 1332; around 1340–1343, the Genoese occupied Cembalo (known in Greek as Symbolon), perhaps the most comfortable haven for trading and fishing ships in the whole Crimea. This continuous growth of their domain is a clear sign of the colonial expansion of the Genoese, which already controlled several urban centres in Crimea, as well as their hinterland.

The period of relative stability for Caffa, Crimea, the Genoese, and perhaps the whole Europe finished in the 1340s. We cannot obviously discuss the causes of the crisis of mid-fourteenth century here; we can only state that this crisis heavily inflicted the life in the Black Sea area. Seemingly, nothing presaged any abrupt fall. The Genoese politics and commerce followed the patterns laid in the previous decades, their major concern on the East being the Pontic area.\textsuperscript{337} However, in the 1340s a pandemics of plague began in China, moving westwards within the Mongol states. It soon reached the Golden Horde. At the same time, in 1342, a certain Venetian Andriolo Civrano killed in Tana during a quarrel a Tatar Hogi Omer, which led to a massacre and a flight of the Venetians. Enraged, Janibeg Khan plundered and destroyed Tana in 1343, though the Commune of Venice tried to send him two envoys, Federico Piccamiglio and Enrico di Guasco.\textsuperscript{338} Janibeg went on to besiege Caffa as well, but this time without much success: the city was well fortified, and in February 1344

\begin{flushright}
334 Брун, Материалы для истории Сугдеи (Одесса, 1871), 21-22.
335 A di 15 marzo, a mezo giorno, in la Tana, ad uno canton dela forteza dela Seg(nori)ja ducal, a ladi el bazar, con fortuna da tramontana, uscite fuoco; salto in la terra, poi nella forteza de Zenovesi et bruso quella con tudo il luoco de Venetiani. Quelli de fuora feceno 4 busi nel muro, non possendo quelli di dentro piu tosto reparare. Fugiron quelli che posseno; chi per li muri / callavano le done et fioli. Assai se amazoron, per la pressa del fuoco. Se bruso persone piui di 400. In tre hore tuo se consumo. Era consul per Venetiani S(er) Marco Duodo. Codice Correr 1327 (XVlin), 1441, f. 139r, 139v.
337 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 75.
338 Thiriet, Régestes du Sénat, vol. 1, 46, No. 120; 51, No. 151.
\end{flushright}
the Caffiotes destroyed the Tatars’ siege machines, and Janibeg had to leave the city.\textsuperscript{339} Genoa and Venice were sending ambassadors to Janibeg Khan, first separately, then together in 1345. The khan gave the Venetians permission to come back to Tana in 1347 (which caused a new Genoese-Venetian war), while the Genoese failed in their diplomacy, because Janibeg besieged Caffa again in the 1346.\textsuperscript{340} The crisis in the Black Sea region in 1343–1347 coincided with the bankruptcy of the two primary Italian trading houses, Peruzzi (1343) and Bardi (1346), followed by the bankruptcy of Acciaiuoli, Bonaccorsi, Corsini, Uzzano, and others, which in turn led to the decline of the Italian commerce on the East.\textsuperscript{341} The biggest problems were yet to come.

The Tatar siege of Caffa that began in 1346 occurred when the Black Death, originating in China, reached Italy and Western Europe. The army of Janibeg Khan was besieging the city without much success, and damaged by the plague. Eventually, the Tatars began gathering the bodies of their dead soldiers and catapulting them beyond the city walls. The population of Caffa soon became infected with plague; moreover, by throwing the infected bodies into the sea they infected the water. Finally, either the people, or the rats, or both sailing on the ships heading from Caffa to Constantinople transmitted the plague to the Byzantine capital. From there, the virus arrived in Italy, and from Italy it reached the rest of Europe. I will not dwell on the losses caused by the Black Death in Europe, or on its direct consequences. In our Black Sea context it is perhaps more important to understand, that it was one of the factors leading to the crisis of the second half of the fourteenth century that resulted in a tremendous decline of the Italian long-distance trade on the East and a relative, although temporary, shrinking of the Italian colonization.

In the wake of the Black Death, in 1350 Genoa and Venice engaged into a new war,\textsuperscript{342} because the Genoese ban on the Venetians sailing to Tana, as well as the Genoese raids against the Venetian Negroponte made from Chios.\textsuperscript{343} This war lasted until 1352, and in the


\textsuperscript{340} Thomas, \textit{Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum}, vol. 1 (Venice, 1880), 300-305, 311-313.

\textsuperscript{341} Каппов, “Кризис середины 14 в.,” 230.


\textsuperscript{343} From 1346, the piratic raids from both sides became more frequent. The Genoese of Galata, enraged by the attacks on their ships, banned the grain supply of Constantinople, which resulted in a hunger. Anna of Savoy promised to punish the guilty ones, the main of whom was a certain Focciolati. However, the later conspired
course of the war Venice acquired two allies against Genoa – Byzantium and Aragon. First, King Pedro IV of Aragon and Venice remained neutral with regard to Genoa. The Venetians were waiting for the emperor’s answer, but not having obtained a clear reply they began leaving Constantinople. After that, the Genoese of Galata shot two cannon-balls into Constantinople, after which the emperor made up his mind. Byzantium again engaged into a useless and destructive war, and result was the reconciliation with Genoa in 1352 and a separate peace. The new treaty separated Byzantium from the anti-Genoese coalition, confirmed the Genoese possession of Galata, promised the exemption of taxes, and forbade Greek ships from sailing to Tana. Byzantium acknowledged its non-existing guilt and was obliged to pay reparations. This only led to a further strengthening of the Genoese influence in the empire.

In 1355 Genoa and Venice signed the Treaty of Milan, according to which both sides could not sail to Tana for three years. This, however, was obviously in favour of the Genoese, whose policy here aimed at concentrating all the Black Sea commerce around Caffa, their undoubtful centre and bulwark by that time. The Venetians tried to compensate this loss and approached the Tatar ruler of Crimea Ramadan asking to let them to establish them in Soldaia again. Ramadan refused, allowing them however according to the treaty dated March 2, 1356 to settle in Provato, close to Caffa, possibly on the site of modern Koktebel. This grant was further confirmed by Temür Qutlug, Khan of the Golden Horde (ca. 1370–1399), who additionally allowed Venetians to sail to Soldaia and Calitera. Nevertheless, the Genoese soon finally outplaced their rivals from Crimea. The second half on the fourteenth century was in fact the period when after a war with Venice that confirmed

with Cantacuzenus and opened to him the gates of the city on February 3, 1347. Thus Cantacuzenus gained power over the empire.

344 Balard, A propos de la Bataille du Bosphore L’expédition de Paganino Doria à Constantinople 1351-1352.
345 By that moment Byzantium was considerably weakened by the Black Death and the preceding Civil War of the 1341–1347 between the party of John VI Cantacuzenus on the one hand, and the party of Anna of Savoy, John V Palaeologos, and Alexios Apokaukos on the other hand.
346 The Venetians were, however, not quite reliable allies. Thus, John Cantacuzenus and the admiral Nicolo Pisani had to besiege Galata together, but having received news about the approaching Genoese fleet of 60–70 galleys Pisani fled to Negroponte, leaving the emperor alone.
349 Брун, Материалы для истории Судьи (Одесса, 1871), 22.
351 Брун, Материалы для истории Судьи (Одесса, 1871), 23.
the Genoese domination on the Black Sea a network of separate Genoese settlements began transforming into a *territorial colonial domain with a consistent administration*. The Genoese, who were previously only allowed by the Tatars to settle in several specific places, put all the Crimean Southern and South-Eastern coastal line under their control, appointing consuls and building citadels.\(^{352}\)

Although we could treat the Crimean Southern and South-Eastern coast as a separate geographical entity (as opposed to the Crimean steppe), administratively the Genoese saw all their domains on the Black and Azov Seas as a single entity. Alongside the colonization of Crimea, the Genoese penetrated the coasts of Caucasus,\(^{353}\) to the Azov Sea, and to Asia Minor.\(^{354}\) All in all they controlled around forty settlements and stations, anchorages, citadels, and castles. This expansion to the South-West from Caffa was not only due to the successful military rivalry with Venice on the Black Sea. First, the Genoese were also skilful diplomatically in dealing with the local Tatar, Caucasian, Turkic, and Greek authorities, applying more cunning and more hypocritical strategies. Second, Genoa, commonly known as less politically stable than Venice, appeared to be stronger institutionally and established an administration that formed out of the coastal lands a certain political, economic, and cultural unity that was further known as the ‘Genoese Gazaria.’

The shaping of Gazaria actually began while the position of the Genoese was still quite shaky and required much diplomatic effort with respect to the Tatars. The Genoese tried their best playing off the central Golden Horde Khan’s power against the local Tatar rulers of Solkhat. Thus, they sent a diplomatic mission led by Niccolò di Goano and Raffo Erminio to Janibeg Khan\(^{355}\) who secured them the right to hold the lands they had before until his death in 1357.\(^{356}\) As a result, the Genoese could feel free to continue their territorial expansion, not fearing the Tatars. There were, however, other actors to be afraid of, at least on the long run, namely the Ottomans, whose victories in 1360s–1370s reconciliated Genoa even with Venice that can be seen from the ardent expressions of friendship in the diplomatic correspondence

\(^{352}\) Thus, in 1357 the Genoese launched building of a pivotal fortress in Cembalo, alongside with the foundation of a Catholic diocese there. In the following year, a diocese was also established in Mapa.


\(^{354}\) In Asia Minor, Genoese established a number of settlements (though they can barely be seen as colonies), including trading stations in Trebizond, Erzurum, Sinop, etc., linking them to Tabriz and opening the gate to Persia.

\(^{355}\) Thiriet, *Régestes du Sénat*, vol. 1, 121, No. 476.

between the doges; even though their rivalry soon resumed. Indeed, the Ottomans expanded immensely in Asia Minor, and after the victorious expeditions of Murad I, the Byzantine Empire lost almost all of its territories. However, in the fourteenth century the Ottoman threat could not have prevented the Genoese colonization of Crimea. Besides the benevolence obtained from Janibeg, the general notion of fiscal profitability of the Genoese presence of the Black Sea seems to have appeared in this period in the mind of the Tatar rulers. They kept bothering the Italians, often made raids, but no longer tried to wipe them out entirely. Another possible explanation is that with all the new citadels, fortifications, and garrisons, the Genoese, who controlled a large part of Crimean coastline, were no longer easy game, but an independent political actor in the Black Sea area.

In terms of their territorial expansion, the Genoese colonists benefited from the dynastic wars in the Golden Horde known in Russian chronicles as ‘The Great Tumult’ (Velikaja zamjatnja). With the death of Berdi Beg Khan in 1359, the dissent of succession resulted in a period of fratricidal wars. There were approximately twenty puppet khans in the Golden Horde over a period of twenty years. This period of social unrest and destabilization led Tatars to a series of defeats at the hands of the Russians. The destabilization in the Golden Horde and its disintegration was paralleled by a constant struggle of claimants and minor princes among themselves. It also marked the beginning of a period of spontaneous raids by Tatar troops to the Russian lands in search of slaves. For the Genoese, however, this unrest still led, notwithstanding the problems caused by the raid of the Grand Prince of Lithuania to Crimea in 1363, to a long-expected license of occupation of the new territories and establishing new settlements, which nobody was able to resist. This was indeed a case demonstrating how “most chains of events in the history of European colonialism were not planned, at least not in the form they eventually took, but followed the principle of unintended consequences”. Since in the summer of 1365 Janibeg Khan and Mamai clashed for power, the Genoese took their advantage of the moment and on July 19, 1365, reacting to the insults made by the lord of Solkhat Temür Qutlugh, who tried to block Caffa from the
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358 The state of things between two republics was at that point equal to the one prior to 1343. However, in 1362 the contradictions appeared again, as the Venetian Senate complained the abuses made by the Genoese on the Black Sea. Stella, Annales Genuenses, 158-159.
359 Heyd, Le colonie commerciali degli Italiani in Oriente, 2, 115.
360 By 1373, John V Palaeologos even became a Sultan’s vassal and was obliged to pay tribute and to supply a military contingent to the Ottoman army.
361 On the other hand, these wars destroyed the stability on the routes of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and thus contributed in the general crisis of commerce in the fourteenth century.
362 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 6.
sea, the Genoese occupied Soldaia and all lands known as Gothia, i.e. basically the entire southern coast of Crimea, and began fortifying their new acquisitions. We do not know if they retained all of Gothia throughout the following decade, but we do know that they owned Soldaia with eighteen neighbouring villages (casalia) notwithstanding the interference of Mamai. Now the Genoese possessed the rural hinterland with predominantly Greek Orthodox population, which on the one hand led to facilitation of their commercial activity and, on the other hand, provided Caffa with both agricultural products and incomes from the eighteen villages. Moreover, now the colonizers had at their disposal Crimean forests with the wood essential for ship-building. Last but not least, now the Genoese alone controlled the Crimean routes of trade and could at any time block the access to them to their Venetian rivals. Indeed after the Genoese founded a settlement in Vosporo on the Strait of Kerch they could even jeopardize the entire Venetian trade in fish, caviar, and slaves that went through Tana on the Sea of Azov. Similarly, the Caffiotes could now combat piracy more easily, send galleys to Constantinople to fight with either the Byzantines or the Venetians or both, and resist the fleet of the Empire of Trebizond or the Bulgarian fleet (namely, the one of a Danubian Despotate of Dobruja, also known as Principality of Karvuna). These new acquisitions laid the foundation stones of their colonial domain, which now was territorial, albeit limited to the coastal area. Thus, we can speak of the period of 1360s–1380s as the time of evolution when the Genoese settlements on the Black Sea shores developed into a consolidated colonial domain.

Since 1374 we find in the Caffae massaria mentions of the expenses on the officers and garrisons in Lusta, Partenit, Gorzuvite and Jalite. Although it seems that in 1375 Mamai temporarily won back part of the Soldaia’s hinterland and some lands in Gothia, the city remained in Italian hands. The fortification project of Soldaia was launched, and in fact the inhabitants kept fortifying the city until the Ottoman conquest in 1475. The acquisitions of the Genoese were officially confirmed by the treaties with the Tatars in 1380 and 1381 (see below). The famous War of Chioggia, 1378–1381, which was a new step of rivalry between Genoa and Venice, dragged the Black Sea trade of both republics into an even deeper
crisis;\textsuperscript{366} politically, however, the war did not change the balance on the Black Sea, which remained Genoese \textit{par excellence}. Genoese Gazaria now constituted a political and administrative unity.

Although Soldaia still remained important in the system of long-distance trade, by this time it was Caffa which was a central pivot in the Genoese domains on the Black Sea. As early as the mid-fourteenth century, Caffa became a large and prosperous port, a multinational and multicultural city (the deeds of Niccolò Beltrame, 1343–1344, are among the testimonies for that). \textit{Officium Gazarie} kept caring about the city planning and controlling the growth of the settlement. There was a citadel in the centre of the city. A large consul’s palace (also known as the palace of the Commune of Caffa) was built instead of the old logia and consul’s house. It had an audience room, i.e. public space where consul made his decisions and rendered justice, the private apartments of the consul, his \textit{vicarius}, and notary, a new logia where the officers of Caffa rendered justice, and a terrace where the notary worked, with all these wings forming a rectangular yard inside.\textsuperscript{367} Managing administration and city space was important for the Genoese; however, managing their relations with the local population was not less important. Peaceful coexistence with the local Greeks, Armenians, and Muslims was particularly important for the colonists, who were often under the threat of the Tatar invasion from outside, and thus they tried their best to avoid pressure from inside.\textsuperscript{368} As for the Khan’s subjects, the relations with them were complicated; the relations with the local Christians were better until the 1430s. There were Greek Orthodox and Armenian churches in the city (alongside Catholic ones – the church of Virgin Mary, Franciscan and Dominican churches, a church of St Nicolas, a hospice of St Kosmas and Damian, and others).

In the process of their colonial expansion, which at that point went beyond the urban settlements and spread to the hinterland and the castles of Gothia, the Genoese had rather difficult relations with the Tatars of Solkhat.\textsuperscript{369} Thus, Genoese had to propitiate Mamai, for whom consul gave a solemn reception with generous gifts in 1374,\textsuperscript{370} to secure relatively

\textsuperscript{367} There was also possibly another palace, the ‘new’ one mentioned in the notarial deeds.
\textsuperscript{368} However, the Orientals living in the city received the parcels of land, being obliged to pay a due rent to the Italian administration; in 1387 this rent (\textit{introitus territoriali veterum}) equalled 50,000 aspres and was the second most important source of revenue in the colonial budget after the taxation of slave trade.
\textsuperscript{370} N. Iorga, \textit{Notes et extraits}, 32-33.
good relations for the following years. The interests of Mamai and the Genoese coincided. Both wanted to resist Tokhtamysh Khan and to destroy Chersonesos and the Principality of Theodoro.\textsuperscript{371} In 1380, the Russian prince Dmitry Donskoy defeated Mamai in the battle of Kulikovo.\textsuperscript{372} After that, Mamai is believed to have sought asylum in Caffa; however, he was finally killed there in 1381, probably by his Genoese ‘best friends’ who wanted to please the new masters of the Golden Horde.\textsuperscript{373} In any case, his murder did not ruin relations. Mamai’s death must have taken place between March and November, 1381, as the Tatar embassy of Ayna and Coia Berdi that came to Caffa in March was send by the Khan and Mamai, while in November the Genoese Corrado de Guasco and Cristoforo della Croce were sent only to the Khan, charged with the gifts (mainly cloth) and accompanied by sixteen men and two interpreters.\textsuperscript{374} The lord of Solkhat, Haji Mouhammed, was also receiving the gift from consul and had his son invited to a dinner in Caffa; Eliasbey, a new lord of Solkhat since 1381, was invited for a solemn reception to Caffa himself, received numerous gifts (cloth and Greek wine), and took part in a Christmas dinner with the consul where fine dishes were served: chicken, geese, meat, rice, bread, fruit, bread, and the wines of Trillia and Malvoisie.\textsuperscript{375} These are the few facts that we know. What we can infer is an elaborated diplomatic strategy behind the gifts, bribes, and solemn visits that allowed the Genoese to occupy virtually all Southern and South-Eastern Crimea in the second half of the fourteenth century without much of resistance from the Tatars.

The results were soon evident. The treaties of the 1380 and 1381 officially recognized the Genoese possessions in Crimea.\textsuperscript{376} The treaty between the Genoese and the lord of Solkhat Iharchass (\textit{Iharchass dominus Sorchati}) dated 28 November 1380 mentioned Gothia with all its population and the eighteen \textit{casalia} around Soldaia,\textsuperscript{377} that were occupied by the

\textsuperscript{371} Х.-Ф. Байер, \textit{История крымских готов}, 192.
\textsuperscript{372} A widespread myth still existing in Russian historiography about the presence of the Genoese military contingent in the Tatar army in the battle of Kulikovo has no grounds. It derives from certain Russian chronicles, the authors of which could be aware of “friendship” between Mamai and the Caffiotes. However, Caffae Massaria meticulously registered all military expenses, and there is not a single trace of sending military troops with the Tatars there.
\textsuperscript{373} Marian Małowist, \textit{Tamerlan i jego czasy} (Warsaw: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1991), 51.
\textsuperscript{374} B. Spuler, \textit{Die Goldene Horde}, 126-127. His body was given for burial to the community of Solkhat.
\textsuperscript{375} ASG, MC 1381, f. 3r, f. 242v.
\textsuperscript{376} ASG, MC 1374, ff. 6v, 7v, 8r-v, 56r; MC 1381, ff. 63r-v, 64r, 65v, 66v, 67v.
Genoese, but later on taken back by Mamai, and then returned to the Genoese. The following treaty dated February 23, 1381 with a new lord of Solkhat Eliasbey, son of Cotloboga, confirmed the previous one, stating clearly that the eighteen casalia and Gothia should be restored to the Genoese. However, while 1380 document states that the population of these lands was Christian, the 1381 document omits this detail;\(^{379}\) neither it is mentioned in an additional agreement dated 1382/83.\(^{380}\) Effectively, this meant that all coastal area between Caffa and Cembalo, all the Southern and South-Eastern coast of Crimea with all its settlements and population, was officially recognized as a domain of the Genoese.\(^{381}\)

Caffa paid several taxes to the Tatars (see below), and we know that the Tatar tax-collectors (comerciarii) are already present in the city in 1289–1290.\(^{382}\) Furthermore, in order to propitiate the Tatar authorities and to demonstrate the splendour of the Commune of which the consul was the representative, the officers of Caffa had to occasionally arrange solemn receptions for the Tatar khans and their ambassadors, and to send them gifts.\(^{383}\) (Apart from the ambassadors of the khans of the Golden Horde and the rulers of Solkhat,\(^{384}\) and later on – independent Crimean khans, the consul had to do the same for the ambassadors of the rulers of Sinope and other Muslim emirs of Asia Minor, as well as for the rulers of Caucasus and Zikhia). The annual gifts to the Tatar authorities amounted to 400–600 sommo (i.e. 2,000-3,000 golden ducats). In 1374–1375, Caffa had to spend 39,600 aspres for a reception of two ambassadors – one from Sarai, another from Savastopoli, and in 1381–1382 the Genoese themselves sent two ambassadors to Sarai (costing 78,000 aspres) and made a reception for the ruler of Solkhat Eliasbey (costing 6,700 aspres). After the war of 1386–1387, a new peace treaty\(^{385}\) declared in vague terms that the Caffiotes were under the khan’s jurisdiction and confirmed their ownership of the casaliae of Gothia.\(^{386}\) The representative of the ruler of Solkhat was called a tudun (titanus canluchorum in Latin),\(^{387}\) a Tatar officer responsible for


\(^{381}\) Л. В. Фирсов, *Исаары: Очерки истории средневековых крепостей Южного берега Крыма* (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1990), 54.

\(^{382}\) M. Balard, *Gênes et l’Outre-Mer*, No. 95. 190, 213, 231, 252, 459.

\(^{383}\) N. Iorga, *Notes et extraits*, 32-34.


\(^{385}\) ASG, Materie politiche, Busta 10/25. S. de Sacy, Pièces diplomatiques, 62-64.

\(^{386}\) S. de Sacy, Pièces diplomatiques, 57. C. Desimoni, Trattato dei Genovesi, 163.

\(^{387}\) A Turkic word tudun was transformed in this way. В.Д. Смирнов, *Крымское ханство под верховенством Отоманской Порты до начала XVIII в.* (St. Petersburg, 1887), 38. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, vol. 2, 371.
the khan’s subjects (canluchi) in the Genoese domains. We do not know how long tudun really executed judiciary functions; however, by 1449 (and perhaps long before), all Tatars living in Caffa or in its hinterland were already subject to the jurisdiction of the Genoese consul and not the one of titanus.388 Even before that, however, his role was comparable to the one of the Italian consuls in the large cities such as Constantinople, as well as the urban centres of Asia Minor and Syria – a representative of a foreign power and community having limited authority. There was also vicarius canluchorum or commerciarius canluchorum, who raised the tax called itself canluchum,389 a tribute to the khan in recognition of his sovereignty390 (although in times of Tatar weakness the Genoese often did not pay it). Moreover, the commercial fees (commercium) collected by the Golden Horde from Italian trading colonies were fixed at 3% of the value of the merchandise (later raised to Venice to 5%)391 – the treaty of 1380 specified that it would not be raised and would be collected as before (segundo le premere usansse). The treaty of 1381 gave the Genoese a privilege to agriculture, animal husbandry, and commerce throughout the Golden Horde.392 Thus, using diplomacy in relations with the Tatar khans, taking full advantage of their internal discords and external wars, playing on the contradictions, and applying money where force was inapplicable, the Genoese managed to become true masters of all Southern and South-Eastern coastal Crimea, only formally recognized the rights of the Tatar rulers of Crimea. In fact, from the fourteenth century on, Genoa had suzerainty in Gazaria, which can be seen from the taxation rights system, judicial liability, and many other sovereign rights, which were fervently defended by the Genoese from both Venetian and Tatar encroachments.393

---

388 Ed. A. Vigna, ASLSP, fasc. 2, 650.
The period 1385–1386 marked a new stage of rivalry between Genoa and Venice, thus Genoa had to strengthen its diplomatic positions intensifying the contacts with its ally, the Hungarian king.\textsuperscript{394} and with the son of Dobrotitch, the young despot of Dobruja Juanco, with whom it arranged a treaty in May 1387.\textsuperscript{395} Another important point in Genoese diplomacy, this time more locally oriented, was an agreement with the lord of Zikhia Teortobogha, who controlled the Strait of Kerch (the importance of this act was twofold: to gain free access to the Sea of Azov and to obtain a source of grain supplies for Caffa, that could now be purchased in Zikhia).\textsuperscript{396} However, a new unrest emerged in Crimea. There was a new war with the Tatars of Solkhat in 1386, but this did not undermine the positions of the Genoese who had the final victory. The war coincided with an insurgence of the canluchi;\textsuperscript{397} these were people formally subject to the Khan and living in the Genoese territory under the protection of a special official called a tudun, or titanus canluchorum in Latin, see above. Despite the fact that they benefited economically from the presence of the Genoese in Crimea and from Italian trade, the local people initiated a series of revolts in the late fourteenth century. The Orientals probably rebelled against Genoese taxation and other economic and military obligations imposed on them. Moreover, the local people could not take part in the administration on their own land. Thus, we can conclude that the anti-Genoese revolts in Gazaria can be likened to the anticolonial rebellions. This said, we have to acknowledge that the rebellion of 1386–1387 did not make much of a dent in the Genoese domination and was soon suppressed. In 1386 the consul of Caffa ordered the confiscation of all the possessions of the local population who sided with the Tatars, or who did not want to loan money; as a consequence those who fled to Solkhat were also proclaimed rebels.\textsuperscript{398}

In historiography these events of the war of 1386–1387 are referred to as ‘the War of Solkhat’ (bellum di Sorcati) in the Massaria Caffae and thanks to Enrico Basso,\textsuperscript{399} who considered it a war between the Genoese and Tokhtamysh. The war did not last long and on June 17, 1387, the Genoese set off fireworks in Caffa celebrating their victory.\textsuperscript{400} The formal end to the conflict was made with a treaty between Genoa and Tokhtamysh stipulated on August 12, 1387 and signed by the ambassadors Giannone Bosco and Gentile Grimaldi from
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the Genoese part and Cotloboga and daroga Boya-bey from the Tatar part, following a previous mutual exchange of the hostages for the sake of guarantee.401

What is interesting about the war of 1386–1387 is that for the Genoese it was offensive rather than defensive: they were attacked by the Tatars of Solkhat only once in May 1387, they repelled the attack with ease, and on 15 May 1387 the Genoese authorities celebrated the victory in Caffa, distributing two barrels of wine and setting off fireworks.402 What is more interesting is that it looks as if Tokhtamysh, the Khan of the Golden Horde, acted as a friend of the Genoese rather than as their enemy in war. Thus, in October 1386 a Khan’s envoy came to Caffa, and soon two Genoese secretly met the Khan’s men on the city’s outskirts. In December 1386 a Genoese Giannisio Gentile was send to the Golden Horde; in April 1387 another Khan’s envoy Satoni arrived to see the consul of Caffa; in July 1387 an official Khan’s ambassador with his suite arrived. The Khan’s envoys receive very generous gifts.403 At the same time, the Tatar merchants were kept in prison in Caffa, and their property, including real estate, was auctioned,404 but this does not seem to have bothered the Khan at all.

What is even more surprising is that the commander of the Genoese troops attacking Solkhat was one of the lords of Solkhat and a senior officer of the Khan called Cotloboga (Cotolboga bey, dominus Solcatensis et brachii recti Imperii Gazarie).405 Thus, first of all, it was not the war between the Genoese and the Khan, and, second, this war overlapped with an internal conflict in the Golden Horde, where the Genoese took one side and became a factor in the Tatar politics (otherwise one cannot explain why the Tatar lord besieged his own Tatar city together with the Genoese).

It was Ponomarev who found the explanation.406 He rejected the idea that ‘the War of Solkhat’ was a war between the Genoese and Tokhtamysh. In fact, massariae of Caffa mention in this period yet another Khan (imperator) – Beck Bulat with his two oglans.407
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401 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 92v, 93r, 94r, 97v, 99r, 99v. See also the text of the treaty: S. de Sacy, Pièces diplomatiques, 62-64.
402 ASG, MC 1386, f. 95v, 99v.
403 MC 1386. Fol. 93r.
404 MC 1386. Fol. 332v.
405 MC 1386. Fol. 98r. Cotloboga was mentioned as a ruler of Solkhat as early as in 1381. ASG, SG, Sala 34, 1226. MC 1381. Fol. 67v. Cotloboga was also receiving exenia prior to the time of his embassy. ASG,SG,34.1226bis. MC 1386. Fol. 97v.
407 MC 1386. Fol. 312r.
Apparently, Beck Bulat, who belonged to the dynasty of the Genghisids, could theoretically be a Khan, and therefore rebelled against Tokhtamysh (in our case, in 1386–1387 for the first time; later on he repeated his attempt in 1391–1392), being supported by the local Crimean beys. At the start of his rebellion in 1386, the Genoese preferred to side with the rebel Beck Bulat, who was situated near their own walls, rather than with Tokhtamysh, who was far away. Later on, when Tokhtamysh took over, the Genoese sided with him, thus minimizing the risks in both cases. Why is this story important for us? First, the treaty of 1387, alongside the earlier two treaties, was a landmark in the history of the Genoese colonies, since it finally established Genoese Gazaria as a territorial and administrative unit of a single colonial domain. Second, there is the fact that the Genoese not only played a mean, but very pragmatic political and diplomatic game with the Tatars, and could also frequently interfere in the politics of the Khans, being themselves kingmakers, or to be more precise, khan-makers alongside the Crimean beys.

But new problems were about to emerge. First of all, the Ottoman expansion in the Eastern Mediterranean, threatened the Latin presence there. The Ottomans were rapidly becoming the leading power in Asia Minor and the Balkans, thus threatening Byzantium and afflicting both the Black Sea region and the Italian trading networks. In 1394–1402, Sultan Bayezid I was besieging Constantinople. After the case of the Crusade of Nicopolis failed with a defeat in 1396, the Sultan tried to assault the Byzantine capital in 1397 and invaded the Despotate of Morea. Around 1399, Manuel II Palaeologos left his nephew to rule the besieged Constantinople and undertook a tour visiting the major European courts including England, France, the Holy Roman Empire, and Aragon in seek of help against the Ottomans. Then the invasion of Tamerlane changed the balance in international relations. On the one hand, Tamerlane’s armies devastated Crimea and Caucasus, and in 1395 plundered Tana. On the other hand, in 1402 Tamerlane defeated Bayezid I in the battle of Ankara, reducing involuntarily the Ottoman threat, saving Constantinople, postponing the end of the Byzantine Empire, and securing the Italians another several decades of free passage through the Bosphorus. Alongside the temporary weakness of the Ottomans, the ideas of a pan-Christian
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409 Daru, Histoire de la République de Venise, vol. 2 (Paris, 1821), 196-197. 1390s were also a turbulent period for Crimea: in 1397, the Grand Prince of Lithuanian Vytautas invaded Crimea reaching Caffa, plundered Kyrk-Or, and attacked Chersonesos; in 1399, Chersonesos was demolished by Edigu.
league and a crusade begin to re-emerge. Venice was eager to defend Constantinople and even the Genoese-owned Pera;\textsuperscript{410} Genoa itself, having fallen under the King of France in 1397,\textsuperscript{411} took a more decisive anti-Ottoman approach. Yet it was not before 1440s that the West organized a new (and unsuccessful) crusade to come to the assistance of a dying Byzantium.

To sum up, what can we say about Genoese colonial strategies? On the large scale, the three main tools of Genoese colonial policy were obtaining concessions and privileges from the sovereigns, the commercial conquest of the markets, and military conquest. Thanks to these three tools the Genoese created their Black Sea colonial empire.\textsuperscript{412} The Genoese managed to establish themselves on the Black Sea, put the commerce in the region under their control, enlarged their settlements, occupied new territories, expanded into the hinterland, defended their acquisitions in struggle both with Venice and with the Tatars, secured the rights of possession of their domain, and made it a unified administrative establishment. In so doing, besides controlling the Silk Route and gaining access to trade with Central and Eastern Asia, they also gained access to the Black Sea region’s granaries. These had been important for the Mediterranean since antiquity. In the course of fifty years, Caffa found its place in the Tatar world. Genoese Gazaria was no longer a network of several settlements disseminated along the shores of the Black Sea and largely dependent on the benevolence of the local authorities and on random accidents, as was the case in the early and mid-fourteenth century. Thanks to elaborate diplomacy and cunning in dealing with the masters of Crimea, that is, the Tatars of Solkhat and eventually the Golden Horde Khans, as well as other authorities of the Black Sea, Genoa created a colonial empire on the shores of the Black Sea with its core on the coastal part of Southern and South-Eastern Crimea, comprising lands previously known as Gothia. This colony, that is, Gazaria with its centre in Caffa, became a mighty power in the region, often dictating its own terms and conditions rather than accepting those of the Tatars.

What was the role of Caffa in the Genoese colonial enterprise? As I have mentioned, it was the commercial, political, administrative, and cultural centre for Genoese Gazaria. In the fourteenth century, it became a major Crimean urban centre with most of the classical features of a medieval city: a high concentration of non-rural population in a limited area,

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{410}{Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise }, 99.}
\footnotetext{411}{De Bouard, \textit{La France et l’Italie au temps du grand Schisme d’Occident} (Paris, 1936), 159-208.}
\footnotetext{412}{Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise }, 105.}
\end{footnotes}
oriented towards trade and craftsmanship rather than agriculture, concentration of trade and artisanship (normally organized within the framework of guilds), political and economic autonomy, its own budget, own economic policy and tax regulations, the presence of a legislature and institutes of justice and executive power, urban law independent of any external authorities and enforced in the city and its hinterland, legal equality of the citizens, a distinctive urban notion of civic freedom, market regulations and regulations on weights and measures, a feudal model of relations with the hinterland where the city acts as a collective seignior, the presence of a citadel and the walls around the burg, a garrison and often a militia made of citizens, organization of religious and cultural life of the community, codified law, curia, and notarial culture.\textsuperscript{413} We can add the means of storing documents, \textit{memorizing the history} of the urban community, and the role of archives; Caffa had its own, besides the copies of the documents constantly sent to Genoa.

This said, we should understand that the period of growth of the political power and significance of Caffa overlapped with the times of the commercial crisis of the mid and late fourteenth century. Black Death, the crisis of the Italian banking houses, the decline and decentralization of the Mongol states, internal struggles, Tamerlane’s invasion, the wars between Genoa and Venice, conflicts with Byzantium, and the Ottoman threat made the key trade routes less safe, and large-scale long-distance trade with Central and Eastern Asia that generated the Italian colonies in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries ever less profitable. At the same time, the circulation of goods within the Black Sea area and the export of regional goods to the Mediterranean and Europe were becoming more important, playing indirectly in favour of an autonomization of the Italian colonies.

Speaking about the formative period of the Genoese Black Sea colonies that lasted until 1380s, we cannot but mention some important – and indeed more global – questions that rise from what was written above. Was not the Genoese colonization of the Black Sea the \textit{first} European and perhaps world experience of the phenomenon of late medieval – early modern colonization?\textsuperscript{414} Did not the Italian colonial experience that was acquired in the

\textsuperscript{413} Vor- und Frühformen der Europäischen Stadt im Mittelalter, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1974), 305-322.
\textsuperscript{414} On the terminological level perhaps the first ones to call the settlements of the Genoese “colonies” were the Byzantine intellectuals (e.g. Nicephorus Gregoras), see: Baratier, “L’activité des occidentaux en Orient au moyen âge,” in Sociétés et compagnies de commerce en Orient et dans l’Océan Indien: Actes du 8e Colloque internationale d’histoire maritime (Paris, 1970), 336. However, we obviously should not overestimate the importance this fact, since the notion of ‘colony’ for Gregoras was essentially different from the one shaped in the late medieval and early modern times by the European experience of overseas colonization.
Mediterranean\textsuperscript{415} explode first in the Atlantic, and then on the global scale? Who was first to colonise chronologically, and was there a continuity between the Medieval Italian colonization and early modern Atlantic colonialism? Genoese Gazaria was obviously shaped as an overseas colony administered from the metropolis, although enjoying certain degree of autonomy, even before the Castilians begin their expansion on the Canary Islands and before the Portuguese began sailing to West Africa and discovered the Azores, not to mention that it was over a century before the discovery of the New World.

The Mediterranean colonial experience undoubtedly preceded and influenced the Atlantic one. The Genoese possessions in Crimea and on the shores of the Black Sea were not the first overseas colonies ruled from a metropolis. Here, the Republic of St Marco had come before the Republic of St George. Venice left Genoa behind chronologically, establishing its territorial colonial domains. If we take 1380–1381 as a point of final shaping of Genoese Gazaria as a colony, we will see that it happened long after the Venetian \textit{Stato da Màr} came into existence. ‘Venice laid the foundations of its centralized maritime empire in 1207, when it began the conquest of Crete and occupied Coron and Modon, two ports in the South-Western Peloponnesus.’\textsuperscript{416} Genoese Gazaria was shaped as an overseas colony after Venetian Crete (1204),\textsuperscript{417} Cythera (1207),\textsuperscript{418} and the Venetian Istria (1267),\textsuperscript{419} although before the majority of the Venetian overseas domains such as Corfu (1386),\textsuperscript{420} Euboea/Negroponte (1390),\textsuperscript{421} Duchy of the Archipelago (1418),\textsuperscript{422} Dalmatia (1420),\textsuperscript{423} Albania (1420),\textsuperscript{424} Cyprus

\textsuperscript{415} In its broad meaning, comprising the Black and Azov Seas.
\textsuperscript{417} Crete was initially given in 1204 to Boniface of Montferrat; he was, however, unable to enforce control over the island, and sold his rights to Venice. Venetians first occupied the island in 1205, but firmly established there against the opposition of Genoa only by 1212. After 1453, Crete became an asylum for the refugees from Constantinople. During 1645–1669, Crete was conquered step by step by the Ottomans.
\textsuperscript{418} After 1204, Cythera became Venetian, and constituted with Anticythera part of the \textit{Stato da Mar} in 1363. The Venetian rule was shortly interrupted by the Ottomans in 1715–1718, but continued afterwards until 1797.
\textsuperscript{419} The coastal areas and cities of Istria came under the Venetian control in the ninth century. However, Parenzo was formally incorporated into the Venetian state only on February 15, 1267, being followed soon by the other coastal towns.
\textsuperscript{420} Following 1204 and \textit{Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae}, Corfu came under Venetian rule, but did not remain there for long. In 1207 doge Pietro Ziani conferred it as a feudum to ten Venetian nobles, provided that they demonstrate loyalty and devotion and that they pay taxes. Around 1204, Corfu became part of the Despotate of Epirus. In 1257, it was conquered by Manfred of Sicily, who put his admiral Philippe Chinard in charge of his eastern domains. With the defeat of Manfred at Benevento and the Treaty of Viterbo (27 May 1267), Corfu passed to the Kingdom of Naples. On 13 February 1386, Corfu once again became Venetian, this time – until the end of the Republic.
\textsuperscript{421} After 1204, Negroponte became a triarchy composed of three feudal baronies owned by Lombard families. It was, only around 1390 that Venice established complete predominance over the island, retaining formally the triarchy of terzieri, but appointing the Venetian podestà residing at Chalkis. During the Ottoman–Venetian War of 1463–1479, Mehmed II attacked Chalkis, and Venice lost the island in 1470.
Cephalonia, Zante and Ithaca (1485, 1500, 1503), Lefkada (1502), and Morea (1684). However, being second chronologically, it was the Genoese colonial experience that shaped the models of colonization used by Portugal and to some extent even by England, France, and the Netherlands before the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries. I will try to explain this in a separate argument.

Coming back to all these questions at the end of this study, but looking at the Genoese Black Sea colonies from 1380s onwards, which I discuss in the following chapters, we should keep these questions in mind. Summarizing this chapter we should mention again that the Genoese penetrated to the Black Sea area due to the shift of the trade routes, which made this area a key to the Silk Route, an important road running through the vast space created by the Pax Mongolica, arguably constituting an early form of Eurasian proto-globalization, enhancing the levels of cultural exchange and bringing together people, goods, knowledge, and technologies. The newcomers found Crimea to be strikingly similar to their native Liguria, a naturally limited narrow strip of Crimean Riviera offering excellent conditions for navigation. Moreover, since Crimea was a crossroads of cultures, they naturally faced a complex world of mixed and entangled identities. The Genoese colonies on the Black Sea originated as a network of small settlements and trading stations. Caffa was the most important among them and already became a city (civitas) in the early fourteenth century. Thanks to the favourable conditions of commerce and the establishment of the Pax
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422 The Duchy of the Archipelago came under the Venetian rule only in 1418.
423 Ladislaus of Naples sold his rights on Dalmatia to the Venetian Republic for 100,000 ducats. Venice gained control over all Dalmatia by 1420, and retained it until 1797.
424 Venetian possessions appeared in 1420, comprising the littoral area of northern Albania and the coast of Montenegro, from Ragusa to Durrës, and around twenty km deep into the peninsula. In 1573 it shrunk because of the Ottoman conquest, but remained Venetian until 1797.
425 Cyprus was initially rather the last of the Crusaders’ kingdoms than an overseas colony of any metropolis. Only following the death in 1473 of James II, the last Lusignan king, Venice assumed control of the island, while the late king’s widow, Queen Catherine Cornaro (a Venetian by origin), reigned as figurehead. Venice annexed Cyprus in 1489, following the abdication of Caterina, and owned it until the Ottomans invaded it, took Nicosia in 1570, and the last Venetian bulwark Famagusta in 1571; the peace treaty was signed in 1573.
426 These three islands were not initially colonies of the Republic, but the feudal possessions of three families, two of them of Venetian origin: the Orsini family, the House of Anjou and the Tocco family. In 1479, the Latin rule was interrupted by the Ottomans, who were however driven out soon by the Venetians. Zante became Venetian in 1485, Cephalonia in 1500, and Ithaca in 1503.
427 As part of the Despotate of Epirus since 1205 Lefkada became a part of the County of Cephalonia ruled by Leonardo I Tocco in 1362. As well as other central Ionian Islands, Lefkada was captured by the Ottomans in 1479 and then by the Venetians in 1502, but, unlike the other islands, it was returned to the Ottoman Empire in 1503, and the Venetian admiral Francesco Morosini reconquered it only in 1684 during the Morean War, and the island officially became Venetian according to the Treaty of Passarowitz (1718).
428 Despite Venice owned Coron and Modono on Peloponnese, Morea never constituted a Venetian territorial colony before it was conquered by Francesco Morosini during the Morean War of 1684–99. Venetian rule was unpopular, and the Ottomans recaptured the Morea in 1714.
Mongolica, the Genoese merchants connected Western Europe and Eastern Asia. Their Italian-modelled urban communities were placed in generally hostile surroundings. The settlements were under constant pressure from outside, which meant that the colonizers and their authorities had to master the skills of negotiation. However, due to the political events of the fourteenth century, as well as to their own cunning diplomatic strategies, the Genoese strengthened their positions both in the Byzantine Empire and in the Black Sea region. Their trading stations, starting with Caffa, evolved into big cities of great commercial importance, and multicultural cosmopolitan centres in the frontier lands on the periphery of the Western world. Benefiting from the dynastic dissent and wars in the Golden Horde, in 1365 the Genoese occupied the entire Southern and South-Eastern coast of Crimea, which laid foundations for the Genoese colonial empire of Gazaria as a consolidated territorial, political, and administrative unity. This state of things was confirmed officially in the treaties with the Tatar authorities in 1380 and 1381. Now the Genoese controlled both the cities and the hinterland, which implied the exploitation of the local rural population or canluchi. The latter rebelled against Genoese domination and, primarily, against the policy of taxation and other burdens, but with no success. Conquering the markets as well as lands and using the tools of diplomacy and obtaining concessions and privileges from the monarchs in the region, the Genoese created their Black Sea colonial empire. In the course of the fourteenth century, their settlements evolved into a true colonial empire thanks to the urban growth determined by their commercial activity, cunning diplomatic strategies, privileges obtained in the neighbouring states, and the unrest in the Golden Horde and its disintegration. Genoese Gazaria was taking shape in the tumultuous time of the crisis of the second half of the fourteenth century, and the need to react swiftly to the impending threats stimulated a significant role for private initiative in managing the colonies. To sum up, Caffa and other Genoese colonies subordinate to it entered the fifteenth century as a colonial domain of the Republic of St. George encompassing several prosperous, active, entangled, and multicultural urban communities. This was one of the first successful experiences in the history of late medieval and early modern Western colonialism.
An unknown mediaeval Genoese writer said of his compatriots: “So many are the Genoese, and so widely scattered through the world, that wherever they make their home, they build themselves another Genoa.” This point has been discussed many times by different authors. Just like other more recent colonizing nations the Genoese tried to reproduce their mother-city, their metropolis, in the colonies. Well before New England, Nouvelle-France, and Nueva España, as well as before New Amsterdam/New York the Genoese colonists were establishing *atra Zenoa* in the places they colonised. Crimea was a particularly suitable place for from the climatic and spatial perspective: the landscape of the Southern coast of Crimea particularly resembles the one of the Ligurian Riviera – a relatively narrow strip of hilly coastal land, framed by the mountains on one side and the sea on the other, mild maritime Mediterranean climate, and weather conditions highly favouring navigation. The first thing that the eyes of a Genoese arriving in Crimea saw was the similarity of the land to that of his motherland so that the idea of a ‘New Genoa’ would naturally arise in his mind.

The *atra Zenoa* was not just for the sake of the natural and climatic similarities. Consciously or unconsciously the Genoese set up this ‘New Genoa’ in Crimea. Genoese family clans (*alberghi*) that organized the urban space of Genoa probably had a projection in Caffa. The urban landscape, the walls of the citadel and the burgs, the churches, monuments, and houses all resembled Genoa. Nonetheless, her metropolis was an essentially Latin Christian European city, and Caffa was more than just a colony – it was a cosmopolitan multicultural urban centre, so that alongside the Genoese influence in its layout we also find the influence of the local population. Caffa was a Genoese colony, but it was also a city
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429 Anonimo genovese, Rime CXXXVIII, 195-98. F.L. Mannucci, *L’anonimo genovese la sua raccolta di rime* (Genoa, 1904), 566. Michel Balard used this piece of poetry as an epigraph to one of the chapters of his “La Romanie génoise,” and I could not resist the temptation to do the same here; indeed, no words characterize the layout of Caffa and Gazaria better than his.

comprising a great deal of the non-Western population. It was a city of Genoese, but also of
the Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Tatars, etc. The first thing that a visitor could notice in Caffa
was its multiculturality:

The spires of Christian churches (both Orthodox and Catholic) rose beside the
minarets and domes of Moslem mosques and Jewish synagogues; and Franciscan
and Dominican missionaries mingled in the streets with Armenian popes and
Jewish rabbis. And here – from the caravans which had arrived from the Far East,
from the neighboring markets of Solgat, the Tartar capital, and from the
surrounding rich fields of the Crimea - came as rich a variety of trade as the world
has ever seen. Here European and Levantine traders sold Grecian wines and
Ligurian figs, and the linen and woollen stuffs of Champagne and Lombardy, and
purchased precious silks from China, carpets from Bokhara and Samarkand, furs
from the Ural Mountains and Indian spices, as well as the produce of the rich
black fields and forests of the Crimea.431

While it is correct to call the Genoese overseas colonies atra Zenoa, we should keep in mind
that the Genoese coming there faced a different reality than the one at home and this
multicultural world mingled people, nations, and traditions, and in the end of the day we
should put forward another concept (introduced by Balard), more important for us than the
one of atra Zenoa, i.e. the concept of a mixed Latin-Oriental culture. The mixed character of
the landscape of Caffa was noticed by many travellers in Genoese period, the Ottoman
period, and even afterwards when Crimea came under Russian rule.432

In fact there it is no surprise that the colony’s townscape and the organization of urban
space copies the metropolis in many respects, since this is a typical feature of colonialism. It
may be more interesting to examine the layout of the Genoese Gazaria from another
perspective: how did the urban and rural landscape of colonies, their physical conditions,
topography and material culture change under the influence of cultural interaction between
newcomers and local people? How can we interpret Gazaria in spatial terms, given that space
is a crucial factor in the formation and development of towns and villages? What can we
grasp from the sources dealing with Genoese settlement morphology and planning? How did
the population of Gazaria, both Latins and Orientals, build relations between them and the

431 I. Origo, Domestic Enemy: The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, 326.
de Peyssonel, Traite sur le commerce de la Mer Noir: Ouvrage commence en Crimée en 1753 et acheve en
Crête en 1762 (Paris, 1787). P. S. Pallas, Voyages entrepris dans les gouvernements méridionaux de l’Empire
de Russie dans les années 1793 et 1794 (Paris, 1805). Naranzi, Essai historique sur la ville de Caffa, dans le
cours du Moyen Age (St. Petersburg, 1811). E. D. Clarke, Travels in various countries of Europe, Asia and
“Le khanat de Crimée en mai 1607 vu par un voyager français [J. de Bordier],” Cahiers du monde russe et
environment? What was the influence of the colonizers, and the local inhabitants, on the developing urban space and in general to the land where they lived and of how did they interact with it? What is the nature of the interaction between the cities of Gazaria and their hinterland and how can we interpret it? How far did the penetration of the Genoese colonizers to the rural area go and how did they manage the hinterland?\textsuperscript{433} How and under the influence of which factors did the material culture of the colonies take shape?\textsuperscript{434} What can we learn about the daily life of the inhabitants of the colonies? What was the connection between the physical layout on the one hand and the social history and social topography of the colonies on the other?

In answering these questions we face an additional challenge in addition to the complex problems already have. Although there is a considerable amount of Western literature on the Italian trade on the Black Sea as well as some other issues (social history, etc.), this historiography largely ignored the spatial aspect of the Genoese Crimean colonies, as Western researchers normally based their work on the documentary material in the Italian archives, often without having visited the colonies themselves. The same is true for the state of research today, since the Western scholars dealing with the written sources on the one hand and the local Russian and Ukrainian researchers dealing with archaeology, epigraphy, topography, and numismatics on the other, are often unaware of the results of the work of another side because of the language barrier or the lack of contacts with other schools.\textsuperscript{435} Sometimes, we come across regrettable factual mistakes even in the works of leading Western historians of the Italian overseas colonies, while the local ones are dealing mainly with concrete factual data without a broader perspective. Making up for this gap is one of my objectives. Thus, I have used some of the data on the Crimean colonies that was little known outside the circle of scholars in local history.

\textsuperscript{433} Here we have to deal with complicated issues such as the questions of land-owning and land exploitation, property legislation, applicability of the terms of seigneury and feudalism to the area and époque in question, and technical questions of managing the agricultural area.

\textsuperscript{434} Meaning material culture in its broad sense including the artefacts, housing, weapons, nutrition, health and diseases, etc.

\textsuperscript{435} For an extensive general overview of the topography of Caffa see: С. Г. Бочаров, Историческая топография Каффы (конец XIII в. 1774 г.), Фортifikация, культовые памятники, система водоснабжения; PhD thesis (Moscow, 2000). Many points of this author were, however, erroneous, and are scrupulously corrected by Ponomarev upon the study he did on MC 1381-1382, see: Ponomarev, A. L. “Население и территория генуэзской Каффы по данным бухгалтерской книги – массарии казначейства за 1381–1382 гг.” (Population and Territory of Genoese Caffa According to Data from the Account Book – Massaria for the Treasury for 1381-1382), Prichernomorie v Srednie veka (The Black Sea Region in the Middle Ages) 4 (2000): 317–443.
In order to answer these questions let us first take a look at the city of Caffa, the capital of Genoese Gazaria. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the territory of Caffa was the largest city in Eastern Europe. The space within the city walls amounted to 205 acres, which was much bigger than for instance the Genoese settlement in Pera, Constantinople. Only the central cities of the Golden Horde at the height of their period (thirteenth early fourteenth centuries) could be compared to Caffa, but the significance of Sarai was decreasing throughout the decades and after Özbeg Khan the Tatar rulers only minted coins there once, while another big city, Bolghar, only recovered after being sacked in 1366 in the 1420s. The city of Moscow was two times smaller than Caffa even after it was reconstructed and considerably expanded after the siege of Tokhtamysh of 1382. However, the city expanded well beyond the walls (the quarters outside the central citadel called castrum were known as burghi, while the extramural quarters were called antiburgi). Its active expansion began in the early fourteenth century, and comprised the construction of the citadel, the burgs and then the antiburgi. In urban landscape of Caffa after 1316 the Latins normally settled within the citadel walls, otherwise leaving space only for the Greek and Armenian churches. The Italians therefore mainly populated the citadel, while the Greeks, Armenians, and Tatars settled in the burg, even though this segregation was not absolute.

When the Officium Gazarie of Genoa, whose duty it was to deal with all the problems of navigation and colonization, settled the new inhabitants of Caffa in 1316, on the occasion of the reconstruction of the city, which had previously been destroyed by the Tatars, the town planners wanted to promote Genoese colonization in the older parts of the city-around the citadel-and to settle the Greeks in the suburbs where their own churches were preserved. But the initial partition between the various communities lost strength over the course of time. In 1381, the Greeks Georgios Chiladici and Callo lane Vassilao dwelt beside the Genoese Giovannino Negron, and the Greek tailor Vasili had his home beside the St. Nicolas church, located in the citadel, which was now no longer reserved for the dwellings of the Latins. The Greeks mentioned in that document lived in the castrum as well as in the suburbs (burgi) of the city. One of the residential quarters mainly occupied by the Greeks, St. Georges, was situated inside the citadel. In the urban space at the end of the fourteenth century, there is no longer any partition between Latins and Greeks. The settlement policy devised by the Genoese authorities at the beginning of the fourteenth century was never duly implemented, because there were not enough Latins to fill the ancient urban areas in Caffa.

436 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 392.
The formation of Caffa as an urban centre can be traced back to 1289–1290 thanks to the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto. These refer to the streets, public roads, main square (plathea ianuensium) and the public buildings including the logia (logia ianuensium) and the fondaco, fountains, mills, slaughterhouses, walls and port. The logia was the centre of the public life, and where the consul administration lived, and kept his court, chancery, and notaries. The nearby church in his residence was the religious centre for the community of newcomers. The consul was both the civil head of the community and the castellan of the castle. The nearby fondaco, which was part of the same complex of public buildings in the central square, functioned as a merchants’ inn or hostel (similar to the Oriental caravanserai) and warehouse. Beyond the central square, we find the convents of the mendicant religious of Minorite Friars and Preachers with a hospital of Saint John. In 1289–1290, there are many cases of selling and buying houses and other real estate in Caffa (often in shares), and the prices varied from 400 to 2,500 aspri. Apparently, even at that early point the city walls did not surround the whole settlement and some houses and workshops were situated in the extramural space. The deeds of Sambuceto refer to the sold and bought real estate as “in territorio de Caffa, in pertinentibus de Caffa extra licias, in Caffa extra licias dicti loci de Caffa, and extra Caffam”.

After the attacks by Toqta Khan in 1307–1308 and the Turks in 1313–1314, Caffa was rebuilt and reorganized. The second decade of the fourteenth century was a period of rapid expansion of Caffa as a settlement. At this point the expansion started to be planned by a special office called the Officium Gazarie. This was regulated by special laws and...
regulations, and directed by the Genoese consul of Caffa.\textsuperscript{448} The documents regulating the urban growth of recent small settlements are dated 1316 and known as \textit{Ordo de Caffa} (this text explains administrative issues, election of the officers, salaries and rewards, taxation, tolls, regulations imposed on the port, etc.) and \textit{Certus ordo de Caffa} (it amplifies \textit{Ordo de Caffa} and regulates navigation and real estate, the latter being particularly important for our analysis).\textsuperscript{449}

As in the previous period, the intramural space was divided into the citadel and the burg. The citadel was generally, albeit not exclusively, restricted to the Genoese (although the Venetian quarter of Saint Peter was also situated in the same citadel\textsuperscript{450} together with the churches of the Greeks and Armenians).\textsuperscript{451} We are not sure what the citadel looked in 1289–1290; perhaps the line of its border (\textit{licicia}) had solid walls, or perhaps just a ditch and a rampart,\textsuperscript{452} maybe with a palisade (the stone walls could have been started in around 1313–1316, but were probably only finished by the mid-fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{453} and the fortification project lasted until the fifteenth century and resulted in a mighty stronghold with seven gates and twelve towers).\textsuperscript{454}

Besides the public buildings that already existed in 1289–1290, in the early fourteenth century the Genoese constructed several new churches including two churches to Mary,\textsuperscript{455} the church of Saint Nicolas,\textsuperscript{456} and a church of Saint Agnes that became the city cathedral.\textsuperscript{457} In addition to the public fondaco we now find private ones.\textsuperscript{458} The settlers also built new workshops, warehouses, inns, taverns, and shops. Pretty much like in the late thirteenth century, a large part of residential zone was situated outside the city walls: the sources of 1316 mention both intramural (\textit{intra Caffe, in confines de Caffa}) and extramural buildings

\textsuperscript{448} Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 407. The consul was responsible for the land distribution both within and outside the city walls. He had to sell land on public auction, reserving the plots vital for the streets, roads, port, and hospital, as well as plots of land right next to the citadel walls. Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 381, 407-408.


\textsuperscript{450} M. Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-Mer}, vol. 1, No. 602.


\textsuperscript{452} A. Ducellier, Byzance, 378-379.


\textsuperscript{454} Cazacu, K. Kevonian, “La chute de Caffà,” 531.

\textsuperscript{455} M. Balard, \textit{Les actes}, No. 742, 300.

\textsuperscript{456} G. Balbi, S. Raiteri, \textit{Notai genovesi in Oltremare}, No. 15.

\textsuperscript{457} Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 407.

\textsuperscript{458} M. Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-Mer}, vol. 1, No. 223, 692, 693, 795, 882.
(extra Caffam, extra muros de Caffa).\textsuperscript{459} They also mention the meadows and empty lands,\textsuperscript{460} from which we can infer that the buildings in the city were not as densely build as in most European urban centres.

Some citadel walls in Caffa were erected in 1313–1316. The construction of the most recent ones that are still standing, 718 meters in length, begun in around 1340s and completed under consul Gotifreddo di Zoagli in 1352 (notably, Pope Clement VI personally contributed to the building of the walls of Caffa).\textsuperscript{461} At the same time, in 1316, the Caffiotes began building a second line of walls around the residential area of the city (burghi). Afterwards they built a moat and earthwork ramparts, and started to build the walls on top of these ramparts. Since the length of these fortifications around the city had to be more than three-miles long, the project took time. Although already in 1357 under consul Gotifreddo di Zoagli the greater part of the city burgs were surrounded by an outer or second wall the present massive structure was only completed in the 1382–1385 by the three consuls sent there by the Genoese doge Leonardo Moctaldi – Giacomo Spinola de Lucullo (1383), Pietro Cazano (1384), and Benedetto Grimaldi (1385).\textsuperscript{462} In the early fifteenth century, a third line of fortifications with a moat and earthworks and without the walls was added. A Flemish knight Guillebert de Lannoy (1386–1462), who was the councillor and the chamberlain of the Duke of Burgundy John the Fearless, and one of the first famous twenty-five members of the Order of the Golden Fleece, visited Caffa in 1421, being involved in the preparation of the anti-Ottoman crusade. In his travelogue he mentions that Caffa then had three lines of fortification.\textsuperscript{463}

There are constant arguments about the localization of the towers and gates mentioned in the written sources. The correlation between the archival documents and the material remains is not always very clear. The sources mention the towers of Christ, St. Apostles, Khachatur (Cazadori, named either after the Armenian inhabitant Khachatur or a titanus canlucorum from Solkhat), Bisagno, Stagonum, Turris Rotunda (or di Scaffa), St. Constantine, St. Mary, St. Antony, St. Theodor, St. Thomas, St. George.\textsuperscript{464} The gates were either joint with towers (e.g. the gates of Christ, Bisagno, and Stagonum) or just in the walls

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{459} Imposicio Officii Gazariae. Col. 407-408.
\item \textsuperscript{460} M. Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, vol. 1, No. 109, 301, 459.
\item \textsuperscript{461} Balard, “Les formes militaires,” 74.
\item \textsuperscript{463} Guilbert de Lannoy, Œuvres (Louven, 1878), 64.
\item \textsuperscript{464} Skrzinskaja, “Inscriptions latines des colonies génoises en Crimée,” ASLSP 56 (1928): 49-55. В. Н. Юргевич, Устав для генуэзских владений... 700-701. Пономарёв, “Население и территория.”
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
not linked to the tower (e.g. the gates of Corchi, St. Nicolas, St. Andrew, of the Armenians, and Vonitica).

In the early fourteenth century Caffa was a Genoese urban settlement without any aspirations to acquire a hinterland: according to the same statute of 1316, all empty land beyond the borders of Caffa had to remain empty and open to everybody, but without any building rights. This area to the north from the city in the direction of the road leading to Solkhat was meant to be used for the market of grain, timber, and other goods. This was yet just one of the markets in Caffa. Most trade was conducted in the port that hosted the warehouses, and constituted the economic heart of the city. According to some accounts, it was spacious enough to accommodate 200 ships. The palace of the commune was accessible from the port by the smaller gate and the larger gate (*hosteum magnum* and *hosteum parvum*). Many warehouses and shops were situated in the area of the port of Caffa. Besides these trading points in the port, among the centres of trade we find the caravanserais (*cavarsaralis*) in the citadel and in the city. Each was headed by a special master (*dominus* or *magister*) responsible to the urban authorities (the lowest level were the *cavallarius* in the citadel and the captain of the burgs in the city; in the late fourteenth century appeared yet another office of *consilium super bazale*). Trade within the city was mainly concentrated in the city squares, the most important being the so-called Genoese square. However, most other attractive squares also hosted warehouses, cellars, and shops, and were points of trade. Even in the Ottoman times the bazars of Caffa were quite impressive according to travellers’ diaries.

Most of the churches of Caffa cannot be located. Unlike the Ottoman period, when the citadel and the port area were completely Muslim and had only mosques (often previously Christian churches), while the Christian part of the city constituted its periphery, in the Genoese period the central area was full of Christian churches, and we can safely state that the majority of the population was Christian. The Latin churches were obviously the most

---

466 Balard, *La Romanie génoise*.
470 *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, 471.
numerous in Caffa and we know some of them by name. I provide a list of churches, albeit not exhaustive) found in *Massaria Caffae* 1423 and some other sources of the same time.

### Latin churches in Caffa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>MC References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral of St. Agnes</td>
<td>MC 1423, 5v, 6r, 6v, 11r, 13r, 15v, 30r, 41r, 42v, 43r, 45v, 47r, 53r, 53v, 55r, 56v, 57r, 60r, 67v, 79r, 83r, 91r, 94v, 95r, 133r, 144v, 147v, 168r, 170r, 171v, 231v, 232r, 241v, 244r, 248v, 258r, 262r, 265r, 273r, 276r, 278r, 288r, 289r, 297v, 313v, 354r, 357v, 382v, 385v, 388r, 393r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary of the Bazar</td>
<td>The massariae normally mention just ‘St. Mary’ without any specification, cf. MC 1423, 42r, 76v, 82r, 127r, 143r, 147v, 147v, 148v, 150v, 151r, 241v, 445r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary of Assumption</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two churches of St. Dominic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two churches of St. George</td>
<td>MC 1423, 34r, 41v, 45r, 50r, 56v, 57r, 79r, 92v, 123v, 206v, 262v, 268v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the consul’s chapel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>MC 1423, 219r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anne of the Flagellants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicolas of the Castle</td>
<td>MC 1423, 55r, 59r, 241r, 248r, 340v, 341r, 352v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael of the Burgs</td>
<td>MC 1423, 34r, 42r, 43r, 45v, 46r, 55r, 57r, 60r, 61r, 77v, 81r, 114v, 115v, 134r, 155r, 170r, 194r, 207v, 208r, 215v, 241r, 241v, 248r, 248v, 320r, 322v, 342v, 352v, 404v, 405r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td>MC 1423, 32v, 34v, 76v, 77r, 83v, 126v, 126v bis, 130r, 131r, 136r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John of the Burgs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine</td>
<td>MC 1423, 79v, 80r, 83v, 84r, 126v, 181r, 181v, 301v, 445v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Antony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jericho [sic]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Angel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lazarus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Simon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Quiricus(^{471})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Apostles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{471}\) Strangely cited alone without his mother St. Martyr Juliette.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Mary Magdalene</th>
<th>Statutum Caphe (1449).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James the Less son of</td>
<td>Statutum Caphe (1449).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpheus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Claire</td>
<td>Statutum Caphe (1449).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary de Coronato</td>
<td>Statutum Caphe (1449).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ambrose</td>
<td>MC 1423, 18r, 44v, 108r, 136r, 208r, 216r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Donatus</td>
<td>MC 1423, 16v, 42r, 43r, 52r, 58r, 62v, 106v, 115v, 117v, 118r, 122v, 231r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke</td>
<td>MC 1423, 42v, 190r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mark</td>
<td>MC 1423, 43r, 45v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>MC 1423, 13r, 42v, 43v, 92v, 189r, 387v, 393r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Matthew</td>
<td>MC 1423, 41v, 102r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Romulus</td>
<td>MC 1423, 3v, 8v, 9v, 16v, 27v, 30r, 41r, 43v, 44v, 45r, 56v, 92v, 95r, 103v, 105r, 106r, 107r, 108r, 127r, 129v, 130r, 136r, 146v, 245v, 247v, 277r, 297r, 313v, 415v, 424r, 436r-v, 447r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Salvatore</td>
<td>MC 1423, 41v, 67r.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek churches of Caffa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary at the Temple</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dormition of the Mother of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Apostles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicolas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter</td>
<td>MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 45v, 121v, 160v, 361v, 367v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Theodore</td>
<td>MC 1423, 44r, 119r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Demetrius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Stephan</td>
<td>MC 1423, 15v, 42r, 45v, 55r, 133r, 141r, 146r, 248r, 276v, 362r, 367v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Anastasius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Barbara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Basil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Akindynos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Cyriacus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Armenian church of St. Stephan could well have been Greek originally, since it has inscriptions in Greek. The Armenian churches of Caffa

The number (about sixty) was basically equal to the number of churches. Around thirty of them were called after the church around

---

which a *contrada* was organized, and another twenty were named after real people.\(^{474}\) The rest were called after a tower, gate, etc., or after the profession of the inhabitants. The neighbourhoods were populated mainly, but not exclusively, by Orientals (Greeks, Armenians, Jews, and Muslims), and probably evolved from the communities of local people (once known as *campagne*, since they used to live outside the citadel walls). In a sense they were similar to the Ligurian communities under the Genoese rule, and pledged an oath of allegiance to the Commune of Genoa as their collective suzerain and became her feudal vassals. These communities retained their autonomy until the end of Caffa and their living quarters by no means be considered a ghetto, since members of all ethnic groups lived freely in different Latin and Oriental *contrade*, as well as even in the citadel itself. Inside the *contrade* there were other smaller units known as ‘hundreds’ and ‘tens’, which were the mechanism of mobilization of both human resources of the inhabitants (e.g. in cases of war or public works) and their money levied as special taxes.

According to Ponomarev, by 1381 (from which time we have statistic sources) the population density in Caffa was about 100 people or less per hectare (that is less than forty persons per acre). The number of *contrade* (urban neighbourhoods) was roughly equal to the number of the churches, that is sixty. The number of people in each neighbourhood amounted to around eighty (that is why the churches were fairly small). The number of houses in the city was around 1,400.\(^{475}\) Again according to Ponomarev in 1381 there must have been around 2,130 adult free men (his figure is 2,127), this means roughly 4,260 adult free men and women, assuming, following Ponomarev, that the number of men and women was roughly equal. Without Caffa’s population pyramid it is difficult to predict how many children could have lived there and what was, therefore, the overall population. According to Ponomarev, it must have been roughly 7,000, and certainly not more than 9,000 people; this account is based on an assumption that children amounted roughly 30% of the city population, and we know the exact figures for slave population in 1386–530 slaves of both sexes living in Caffa\(^{476}\) – and can assume that the relative share of slaves in the urban population, if not their absolute quantity, was fairly stable and did not change much;

---

\(^{474}\) See: Balard, *La Romanie génoise*. For instance we find the neighborhoods called after a certain *marchissius*, Coia Beg, Anastaxius Carrus, Carlinus dell’Orto, *commerchiarius* Xandi, bath attendant Kosta, syndic of the guild of shipwrights Manoli, Michalli Pinaka, *candellerius* Omet, *cotonerius* Alexander, or a Hungarian called Ferenc (*Francischus*), Ponomarev, “Население и территория.”

\(^{475}\) Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 391–392.

\(^{476}\) Balard and Veinstein, “Continuité ou changement d’un paysage urbain?” 82-83.
therefore, they must have been similar in 1381. I will discuss Caffa’s demography of Caffa later on.

As already mentioned, writing the history of Caffa means writing the history of the whole of Gazaria, and vice versa. In general, we can see Gazaria mainly, if not exclusively, through the lenses of Caffa. This is chiefly due to the fact that most documentary sources on the other colonies were drawn up in Caffa, to which they were subordinate. The consolidation of the Genoese colonies under the authority of the consul of Caffa occurred relatively early on. In the late thirteenth century there were attempts to unify the Genoese settlements on the Black Sea under the podestà of Pera, reflected in the Statute dated October 31, 1290. Nevertheless, beginning from the fourteenth century Caffa became an administrative centre of a colonial unit known as Genoese Gazaria. All the local officers along the shores of the Black Sea and Azov Sea depended on the consulate and the Commune of Caffa. This was with the exception of Pera, which was outside either of the two seas, albeit very close, and secondly, was too important to be a subordinate colony. The consul of Caffa appointed the administration of other Genoese domains, was responsible for levying taxes, recruiting mercenaries, etc. By the second half of the fourteenth century, Caffa was without doubt the head of the Genoese Black Sea colonial empire. This was reflected in the statute of 1398, which called the consul of Caffa the head of the Genoese “of all the Black Sea and of the Empire of Gazaria.”

Let us now look briefly at the Genoese possessions in the Black Sea region and describe the most salient points of these settlements. The question I address here is whether Genoese Gazaria was simply a flexible network of disparate trading stations subject exclusively to the momentary aims of commerce, or whether it constituted a colonial domain, or, to put it more boldly, a colonial empire, that was used by many different groups of colonizers, being a political and administrative unit ruled from Caffa.

Over a period of roughly two centuries, Genoese settlements appeared on all the shores of the Black and Azov Seas. First of all, we should describe those founded in Crimea, in the immediate proximity to Caffa. Soldaia (Σουγδαία in Greek, Сурожъ in Old Russian, Судак in modern Russian) was the actual site where the Italian colonization of the Black Sea began.

478 Brătianu, Recherches sur le commerce, 222.
479 See in: Rossi, Gli statuti della Liguria (Genoa: Tipografia del R. Istituto sordo-muti, 1878).
Moreover, before the rise of Caffa it was the main centre of trade in the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{480} The city had existed for centuries. In the sixth century, Justinian I erected a citadel there. Throughout the early Middle Ages Soldaia seemed to be a fairly significant city. The peak of the city’s (then called Sougdaia) economic development took place in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when the city first grew thanks to the influx of people from the neighbouring areas, and then it became an important transit point on the Silk Road.\textsuperscript{481} At that point this predominantly Greek urban centre was politically under the Cuman power.\textsuperscript{482} Venetian and, later, Genoese merchants visited the city after 1204, and, by mid-thirteenth century, were firmly established there. The earliest trade contracts mentioning Soldaia as one of the destinations of Italian trade were drawn up in 1206 between the merchants Zaccaria Stagnoria and Pietro Ferraguto.\textsuperscript{483} There was a certain momentary interruption of trade during the expedition of Jebe and Subutai (1220–1224) to capture Ala ad-Din Muhammad II of Khwarazm. After his death the expedition evolved into the first Mongol dive into Eastern Europe. The city was plundered by the Mongols, but its commercial significance was so strong that it recovered and was rebuilt very soon after the siege. Guillaume de Rubrouck, who visited Soldaia in 1253, depicted it as vivid centre of international trade.\textsuperscript{484} At this point, the leading commercial positions in the city initially were taken over by the Venetians, who later on continued (though unrealistically) to consider Soldaia as their area of interest;

\textsuperscript{480} See: [F. K. Brun] Ф. К. Брун, Материалы для истории Сугдеи (Odessa: 1871).

482 Although around 1222 the Seljuk armies from Asia Minor plundered Sougdaia following the order of ‘Alā al-Dīn Kayqubād bin Keykavus, the Seljuq Sultan of Rûm; they defeated joined Cuman and Russian troops, destroyed some crosses and bells in the Orthodox churches, and built one or several mosques.


484 William of Rubruck, or Guillaume de Rubrouck (c. 1220 – c. 1293) was a Flemish Franciscan friar, who was ordered to travel to the Mongol lands by the French king Louis IX of France, and did this expedition in the 1253-1255. His travelogue “Intinerarium fratis Willielmi de Rubraquis de ordine fratrum Minorum, Galli, Anno gratie 1253.AD” is one of the best pieces of writing in this genre and in the given época, and his contribution into the medieval geography is undoubtedly equal to the one of Marco Polo.
however, the records show that the Genoese merchants visited Soldaia from 1274, and this is only the first documentary evidence. After 1287, Soldaia became the residence of the Venetian consul responsible for the entire jurisdiction of Venetian Gazaria. From then on, Soldaia became a leading city in the Venetian trade on the Black Sea, and it retained this position until the rise of Caffa and the emergence of the Venetian trading station in Tana.

The emergence and development of Caffa reduced the commercial significance of Soldaia. Moreover, in 1299 Soldaia was plundered by the hordes of Tatar Nogai Khan. Ibn Battuta, who visited Soldaia in 1333/1334, described the devastated state of the city.

According to Baranov’s data on the excavations in Soldaia, the city was an important centre of craftsmanship until the thirteenth century. The jewellers’ and metal-working workshops were situated near the main gate and the church of the Virgin, while pottery and glass workshops were normally in the valley and around the city in the burgs, where some bracelets have been found. It is likely that some kind of guild organization with specialized production already existed prior to the Tatar conquest. Unfortunately, we cannot say much about the craftsmanship in Soldaia either before or after the Tatar raids – it was a common thing for almost all the Tatar military expeditions to take all skilful artisans into captivity and then – depending on the farsightedness of the khan – either to sell them as ‘slaves with benefits’, or to use them to populate the evolving urban centres of the Golden Horde, which initially lacked qualified craftsmen. Thus, after the conquest of Soldaia, artisanship could

theoretically have been resumed only by imported slave labour, but this probably did not occur. By mid-fourteenth century there was no more craftsmanship in Soldaia, just some wine production. Nonetheless, in spite of the absence of craftsmanship, the Genoese, who occupied Soldaia in 1365, were positive about the location, which can be judged from the fact that they launched a huge project of fortification and built a citadel comparable to the one in Caffa.491

While Soldaia was not yet in Genoese hands, the Ligurians tried to reduce its role, trying to make Caffa the economic centre of Crimea and, indeed, the Black Sea. After Soldaia was finally ceded to the Genoese in 1365 never to return to Venetian hands, and was no longer a competing Venetian settlement, the Genoese transformed it into their military bulwark. As a Genoese city, Soldaia was ruled by a consul who held all civil and military power, bearing the title of castellanus492 and who was in charge of the fortress and garrison. The consul’s salary amounted to 60 sommo, six times less than the salary of the consul of Caffa. He was helped by two servants, one knight, one notary, one scribe of the court, two treasurers, and a Greek interpreter (which is understandable, as the majority of population was Greek).493 Some other officers and public servants are also recorded – three secretaries, three porters to guard the gates of the citadel, one trumpeter, and one nacharatus494 to play nacaro.495 The Genoese staff also included orguxii – the suite and the bodyguards of consul; there were four orguxii in 1381,496 six in 1386,497 and twenty in 1449. The administration

493 Μ. Νυστατζοπούλου, Άλτε εν τη Ταυρική Χερσόνησο πόλις Σουγδαία (Athens, 1965), 65-68.
495 ASG, Notai, cart. No. 202, f. 193 r.
496 ASG, MC 1381, f. 177r.
also subsidized the bishop of Soldaia, a Franciscan friar, a fountain-keeper, a physician, and an axeman. Additionally, two citizens, one Latin origin and the other Greek, were elected to form the *Officium provisionis Soldaie*, looking after the grain supplies and water supply for the irrigation of the vineyards.498

*Cembalo* (modern Balaklava), situated in the South of Crimea, was situated on the coast of one of the best (if not the best) havens in the Black Sea.499 For this reason it had been inhabited since time immemorial. Homer mentioned this location in his *Odyssey* as the place where the Lestrigones500 a tribe of giant cannibals, lived. Later on, it became known as a station of Tauri (Ταῦροι) pirates, who attacked Greek vessels from the bay and who sacrificed captives and shipwrecked travellers to their cruel goddess. The legend of Iphigeneia, Orestes, and Pylades recounted by Euripides in his ‘Iphigeneia in Tauris’ is inspired by the reports of Tauri. Plinius Maior also mentioned the hamlet in the bay among the places surrounding Chersonesos in his *Naturalis Historia* and called it Symbolum portus.501 Strabo wrote about the haven with a narrow entrance where the Tauri established their piratic station, and says that the name of the place is Symbolon Limen (Συμβόλων Λιμήν),502 that is ‘the Bay of Signals.’ Between 63 and 66 AD, the Romans under Plautius Sylvanus defeated Scytho-Taurian (Σκυθοταύροι) troops, built a fortress called Charax on the Ay Todor Cape, and established a military camp in the Symbolon Limen, having erected a temple there dedicated to Jupiter Dolichenus (according to another more reliable version, it happened no later than 139-161 AD).503 Close to 224 AD the camp was destroyed.504 In
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497 MC 1386, f. 568r – 571v.
499 The bay of Balaklava has narrow entrance and is virtually closed between two mountain massifs protecting it from the storms, being around 1500 m long, 200 – 400 m wide, and 5 – 35 m deep. Balaklava bay is so peculiar because it is semi-enclosed and only partly connected with the open space of the Black Sea.
500 ἕνθ᾽ ἐπεὶ ἐς λιμένα κλυτὸν ἠλίβατος, ὅν πέρι πύρη

---

502 Strabo, *Geographica*, VII.
medieval times, the fishermen’s village in the bay had been known since the early seventh century as Iamboli, and in 702 political imperial events occurred there, since Emperor Justinian II Rhinotmetos (669–711) fled from Chersonesos and hid there. The village’s final fate is not known, but we can safely hypothesize that it did not remain uninhabited.

The Genoese occupied Cembalo in 1344/1345. Initially, they built a rampart and a wooden wall, and a deed dated to 1344 and drawn up by the notary Rolando Saliceto for Paolo di Podio also testifies to the construction of a church consecrated to the Virgin. In 1345, Tatar troops forced the inhabitants to flee to the mountains. However, by 1357 the Genoese had regained Cembalo, judging from the petition of the consul of Caffa to the Genoese Doge Giovanni di Murta (1344–1350). In 1357, the consul and castellan of Cembalo Simone del Orto launched a building project in the town, including plans for a citadel. Argono di Savignone, consul and castellan in 1386, continued building the walls, but he was put on trial for embezzling the public funds. The subsequent officers, Giorgio Spinola and Giovanni di Podio, took care of city’s water supply and built three large towers, one of which was put under the protection of St Nicolas, and thus the entire upper citadel was further called ‘town of St Nicolas’, the lower burg being called ‘town of St George’. The castle was extolled by a Polish traveller Martinus Broniovius de Biezdzfedea. Indeed, the fortress must have looked impressive, placed on the top of the mountain, facing the sea from one side with its abrupt cliff and being surrounded by the mighty walls with eight towers on the other. Inside the citadel, there was the consul’s tower, the toll, and the church. Later on, in the 1460s, the citadel was rebuilt. A new tower – a donjon around twenty metres high – appeared on the South-Eastern edge of the fortress. The new donjon had three floors, the first hosting the water cistern, the second had a hall with a fireplace, and the third was used to patrol and perhaps as a beacon. Downhill below the

505 G. Balbi, S. Raiteri, Notai genovesi, 112.
506 This was a title of the head of Cembalo later on too. See: ASG, MC 1374, f. 256v.
508 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 6v, 97r, 361r, 374r. See also: Skrzynska, “Inscriptions latines,” 127. А.Л. Якобсон, Средневековый Крым (Moscow, 1964), 216.
509 The plaques exposing epigraphic inscriptions and the coats of arms of the consuls are one of the important sources for the history of Cembalo: [E. A. Jarovaya] Е. А. Яровая, “Генеалогия и геральдика генуэзских официалов Крыма (по материалам лапидарного наследия Кафы, Солдайи и Чембало XIV–XV вв.)” [Genealogy and heraldry of the Genoese officials of the Crimea: the lapidary heritage of Caffa, Soldaya and Cembalo, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries], PSV 6 (2005): 139-170.
510 Airaldi, Colonie genovesi nel mar Nero, 9-12.
511 The water went to the cistern via a clay aqueduct from the existing and still in use source called Kefalo-Vrisi (in Greek Κεφαλή Βρύση means “the head of the sources,” that is, its beginning), situated on a mountain Spilia (Greek Σπήλαια means “the cave”).
fortress there was the burg or ‘town of St George’, which was inhabited by local people as well as the Genoese (unlike the citadel reserved to the latter), the market, and the port. The burg was surrounded by walls with six towers.

The administrative offices of Cembalo were situated in the ‘town of St Nicolas.’ In 1386 besides the consul and the vicar these consisted of two law enforcement officers, one Greek scribe, two guardians for the gates, two orguxii, the church chaplain church, and a garrison of twenty-six men. In the fifteenth century the staff comprised the consul and castellan, a vicar who performed the functions of a judge, two massarii, elders, a bishop, a messenger, and trumpeters. By the end of the fifteenth century, the garrison of the citadel comprised forty archers (including a barber, two trumpeters, and a law enforcement officer). Seven of these, together with the castellan, permanently guarded the ‘town of St Nicolas.’ Perhaps there was also a consul’s guard consisting of Tatars on horseback. The revenues of Cembalo came mainly from taxes on wine, salt, and mills.513

Until 1380–1381, Cembalo was the Genoese outpost in the South-West of the Crimea. It was vitally important to possess this location in order to have a base to the West from Caffa. After the Tatars conceded the entire coastline to the Genoese, Cembalo, formerly an important but remote outpost became the watchtower of the Genoese frontiers, controlling all the troops penetrating to Gothia. Thus, it was the base for all the Genoese wars with the Principality of Theodoro, a Greek state in the foothills of Crimean Mountains with a capital in Mangup. The Theodorites occupied Cembalo in 1423, but were soon pushed out, provoking the further fortification of Cembalo, which began in 1424–1425.

After the plague of 1429 and the drought of 1428–1430, the local population of Cembalo rebelled against the Genoese (see the last chapter) and helped the Greeks from the Principality of Theodoro to occupy their town. The Genoese Senate and the Bank of Saint George sent an expedition of twenty galleys with 6,000 people headed by Carlo Lomellino to Crimea. In 1434, the Genoese regained Cembalo, slaughtered the rebels, and captured their leader Olu Bej, the son of the Prince of Theodoro, Alexios. Then the Genoese besieged and occupied Kalamita (modern Inkerman), a Theodorite fortress and the only port in the principality. However, the Lomellino’s army was defeated by the Tatars of Solkhat.  

512 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 595r-603r.
513 ASG, MC 1386, f. 4v.
Cembalo remained Genoese until 1475, extending the Caffa’s control over the southern coast of Crimea, guarding the borders of Genoese Gazaria against the Principality of Theodoro, bothering the Theodorite city of Kalamita, and limiting the political and commercial activity of the Theodorites.

**Chersonesos**, Greek Χερσόνησος was an ancient Greek city-state on the territory of modern Sevastopol established by the Dorians from Heraclea Pontica in 422–421 BC (according to Tiumenev) or in 529/528 BC (according to Zolotarev). It continued to exist as a prosperous Byzantine city, and a centre of the Byzantine province in Crimea (Θέμα Χερσῶνος, also known as τὰ Κλίματα). It was not a Genoese colony in a proper sense, but there was a Genoese trading station in Cherson, numerous Italians lived there, and we know that there was a Latin bishopric, and Franciscan and Dominican convents conducting active proselytising activity (see section on religion in Caffa and the organization of the Roman Catholic Church in Gazaria). Apparently, there were still some Italians living in Cherson throughout the fifteenth century.

**Vosporo** with the minor settlements Cerchio and Pondico or Pondicopera next to it was located on the site of ancient Panticapaeum (Παντικάπαιον), founded by the people from Miletus in the late seventh or early sixth centuries BC in the extreme East of Crimea, facing
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515 А.И. Тюменев, “Херсонесские этюды. К вопросу о времени возникновения Херсонеса. Херсонес и Делос,” Вестник древней истории 2/3 (1938): 257.
518 One person in the Venetian notarial deeds of the 1430s, a certain Antonio from the parish of St. Severus, defined himself “from Chersonese” (ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 28v); de Chersso should be read de Cherssone, for the scribe often contracts the name in such cases. The settlement on the territory of the ancient and medieval Tauric Chersonese repeatedly appears in the medieval portolans with different spellings: Crexona, Zurzona, Zerzona, Cressona, Girisonda, Gerezonda, Cherson, Jaburt fl. See: Tammar Luxoro (early fourteenth century); Adolf E. Nordenskjöld, Periplus. An Essay on the Early History of Charts and Sailing Directions (Stockholm:A. Norstedt, 1897). Kretschmer, Die italienischen Portolane des Mittelalters (Berlin: Mittler, 1909). I. Fomenko, Образ мира на старинных портоланах. Причерноморье. Конец XIII–XVII в. [The image of the world in the ancient portolans. Black Sea region, Late thirteenth – seventeenth century]. (Moscow: Indrik, 2007), 266, 280, 286, 292. See also: Ievgen A. Khvalkov, Tana, a Venetian and Genoese Black Sea Trading Station in the 1430s: A Social and Economic History (MA thesis in Medieval Studies, Central European University, Budapest, 2011).
the Strait of Kerch. It became the capital of a Hellenistic monarchy of Bosporus, and thus the name ‘Bosporus’ remained even after Panticapaeum was already of no significance. However, people settled in a strategic location controlling the strait that connects the Black Sea with the Sea of Azov. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, the town (or perhaps hamlet) belonged to a Russian Principality of Tmutarakan and was called Korchev (Корчев), but in the twelfth century it returned under Byzantine rule. It developed intensively in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and the zone of urban growth shifted from the acropolis to the port.\(^{519}\) Vosporo became a Genoese colony in 1318. As the owner of the city controlled the Strait of Kerch (and thus the route of trade going through Tana), the Genoese appreciated the acquisition and established there a consulate.\(^{520}\) In 1381, after the war of Chioggia the Genoese authorities send quite a number of ships to Vosporo in order to make sure that *devetum Tanae*, i.e. a ban on Venetian vessels sailing to Tana, was respected.\(^{521}\) The Genoese captains received rewards for capturing ships which broke the *devetum*.\(^{522}\)

**Lusto**, also known as Lusce, Lasta, Austa, Lustra, Lustia, Lusta, Lusca, Salusta, was situated on the site of modern Alushta. A fortress called Aluston was built by Justinian I in the sixth century. In the course of the middle ages, Aluston became a significant coastal citadel. Under the Genoese, it became an important part of the captaincy of Gothia, as it had a good anchorage alongside Gialita and Gorzoni.\(^{523}\) Today only the remains of two towers of the Genoese fortress are preserved.

**Pertinice** or what is now Partenit. In the middle ages it was part of the diocese of Gothia of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and it is connected with the name and actions of St John, the bishop of Gothia in the eighth century. In the eighth to tenth centuries, Partenit was under the rule of the Khazars. In the tenth to thirteenth centuries it belonged to Byzantium. From the fourteenth century it became a part of the Genoese domains and is mentioned in Genoese documents.\(^{524}\) A nearby *isar* (castle) on *Gelin-Kaja* (modern
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520 ASG, MC 1381, f. 295r.
522 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 67 r, 293r.
523 [V. L. Myts] В. Л. Мыц, Генуэзская Луста и Капитанство Готии в 50–70-е гг. XV в., in *Алу́шта и алу́штинский регион с древнейших времен до наших дней* (Кiev, 2002), 139–189.
524 Л. В. Фирсов, Исары: Очерки истории средневековых крепостей Южного берега Крыма (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1990), 139.
Krasnokamenka) was probably used by the Genoese as a fortress, even though it was built in the earlier times.

**Gorzoni**, or Gorzuvium, modern Gurzuf, was a key town and a connecting point between the area of Caffa and Soldaia and the Southern coast of Crimea. It is first mentioned by Procopius of Caesarea in his *Buildings* (Περί Κτισμάτων), written in 553–555. The text reports that Justinian I built the castle of Aluston and a castle in the Gorzuvite area. The excavations of 1965–1967 reveal the continuity of the existence of this castle until the arrival of the Genoese. They strengthened the walls and made shot-holes for the artillery. Gorzoni is mentioned in the travelogue *A Journey Beyond the Three Seas* by Afanasy Nikitin, who visited it in 1472 and stayed there for five days on his way back from India, waiting for the end of the storm. After the Ottoman conquest the fortress of Gurzuf was abandoned, but the site is called Genovez-Kaja in Crimean Tatar and Russian.525

**Gialita** or Jalite was a settlement on the site of current day Yalta. According to legend, it owes its name to the medieval Greek sailors who risked being shipwrecked and then could not find the land in the fog, but after that they saw the shore (γιαλός in Greek) and this is what the area is called. In the second half of the thirteenth century, the Venetian merchants began visiting Gialita. In the fourteenth century the settlement became part of Genoese Gothia. The ruins of a small medieval fortress can still be seen near the Uchan-su waterfall. The Genoese kept in a garrison and administration in Gialita, and probably appointed a consul.526

**Lupico** (from Greek ἀλώπηξ, the fox) was a tiny settlement owned by the Genoese on the site of modern Alupka. Furthermore, on the other side of the mountains, in the foothills, and among the castles around Chufut-Kale, which Rubruclus called *Castella Iudaeorum*, or *Quadraginta castella*, there could have been some owned by the Genoese.

Going beyond the Southern, South-Eastern, and Eastern shores of Crimea, we also find in the extreme West of the peninsula *Chirechiniti* (also Crichiniri, Crerenichi, Chiiti, Trinici, 525 Л. В. Фирсов, *Исары: Очерки истории средневековых крепостей Южного берега Крыма* (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1990), 152-155.
Trichineh) – ancient Greek Kerkenitis (Κερκινίτις) and modern Yevpatoria. The Genoese had a settlement or an anchorage there. Same is true for modern Tarhan Qut Cape, known to the Italians as Rosso far.

Outside Crimea, the ostium of the Danube was one of the zones of primary interest for the Genoese, and consequently an important part of Genoese Gazaria. The Danubian colonies had particular significance as a source of grain from Bulgaria and from the plains of the Danube for supplying Caffa and for export to Constantinople and the Pontic cities of Asia Minor. Moreover, they also played an additional and vitally important role. These colonies were the key point on the route going through Walachia and Moldavia and connecting the Black Sea with Hungary and Central Europe. This route was essential for the Genoese, particularly in times of war, when the straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were blocked by the Venetian and, later Ottoman, ships.

The first Genoese trading station in the Danubian region appeared as early as in the 1280s and was called Vicina. After the state of Svetoslav prohibited all Genoese trade in 1316 and the Mongols disturbed the area, the presence of the Ligurians in Vicina temporarily diminished, and only recommenced after they were awarded commercial privileges by the King Louis I of Hungary in 1349, their ally against Venice.

However, the main one of the two Genoese cities on the Danube was initially called Chilia. Hypothetically, Chilia was founded in the seventh century BC, and according to the legend it owed its name to Alexander the Great, who allegedly ordered the town to be called Achillia in honour of Achilles in 385 BC. By the fourteenth century, Chilia was situated in the mouth of the Danube, several dozen miles’ from the shores of the Black Sea, and was
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527 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 143, 149.
529 G. I. Brătianu, La mer Noire, 281-282.
effectively the most western city within the borders of the Golden Horde. The Danube delta was full of lakes and marches, and the so-called delta of Chilia probably hosted the Genoese town, or rather two of them, since it is believed that Chilia Vecchia was on the southern bank and Chilia Nuova on the northern one. The city was the centre of Genoese trade, the main exports being grain, honey, wax, salt, horses, and slaves. The Italian colony was headed by a consul. The Genoese town was surrounded by a fosse and had one gate leading through a small square with the Latin church of St John and the consul’s house to the loggia where the consul applied the law. In 1361, Chilia was ruled by the consul Bernabò de Carpina, who settled after his term of power in Licostomo and who died there in 1382, as is written in the inventory of his property dated January 1383.

Another Danubian colony, **Licostomo**, was built on an island in the mouth of the Danube and was well fortified; thus, it was safer than Chilia, especially taken into account the threat of the Princes of Dobrotitch. Thus, Chilia is not mentioned after 1370, as the Genoese found a better location to settle. The notarial deeds drawn up in Licostomo in 1373 and 1383–1384 make no mention of Chilia, neither is it mentioned in the Massaria of Pera. However, a well-fortified island with a Genoese citadel became a transit point for grain trade for the following hundred years. The registers of Caffae Massaria in the fifteenth century contain clauses about the supply of grain, rice, mutton, chicken, and candles from Moldavia and Walachia. It worth mentioning that although the Genoese probably did not own any hinterland around the Danube colonies and thus did not have a territorial domain there (unlike the Crimea), Balard, who generally disagrees with the notion of Genoese settlements as colonies, wrote that Chilia and Licostomo were colonies for the Genoese and were exploited as such, apparently because they were extensively used as granaries.

---

The mouth of the Dniestr was not a main area of Genoese colonization at the outset, but it became important after 1453, since it offered, along with the Danubian area, an alternative route from Europe to the Black Sea. The main colony that the Genoese had there was *Moncastro*, also known as Maurocastro, Macastro, Asproastron; Phoenician Ωφιούσα, Ancient Greek Τύρας, Roman Album Castrum, Byzantine Asperon, or Μαυρόκαστρον, or Λευκόπολις, Walachian Cetatea Albă; modern Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi. The city was situated on the right bank of the Bay of Dniester. The excavations revealed that in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries it was quite populated. Most probably, at that point the main bulk of population were the captives brought there by the Mongols. It used to be a large sea port of the Golden Horde, connected to the Genoese colonies of Crimea. As in case of the Danubian colonies, its central axis in trade was the export of grain. The city was also a centre of craftsmanship, and excavations have revealed a pottery-makers’ quarter, and the amount of production appears to have gone far beyond local needs. The houses of common people reveal links with the Golden Horde, with their typically Tatar ovens, stove benches, and washbasins. However, around 1360s Moncastro was abandoned. In the course of thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it was probably already populated by some Genoese; nonetheless, it did not have its own administration and was without a consul. Balard thought that up to late fourteenth century it was an autonomous community under the sovereignty of the Principality of Moldova.

The area of the Dniester was peculiar in one sense, becoming particularly important after 1453 and the problems with accessing the Black Sea through the Bosporus. It was the only area where the Genoese colonizers went deep inside the continent. Probably, some merchants of Italian origin travelled on the rivers Don and Danube. Nonetheless, they did not establish any settlements other than the coastal ones. However, the area of the Dniester favoured inland colonization given the alternative routes of trade which passed through it. The Genoese established a castle and a settlement *Olichonia* (or Alchona) in Northern Moldavia, on the site of modern Soroca, around 330 km from the sea.

---

There were a number of smaller Genoese settlements and anchorages on the shores of the present Gulf of Odessa – Ginestra (modern Luzanovka or Kujalnik), Seraticia or Setaxicia (Odessa), and Mauro Neo (Chernavoda in Hryhorivsky Estuary/Small Adzhalyk Estuary), and several others further to the East – Porto de l’Ovo, also known as Porto de l’Ow, Porto de l’Bos, Porto de l’Bo, Porto de l’Bovo (somewhere near modern Kherson or Ochakov), Flor-de-lis (Tyligul Estuary), Borbarese or Barbarese (Berezan Estuary), Zagaglia, or Zuchala, Zucalay, Zacalai (on the Isthmus of Perekop or on the Arabat Spit), and Palasta (Mariupol). However, the main stronghold in the area to the north from Crimea was castle Illice or Lerici, situated in the estuary of the Dnieper. The Genoese established friendly contact with the local ruler Acboga in the fourteenth century. In 1381–1382 the envoys bearing diplomatic correspondence travelled from Licostomo through Illice (which was not yet Genoese, but existed as a settlement), though this route was unsafe. The Genoese bought Illice from Tatars and built a citadel in the early the fourteenth century.

The mouth of the River Don was the place of the second most important Italian colony after Caffa in the Northern Black (and Azov) Sea region. A town had existed here since 3 BC. It was part of the Hellenistic Kingdom of the Bosporus and later a dependant of the Roman Empire. It was called in Greek Τάναι after the Ancient Greek name of the River Don; thus the Italian newcomers called it Tana. Genoese and Venetian settlements appeared at an unknown point in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth centuries in the middle of the Tatar semi-nomadic city of Azaq (the site of modern Azov). The initial territory of

539 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 63r, 64r, 65v, 292v.
Venetian Tana was very small (it grew later in the fifteenth century), but the town was regarded as a bulwark of the Venetian thalassocracy against the Genoese, who, however, also established a consulate there. Some scholars thought that the central commerce through Tana was the slave trade, which may be partially true, as Tana could compete even with Caffa in trafficking manpower. However, in the fourteenth century it was an important transit point of the spice trade and silk trade, and with the fourteenth century crisis and the decline of the routes connecting Europe through Volga region to Central and Eastern Asia Tana became a redistributing point of the regional trade and an exporter of fish, caviar, salt, rye, buckwheat, millet, and animals (horses, sheep, and bulls) with Europe. Additionally, it remained a connecting point between the Mediterranean and Russia and a transit point for the fur trade (sable, beaver, marten, ermine, fox, lynx, squirrel, etc. from Russia). Although for the Europeans in the Middle Ages it was really in extreme Oriente, and navigation was not possible in winter, Tana was frequented both by the Genoese and the Venetians, as well as by the merchants from the Volga area and Trans-Caspian regions.

The crisis of the fourteenth century led to a decline of the long-distance trade with Central and Eastern Asia. In 1395, Tana was demolished by the armies of Tamerlane. But it was soon rebuilt. The town was plundered three times in the fifteenth century, but each time it recovered. Thus, in August 1410, in the very middle of the commercial season, the Tatars attacked Tana, killed all the Venetians (over 600 people) and plundered their warehouses (goods estimated as of 200,000 ducats). The next two times the sackage took place in 1412 and 1418. Yet every time Tana was rebuilt almost immediately, which is a sign of its importance for Italian trade. For the Genoese, perhaps, Tana was only the fourth most

---


542 The names of the Genoese consuls are known only for the later period: 1434 – Battista Fornari, 1438 – Paolo Imperiale, 1441 – Teodoro Fieschi. Ф.К. Брун, Материалы для истории Судей (С.а., с.1).


544 Through Don, one could arrive either to Sarai (the capital of Golden Horde) and Hagitarkhan (modern Astrakhan), then to Khwarazm, and from there to Khanbalik (modern Beijing). The description of the route is preserved by Pegolotti in his Pratrica.

545 Л. Колли, “Хаджи-Гирей хан и его политика (по генуэзским источникам). Взгляд на политические сношения Каффы с татарами в XV веке,” ITUAK 50 (1913): 106.

important site after Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo;\textsuperscript{547} for the Venetians owning a stronghold in Tana was a question of having access to the Northern Black Sea, Eastern Europe,\textsuperscript{548} and Asia. Tana was therefore a constant apple of discord between Venice and Genoa (see above for conflicts, wars, and the \textit{devetum Tanae}).\textsuperscript{549} Until the 1420s–1430s Tana was mainly populated by the Genoese and was a Genoese colony \textit{par excellence}. However, while they were always trying to limit is commercial significance in favour of the growth of Caffa, the Venetians made a great effort to establish themselves in Tana as firmly as possibly. Ibn fact, the Republic of San Marco had only two trading stations in the Black Sea region, namely Trebizond and Tana, which confirms its importance for the Venetians.\textsuperscript{550} The Genoese regarded Tana mainly as a transit point for the slave trade; at least we know that the slave trade via Tana was intensive, and the majority of the deeds show that the traders were predominantly of Genoese origin.

In the fifteenth century it was a modestly-sized settlement, all or almost entirely surrounded by walls\textsuperscript{551} punctuated by towers. Barbaro recorded his conversation with a merchant-Tatar in one of them.\textsuperscript{552} In the centre of the Venetian quarter there was the area from her parted road uphill to the Jewish and Genoese quarters, and to a river. The Tatar, Zikh, Jewish, Russian and Greek settlements were situated nearby, and the Greek-Russian quarter was located around the Orthodox parish of St. Nicholas.\textsuperscript{553} The fortifications of both Genoese and Venetian towns were quite mighty. The Genoese town was ruled by a consul.\textsuperscript{554}

\textsuperscript{547} Л. Колли, “Христофоро ди Нетро, последний консул Солдайи. Последние годы генуэзской Солдайи (1469-1475 гг.),” \textit{ITUAK} 38 (1905): 6.
\textsuperscript{548} We do not know much about the Italian navigation on the River Don, but we cannot exclude that they ventured to go up on some river-going vessels, as they did on the Dniester; and in any case they received goods from there.
\textsuperscript{551} Kowalewski, \textit{To the early history of Azov. Venetian and Genoese colony in Tana in the XIV century.}, \textit{Works of the XII Archaeological Congress in Kharkov}, 1902, (Moscow, 1905), vol. 2, 157-162.
\textsuperscript{552} I viaggi in Persia degli ambasciatori veneti Barbaro e Contarini, ed. L. Lockhart, R. Morozzo della Rocca e M. F. Tiepolo (Rome, 1973), 83.
\textsuperscript{553} The relations of different denominations could be quite entangled and ambiguous. See: Kaprov, “Orthodox Christians in Italian-Tatar surrounding.” 456–457.
\textsuperscript{554} While we have a statute for the Genoese colonies in Gazaria published by Amadeo Vigna, no Venetian statute of Tana has been preserved. We only have some data on the administration of the Venetian settlement.
The salary for himself and his law enforcement officer (dicti Consulis et cavalerii sui) was paid from the 1% toll on all imports and exports (unum pro centario de ingressu et to tidem de egressu). The consul was paid additionally 300 aspres from the Caffa treasury, so that “the good consuls would go to that place”. On arrival the consul appointed two local people as massarii (account-keepers). They could be nobiles or popolani, but they had to be ex melioribus. They relegated at a public auction most of the existing tolls in Tana, apart from the above-mentioned 1% toll. Massarii were also obliged to collect money every three months from the tax-farmers, the tax on land (terratica communis), and the fines imposed by consul. All the incomes and expenses were entered in the ledgers called respectively massariae (but unlike the Caffa massariae, which exist for most years and constitute one of the major sources for the present thesis, the massariae of Tana have been lost). The salary for a scribe (scriba) and interpreter should have been paid from the treasury as of 300 bezants each; two other assistants at Curia (servientes) were salaried as of 150 bezants each. According to the Statute of 1449, after paying all the salaries and other expenses (mainly the many religious feasts, as Genoese took particular care to celebrate all of them in the same day as the metropolis), the remaining money should be used for the repairs of the walls from the side of Zikhia, the repairs that were launched by a priest Salomon Teramus. The consul and the massarii were not allowed to spend more than the statute permitted, and in case of groundless extra expenses they would have had to reimburse them from their own funds upon the end of their term of office.

The Venetian consul ruled according to the customs. He was the one in charge of maintaining the navigation of muda, see: Karpov, “Ports of the Peloponnese in the commercial navigation of Venetian trade Galey in the Black Sea (XIV-XV centuries),” Srednie veka 59 (1997): 55. Being placed face to face with the Tartars, the Turks, the tribes of Caucasus, he had to be a diplomat. He was helped by a council of twelve elders, or anziani, see: Brun, “Etudes sur le commerce au moyen-âge. Histoire du commerce de la mer Noire et des colonies Génoises de la Crimée, par F. de la Primandie,” ZOOID 2 (1848): 716. Obviously, he was also responsible for the defence of the town (Barbaro and Contarini… 33). A document dated February 12, 1474 indicates that the consul’s salary was formed from the tolls paid by the Venetian merchants trading in Gazaria, see: Iorga, Notes et extraits pour servir à l’histoire des Croisade au XVe siècle, Ser. I, (Paris, 1899). 211. As well as in the case with the consul of Caffa, the Venetian consul was called “of Tana and of the entire Empire of Gazaria;” this, however, was a pure honorific, since, unlike the Genoese, the Venetians did not own anything in Gazaria but Tana itself. The Venetian consul was assisted by a notary, who was a priest (Régestes… 28), unlike Genoa, where notaries were laymen.

555 “Устав для генуэзских колоний в Черном море, изданный в Генуе в 1449 г. (ed. V.N. Yurgevich),” ZOOID 5 (1863): 807–809. Normally the expenses of the budget were much higher than the sum agreed and assigned for them in the budget, and some officers and offices often had to cover their expenses from the incomes they received (e.g. tax revenues), so the treasury in the end of the day received and registered just the rest.
Another colony on the Sea of Azov was founded earlier than Tana, but soon lost most of its importance. This settlement was called Portus Pisanus or Pixinus. It appeared after 1204, either somewhere not far from modern Taganrog or to the east of the River Mius, if its identification with the Flumen Rosso of medieval maps is correct. The shore between the settlement and the river was known as Kabarda, and this was also a location of an island Magronisi, mentioned by Strabo as Alopekia (from Greek ἁλώπηξ, the fox). 556

The shores of Caucasus were one of the main directions of the Genoese colonization, especially in the fourteenth century and particularly for the sake of the slave trade. The main colony situated there was called Matrega, situated on the Taman Peninsula and identical to Ancient Greek Ἑρμώνασσα. In the tenth to eleventh centuries it was part of Kievan Rus’, and then – the capital of the most southern of Russian feudal principalities – the Principality of Tmutarakan 557 (the name Matrega, also Matarkha, actually derived from this Turkic word Tamatarkha, known in Greek transliteration as Ταμάταρχα). The Russian princes owned Tmutarakan until late eleventh century, 558 when it fell under the Cuman authority. The bulk of population seems to have consisted of Zikhs and Circassians with some Greek and Russian elements. Matrega had been known to the Latin world at least since the thirteenth century, when Fra Riccardo travelled through it during his mission to the Volga–Kama Bulghar following the orders of Pope Gregory IX. He reported that the prince of Matrega and all its people were Orthodox Christians using Greek liturgical books; at the same time, according to the mendicant, the prince had 100 wives. 559 The sources first mention the Genoese presence in Matrega in 1386, 560 although it is likely that they sailed there much earlier. The main commercial interests of Caucasus were wax, leather, grain, fur, and, most of all, slaves. The location was also important for the fish and caviar trade, especially for the transhipment, as the big Genoese vessels often waited in the port of Matrega for the smaller fishing ships from the Sea of Azov to reload with a catch. This meant that it was also a transit point on the way from Tana. The commercial significance of Matrega increased in the course of the fourteenth century.

556 Ф. Брун, Древняя топография некоторых мест Новороссийского края и Бессарабии (С.п., с.п.), 98-99.
558 These princes were: Mstislav Vladimirovich the Brave (988/1010–1036), Svatoslav Iaroslavich (?–1064), Gleb Svyatoslavich (1064–1064), Rostislav Vladimirovich (1064–1067), Gleb Svyatoslavich, again (1067–1068), Roman Svyatoslavich Krasnyj (1069–1079), David Igorevich (1081–1083), Volodar Rostislavich (1081–1083), Oleg Svyatoslavich (1083–1094).
559 “De facto Hungariae magnae a fratro Riccardo invento tempore Gregorii papae noni,” ZOOID 5 (1863): 999.
560 ASG, МС 1386, ф. 10р.
century and early fifteenth centuries. For the Genoese, Matrega was important from the strategic point of view, since it was situated on the shore of the Strait of Kerch and secured, on the one hand, connection between the Crimean and the Caucasian Genoese colonies, and, on the other, it allowed together with Vosporo situated on the opposite side of the strait to control the access to the Sea of Azov. In 1419, a member of the Genoese patrician family Vincenzo Guizolfi, son of Simone Guizolfi, married an Adyghe princess, Bikikhanum, daughter of the ruler of the principality of Berosocha, and thus incorporated into local nobility, effectively becoming a ruler not only of Matrega, but also of the Caucasian lands around. In 1424, the princely privileges of Guizolfi were confirmed by a special treaty with the Commune of Genoa. After the Genoese colonies fell under the rule of the Bank of St George, Guizolfi retained their position, sending the reports to the Bank and managing Matrega. In the mid-fifteenth century, the Genoese built fortifications on both sides of the strait, which they had already controlled for a long time.

There were a number of other minor villages, hamlets, and anchorages inhabited or frequented by the Genoese on the Eastern coast of Azov Sea, namely Copa, Il Pesce, Balzamachi, Santa Croce, San-Giorgio, Lotar, and others. Most of them were ruled by the local Zikh and Circassian princes and did not have a Genoese consul; however, they did form part of the Genoese commercial network, and some of them probably had Genoese fortifications, although for this area we do not know anything for certain. The most important point in the Eastern Azov Sea was without doubt Copa, the modern Slavyansk-na-Kubani, in the mouth of the River Kuban. The merchants from Caffa already frequented this place in the thirteenth century. According to Pegolotti, Copa was a bad port for shipping goods. However, the Genoese successfully used the shores of Zikhia for piracy against both the Venetians and the local Zikhs and Circassians, as well as for controlling the route to Tana. In the fourteenth century, Copa was not mentioned in the sources; however, it appears again in

562 The Genoese notary Oberto di Salvo worked in San Giorgio in 1344, which means that the town already had a significant Genoese population. Balbi, Raiteri, Notai genovesi, 137.
563 Some of these princes had Turkic names; others might have had the ones from the local languages: Belzebuc, Parsabok, Biberd, Kertibey, Petrezoc, Costomoch, Cadibeld, and others.
564 Brătianu, Recherches sur le commerce, 244-245.
565 Pegolotti, La pratica della mercatura, 54-55.
1427 as a place with a Genoese consul\textsuperscript{566} (unlike most of the other minor colonies in Zikhia, i.e. the Eastern Azov Sea region). The Statute of 1449 stipulated that the Genoese consul in Copa had to rely on two paymasters (\textit{taxatores}) elected from among the Latins and two others elected from among the Greeks.\textsuperscript{567}

Outside \textit{Palus Meotis}, on the Black Sea coast, \textit{Mapa}, modern Anapa, was founded by the Genoese in early fourteenth century on the site of the Ancient Greek Gorgippia (\textit{Γοργιππία}). Its primary role was to secure the system of transit routes of trade and to provide a safe connection with the Caucasus.\textsuperscript{568} There were many other Genoese settlements, trading stations and anchorages, with or without fortifications and consulates, on the Caucasian Black Sea coastal line: \textit{Bata} (modern Novorossiysk), \textit{Casto} (modern Khosta), \textit{Layso} (modern Adlersky City District of Sochi), \textit{Abcasia} (modern Tsandryphsh), \textit{Chacari} (modern Gagra), \textit{Santa Sophia} (modern Alakashdi), \textit{Pesonqa} (modern Pitsunda), \textit{Cavo di Buxo} (modern Gudauta), \textit{Niocoxia} (modern New Athos) with a large Genoese castle on Iverian Mountain called \textit{Anakopia}, and \textit{Lo Vati} (modern Batumi). However, if the centre of the Genoese possessions in Zikhia on the Eastern Azov sea coast was Copa, then \textit{Savastopoli} (modern Sukhumi, capital of Abkhazia) played the same role for the domains of the Republic of St George on the Caucasus. The settlement had been known since 736 AD and had some well-preserved early medieval sites, but then declined. It was not before the late thirteenth centuries that Savastopoli gained its significance, becoming a commercial port and a bulwark of the Genoese colonization on the shores of Caucasus. The Genoese merchants settled in Savastopoli quite early on as early as 1280, which is the date of the first notarial deed mentioning them.\textsuperscript{569} A consulate in Savastopoli was established in the mid-fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{570} The administration consisted of a consul, a notary, and a secretary. \textit{Massaria Caffae} of 1381 mentions that the rent for the consul’s house and two \textit{botte} of wine were supplied directly from the funds of the Caffa administration.\textsuperscript{571}

\textsuperscript{566} Canale, Commentari, Vol. 1, 313; Vol. 2, 353.  
569 Brătianu, \textit{Actes des notaires}, 177.  
570 Pistarino, “Presenze abkhaze nel mondo medievale Genovese,” 218.  
571 ASG, MC 1381, f. 411v.
To finish the list of the Genoese domains that constituted Genoese Gazaria, we should mention those in Asia Minor, namely the settlements in Trebizond (modern Trabzon), Simisso (modern Samsun), Sinope (modern Sinop), and Samastri (modern Amasra), and a Genoese settlement in Tabriz in Persia. Caffa had intensive commercial connections with Asia Minor (especially with Trebizond), mainly in slaves and grain (see respective chapter). These settlements, however, can hardly be considered colonies in a proper sense, and are more like ‘trading stations’, because they were established in the already large and prosperous trading cities and enjoyed a small degree of autonomy, being allowed to exist on the territory of the hosting state rather than becoming masters on their own and subjects of politics, often threatening both the host and the neighbouring states, as it happened in Crimea.

How intensive were the connections between Caffa and the rest of Gazaria? Were all these above-mentioned sites unrelated initiatives of particular merchants and settlers? Was ‘Gazaria’ just a geographic name rather than political and economic entity, especially taken into account the traditional weakness of the Genoese state machine? Was this weakness transmitted to the Black Sea ‘New Genoa’? Was the administration in Caffa weak, only theoretically supervising other colonies that were in fact semi-independent? The answer is ‘yes and no’. Yes, neither Genoa nor Caffa could meticulously control every step taken by the local consuls, as was the case with most other pre-modern and early modern administrations. In fact when we take the degree of development of medieval communications into account we have to acknowledge that these consuls had often to act on their own, relying on the strength of their communities. Having said that Genoa was a weak state, unlike, for instance, Venice, we have omitted one important issue. While in the Venetian case the very being of the colonies in Trebizond and Tana depended on the annual state-governed and state-maintained navigation of the galleys of muda (maritime caravans), the connection of the Genoese colonies with the metropolis were built up in a totally different way, characterized as less rigid and more flexible than the Venetian one. The main axis of the Genoese colonies was not the state initiative, but rather an entangled combination of private interests of different alberghi, which made this colonization a private initiative from the very start. This allowed private actors in the Black Sea to react more effectively to the changes and challenges imposed by the world that they were progressively colonizing. This in turn secured the uniformity and homogeneity of Genoese interests on the Black Sea, and therefore

the uniformity and homogeneity of their domains. This, however, does not mean that the administrative network of Gazaria as a whole was shaky and crumbly. The main point here is that, first, the administration of Gazaria served the needs of commerce and not the other way around. Second, local Genoese administrations had to take independent steps whilst being continually connected by the common interests to all the settlements of Genoese Gazaria, which dictated how they should behave.

We can take the geographical mobility of the soldiers within the system of the Black Sea colonies as a clear evidence of intensive connections among the cities and towns of Gazaria. As my research of *Massariae Caffae* 1423 and 1461 shows, many people in the service of the colonial administration moved from one city to another (Caffa, Soldaia, Cembalo, Samastro, Simisso, Sinope, etc.) within a single year. This evidence of the connections clearly shows that Caffa was not only an administrative centre for all of Gazaria, but that it was also a centre of gravitation for all the settlements and trading stations on the Black Sea coasts. The connections of these stations with Caffa were often more intensive that with the neighbouring settlements or among themselves, and it was often mandatory, as in the case of slaves, to direct ship certain goods only through the port of Caffa. Thus, we can conclude, Caffa was a true centre of the Genoese world in the Black Sea.

From a panoramic overview of Genoese Gazaria we get a general picture of how the Genoese colonizers established and guarded their acquisitions, both homogeneous territorial domains, as was the case in Crimea, and constellations of large and small settlements on the seacoast and in the inland of the continent, as was the case for the rest of Gazaria. All politics served to one and the same purpose, which was also the purpose of the Genoese colonization; that is, to establish, ensure, and defend their supremacy and thalassocracy on the Black Sea, relying on a network of colonies, which were autonomous, but which formed an administrative unit ruled from Caffa. In order to implement this policy, the Genoese occupied the most strategically important points on the Black Sea, so that by late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries they controlled all the coastal area between Cembalo and Vosporo in Crimea and a constellation of other possessions on the coasts of the Black and Azov Sea.

Besides the Genoese cities, towns, castles, and anchorages around the shores of the Black and Azov Sea, we should not forget the hinterland or rural domain that the Genoese controlled in Gazaria and their exploitation of this domain. This territory was not large – it was just the coastal area of South-western, Southern, and South-eastern Crimea, so-called ‘Crimean Riviera’, framed by the Black Sea from one side and by the Crimean Mountains.
from the other. Sekirinskiy wrote in his dissertation that the Genoese went through a process of ‘feudalization’ in Gazaria, acquiring rural estates. Although we cannot call owning land in the hinterland feudalism by default, we can see that rural area and the interest in agriculture was not alien to the citizen of Superba. The Marxist ‘feudalism versus capitalism’ opposition is useless here.\textsuperscript{573} The emergence of pre-industrial capitalism and the feudal tools and mechanisms normally coexisted elsewhere side by side. The basis of the Italian long-distance trade was distinctively capitalistic. On the other hand, Genoese used feudal mechanisms in their colonies which were an indispensable element of each late medieval and early modern colonization.\textsuperscript{574} What we can say is that the hinterland of Gazaria was vitally important for the Genoese not only for strategic, but also for economic reasons.

We cannot speak about any Genoese ownership of hinterland prior to 1360s–1380s.\textsuperscript{575} In the thirteenth century, there is barely any trace of it in the sources which only mention forests and wasteland in the immediate neighbourhood of Caffa with just some scarce barns\textsuperscript{576} (some wasteland could be actually found even in the citadel of Caffa as late as in 1344).\textsuperscript{577}


\textsuperscript{575} Note the absence of any rural occupations among the people mentioned by the sources originating from the thirteenth century Caffa: Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, 232.

\textsuperscript{576} Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-Mer}, No. 370, 783, 891.

\textsuperscript{577} Babi and Raiteri, Notai genovesi, No. 24, 54-55.
However, around 1360s–1390 the Genoese occupied a large part of the coastal area and a network of trading stations was consolidated in a colonial domain. In the first stage, alongside the occupation of Soldaia, the Genoese occupied eighteen villages in the immediate surroundings. In the original sources these villages were called *casalia* (the term was not unknown in other zones where Latins and Orientals came into contact), and we should keep in mind here that the word ‘village’ does not mean a hamlet, but a district or county. These areas with additional increments were known as Gothia (the medieval historical name of this area already existed under the Byzantine Empire), and although we can be sure that the Genoese owned pieces of hinterland in most of their colonies, our sources impose some limitations and restrict our knowledge of the rural part of Genoese Gazaria to Gothia. The occupations of the inhabitants of the *casalia* of rural Gothia were mainly agriculture and, to a lesser extent, crafts connected to the rural life (such as processing flax, cotton, and hemp), but mainly – viticulture, horticulture, and animal husbandry. It is probable that many artisans with basic professions such as smiths, potters, millers, weavers, spinners, and carders came to Caffa from the hinterland, which provoked a shift in their status from *chanluchi* to *habitatores* or even *burgenses* according to the rule of the ‘one year and one day’ of city life. The control over the *casalia* (units of countryside) of Gothia was effectively executed through the institute of the *vixitatores Gotie*, who carried out the inspections of the area since the 1370s. In legal terms, the Genoese administration assumed and exercised feudal suzerainty and seignorial rights over the local Orientals. Genoese Gazaria was not completely unique in this sense: e.g. in Chios, the Commune of Genoa clearly treated the local people as a collective seignior would treat his vassals. In both cases this meant a privilege to levy taxes, to mobilize the Orientals for defence and public works.

Most probably, the fiscal demands of the Genoese (who levied 1791 *aspres* in just four of these villages) and heavy pressure otherwise, since we can imagine that the Genoese

administration was much more meticulous than the Tatar one, could push the local population back to the Tatars and eased the short-living reconquering of those eighteen villages by Mamai in around 1375. However, once Mamai was defeated by the Russians in the Battle of Kulikovo, the authorities of Caffa sent Corrado de Goasco, Giacomo de Turre, and a curial scribe Filippo di San Andrea with a task of re-establishing the Genoese control over the entire Crimean Riviera from Caffa to Cembalo (‘sunt pro eius fatica de eundo per totam Gotiam usque in Cimballo cum Conrado de Goasco et Iacobo de Turre’).

It was important to take a scribe (Filippo di San Andrea) who could write and speak Greek, which, as Ponomarev noted, is direct evidence that the local population was mainly Greek-speakers rather than Tatar-speakers, or at least they spoke Greek as a *lingua franca*. Otherwise instead of Filippo di San Andrea, who specialized in Greek, the Genoese would have sent another scribe, Francesco from Gibelleto, who was a scribe in ‘Uyghur’, a Turkic language that served as a *lingua franca* in the Mongol realms (*scriba litteris ugoresche*, *scriba communis litteris ungareschis*).

Speaking about the ethnic composition of the local population, the only thing we should stress is that it was very diverse (see below).

After the effective control over the hinterland was re-established by the Genoese following the defeat of Mamai, the *casalia* were officially regained by the Genoese under the treaties of 1381, one with the lord of Solkhat Eliasbey, and another with a certain Jharcassius. (The question of the reasons why the Genoese had to draw up two treaties with different Lords of Solkhat was studied in detail by Ciocáltan. We can disagree with his idea of succession in the 1380s’ Solkhat, but so far no better explanation has been found).

The Genoese immediately sent the *casalia* military troops under Raffaele Ultramarino, who reached Cembalo (thus crossing the entire ‘Crimean Riviera’) and accepted declarations of fidelity and oaths of allegiance from the inhabitants of Gothia and other areas on his way. Based on *Caffa Massaria* 1381, we can map at least some of these *casalia*; e.g. it mentions *casalle Jallite* (Yalta), *cazalle Lupichi* (Alupka), *casalle Mazaconi*, and

---

586 MC 1381, 73v, 293r.
587 MC 1381, 67v.
588 MC 1381, 303r.
591 See also: Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*.
592 ASG, MC 1381, f. 65v.
593 MC 1381, 40v.
594 MC 1381, 47r.
595 MC 1381, 47r.
casalle de Chinicheo (Cerchio near Vosporo, see above).\textsuperscript{596} Later sources also mention Lusta (Alushta) and Megapotami. The revenues from the hinterland were huge: in the financial year 1381–1382 they equalled 81,612 aspres and 665 sommi,\textsuperscript{597} and this is just what we have in the Caffa Massaria, while in the same year the massarius Guglielmo di Rapallo wrote at least one more ledger, namely cartularium introytus\textsuperscript{598} (“…et sunt quos habuit pro scribendo et componendo cartularium introytus casalium Soldaya Gotie et Cimballi”), that contained the revenues from the rural estates. The exploitation of rural Gothia was clearly not limited to levying taxes or using manpower – the treaty with the Tatars in 1381 allowed the Genoese to sow crops and graze cattle,\textsuperscript{599} which they apparently they had already began doing beforehand.

At certain points the local people of the countryside rebelled or at least disobeyed. Thus from the 1370s until 1390 they occasionally refused to pay taxes and to supply resources such as wood.\textsuperscript{600} Moreover, during the war between the Genoese and the Tatars of Solkhat in 1386 they, apparently, rebelled openly, since Caffa had to send a ship against them pro damnificando inimicos.\textsuperscript{601} This had no effect since the new treaty of 1387 between the consul of Caffa Giovanni de Innocentibus and the Lord of Solkhat Cotlobogha confirmed the Genoese ownership of the countryside.\textsuperscript{602} It does not seem that the Genoese invested too much in the agricultural development of the immediate neighbourhood of Caffa (besides we know that a vineyard near Caffa was leased by the Commune to a certain Sorleone Piccamiglio for a rent of 12,000 aspres in 1381),\textsuperscript{603} Yet by the late fourteenth century there were several windmills on the hills around the city, and owned by its inhabitants,\textsuperscript{604} and there must have been some animal husbandry, since the Genoese offered animals as gifts to the envoys,\textsuperscript{605} and obviously the focus of Genoese interests in the hinterland remained in Gothia. According to Schiltberger, viticulture was mainly dominated by the Greeks (that is, Greek Orthodox including Goths, Caucasians, etc.), who produced very good wine. Some sources of the earlier period also confirm predominantly Greek involvement in wine production.\textsuperscript{606}

\textsuperscript{596} MC 1381, 47r.
\textsuperscript{597} ASG, MC 1381, ff. 40 r, 277v, 293 r, 294v.
\textsuperscript{598} MC 1381, 284v. Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 335.
\textsuperscript{599} Desimoni, Trattato dei Genovesi, 164-165.
\textsuperscript{600} ASG, MC 1374, ff. 8 v, 54v, 55v. MC 1381, f. 67r.
\textsuperscript{601} ASG, MC 1386, f. 95v.
\textsuperscript{602} de Sacy, Pièces diplomatiques, 62-64.
\textsuperscript{603} ASG, MC 1381, ff. 27r, 117v, 179r.
\textsuperscript{605} ASG, MC 1386, f. 14r.
\textsuperscript{606} Skrzinska, “Le colonie genovesi in Crimea, 134-135.
However, albeit all or almost all the workers were, mainly of local origin, it appears that the Genoese did not limit themselves to levying taxes, since we have evidence that they directly ran some vineyards. The data of taxation confirms a common belief that Gothia remained a wine-producing region when it was part of the Genoese domains.\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, ff. 8v, 167r.} Moreover, in Soldaia the Genoese had the vineyards that gave 14,354 \textit{aspres} as early as in 1381,\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, ff. 27r, 117v, 179r.} and the above-mentioned vineyards around Caffa must also have been quite profitable.

Thus, the khanlucks (\textit{canluchi}) were the mainly Greek-speaking local population of the \textit{casalia} of Gothia. There were lasting debates as to the identity of these people, whether they were Tatars or not, whether they were Muslims or not, and whether they were the subjects of Caffa, or of the Khans, or both. The legal standing of \textit{canluchi} is still unclear. On the one hand they apparently were under the feudal suzerainty of the Genoese, paid them taxes, supplied them with manpower, and to be frank were exploited in an intensive, if not exhausting way. On the other hand, the very name \textit{canluchi} reveals their special relations with the Khan. Moreover, the Khan’s representative had an office in Caffa run by khanlucks, and called a \textit{tudun} in Tatar or \textit{titanus canluchorum} in Latin. In fact, part of the taxes levied by the Genoese went to \textit{titanus canluchorum},\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 87v. so these people had to be subject both to Genoa and to the Khans. Although many questions remain unanswered regarding the legal standing of the \textit{khanlucks}, the issue of their ethnic origin is quite clear from the sources. They did not have to be either Tatars or Muslims, and the term \textit{canluchi} bears absolutely no particular reference to any ethnicity or religion. This is clear from the sources. Besides the feudal rents (e.g. for using pastures),\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, ff. 8v, 167r.} the khanlucks paid the Genoese rents and a tax called \textit{coutume}, and among them we find Greeks (\textit{cotumum factum super grecis canluchis de Sorchati}),\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 27r, 179r.} Armenians (\textit{cotumo super ermineis de Sorchati}),\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 274v. Muslims (\textit{cotumo super sarracenis}),\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 273r. and Jews (\textit{cotumum factum super iudeis canluchis}).\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 275v. In particular, there were khanlucks who lived in Solkhat, which is in the Tatar lands and territorially outside the

\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 36v.} 607\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, f. 99r. The tax on the vineyards was further mentioned and regulated in the Statute of Caffa of 1449. Codice diplomatico, in ASLSP, Vol. VII, fasc. II, 629. Badian and Cipetis, \textit{Le commerce de Caffa}, 186. The tax for using pastures imposed on the \textit{titanus canluchorum} (notably with an Armenian name Caihador, i.e. Khachatur in Armenian) equalled 4,000 \textit{aspres} in 1374, see: ASG, MC 1374, 36v.} 608\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, 87v.} 609\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, ff. 8v, 167r.} 610\footnote{ASG, MC 1381, ff. 27r, 117v, 179r. The revenues from the taxes on crops from the hinterland, \textit{introytus montilis seu seminati}, was incomparably less – just some 400 aspres per year. ASG, MC 1381, f. 99r.}
Genoese jurisdiction, but who still had to pay taxes to the Genoese. This has to be seen as a sign of seigneurial relations between the city as collective seigneur and the countrymen linked to it, perhaps by the bonds of serfdom.\textsuperscript{615}

As I have already said, from time to time we find mentions of the khanlucks’ rebellions and robbery in the Genoese sources. Thus, in 1381 khanlucks carried out raids and committed brigandry in the rural area: ‘\textit{et sunt quos exigerunt de naulis de certis raubis canlucorum... in quibus computati sunt asperos 1200 habiti per dicto Bartolomeo [de Finario] a Iharchacio famulo de Corcho ennineo}’\textsuperscript{616} The same happened some forty years later: on August 13, 1420, a Genoese ambassador Carlo Romeo gave gifts to the Tatar Khan on behalf of the consul Manfredo Sauli as a sign of thankfulness for having found the cattle of the inhabitants of Caffa, which had been stolen by khanlucks.\textsuperscript{617}

Initially, the legislation of Caffa often prohibited the Genoese to buy or rent agricultural lands, meadows, pastures, fisheries, salt evaporation ponds or other real estate outside the Genoese possessions. This was done with a clear intent to limit the Genoese penetration into inland Crimea and to minimize potential risks of conflict with the Tatars. However, the Genoese found loopholes and many Italians were still exploiting the rural areas in and outside the Genoese domains. The source of economic power was still largely possessions in the countryside, even in cities such as Genoa and its colonies.\textsuperscript{618} By and during the fifteenth century the Genoese penetration into the hinterland was becoming increasingly important.

Summarizing, we should highlight the fact that from their very outset the Genoese colonists were trying to bring their way of organization and impose it on the reality of Crimea in Caffa and other settlements (which in many senses - at least, in terms of climate and nature – were not very different from their home country). That was the reason why both Caffa and other colonies were modelled as ‘New Genoa’, pretty much alike many other colonies throughout the human history were to a greater or lesser degree resembling the metropolis. However, the Latin culture of the colonizers mixed and mingled with the local Oriental elements, giving birth to a complex, entangled, and multicultural society, which shaped the layout and the image of the cities and their hinterland.

\textsuperscript{615} At the same time, the local nobility (\textit{domini canlucorum}) was somewhat integrated into the Genoese system of administration and received gifts, commonly horses: \textit{equi dati et presentati pro parte... dominorum canlucorum}. MC 1381, 61v.
\textsuperscript{616} MC 1381, 40r.
\textsuperscript{617} ASG, SG, Sala 34, 590/1228, 1229. MC 1420, f. 3r.
As can be seen from this chapter, having founded the initial colonies such as Caffa, Latins did not moderate their ambitions of commercial expansion. Most of the second rank colonies described below were founded not by the absolute newcomers to the Black Sea area, but by the inhabitants of Caffa and other already existing settlements. In this sense we can treat Caffa as a colony that in turn began to colonize the neighbouring coastal areas. Although I would avoid applying the modern concept of imperialism to the medieval Black Sea area, we can describe Genoese colonization in the terms coined by Wolfgang Reinhard, who defined imperialism in the broadest possible sense, as “every form of a polity’s will to expand and dominate”; in the light of which he conceptualized the following: “If imperialism emanates not from a colonial power, like Britain, but from a colony, like Australia, we may speak of ‘sub-imperialism’, and its outcome will be a formal or informal ‘sub-colony’.”\(^6^{19}\) As we can see from the history of the Black Sea colonies, Caffa itself began colonising and thus the new settlements, besides being Caffa’s administrative dependencies, can be safely be referred to as ‘sub-colonies.’

As far as the regional cohesion and consolidation of Gazaria is concerned, we can only make retrospective judgements. Upon the Ottoman conquest in 1475, the Khanate of Crimea became a vassal state of the Ottoman sultan. However, the borders of the Khanate did not coincide with the borders of the Crimean peninsula. On the one hand, the Khans controlled a great deal of the mainland territory of modern day Ukraine. On the other hand, a strip of coastal land coinciding with the borders of Genoese Gazaria did not become part of the Khanate of Crimea, but instead formed first a sancak and then an eyalet – the Ottoman possessions in Crimea under the direct rule of the Sublime Porte. Thus the area that was called under the Byzantine Empire the Theme of Cherson (θέμα Χερσόνησος), or the Theme Klimata (τὰ Κλίματα), and that was called Gazaria under the Genoese now became the Ottoman Eyalet of Kefe. The Ottomans found a unit that was consolidated geographically, climatically, historically, politically, economically, and administratively, and for good reasons they had no intention of making any profound changes.

CHAPTER 4. GOVERNING THE OVERSEAS COLONIES: EVOLUTION AND TRANSFORMATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM

The link between the colony and the metropolis is particularly visible in the fields of administration and law. The institutional history is vitally important in colonial studies. Obviously, governing large territories requires a permanent administration, the accumulation and preservation of documents, and the presence of a military force to enforce law and order. All these components were present in the Genoese Black Sea colonies. However, did the colonial administration, made up of Genoese citizens always follow the patterns laid down by the metropolis? Can we consider Genoese Gazaria as an entity, and as a single consolidated administrative unit, bound by common administration, law, and legal culture? Was this sort of connection present both between Gazaria and Genoa and within Gazaria, i.e. between Caffa and the rest of the colonies? Did the colonies apply the legal norms and provisions of the metropolis in different fields of the colonial administrative and legal practice (like the institutional structures, taxation policies, definitions of lawful and unlawful violence, procedures of the lawsuits, property rights, forms of property, etc.)? And if so, to what extent? On the other hand, how much does the local (Oriental) component contribute in the formation of the new colonial administrative and legal system in this mixed society, and to what extent did it give an impetus to the centrifugal tendencies that took form of adaptation to the local conditions and disintegration? How did this local component influence creation of the new institutions, their functioning and development? What can we say about the interaction of imperial politics and local actors? How did people interact with the institutions and within institutions? What political and legal language did this society use and which practices were behind these formulae? What can we learn about the regional cohesion of Genoese Gazaria and what can we infer regarding such factors in administering it spatially and as regards communications, given that the colonial administration of Caffa often had to act on its own initiative without relying on the metropolis. The administrations in Gazaria also often had to act on their own without relying on Caffa? How did the community of colonizers survive and evolve in institutional terms exposed to the constant threat from the

620 For a fuller explanation of this point see: Барабанов, Суд и право в генуэзских факториях Причерноморья (XIII-XV вв.), гражданский судебный процесс, PhD thesis (Moscow, МГУ, 1997).
622 Impositio Officii Gazariae, Monumenta Historiae Patriae, vol. 2: Leges municipales (Turin, 1838), col. 298-430
623 As I mention elsewhere Genoese Gazaria preserved its Ghibelline rule even when the Guelfs took over Genoa.
Tatar steppe and then from the emerging Ottoman power, together with the threat of unrest and revolts from its not always loyal Oriental subjects? Can we see a link between the evolution of the administrative and military systems of the colonies and the complicated and not always peaceful relations between the colonizers and the Orientals?

Looking at the relations between the Latin–Italian colony and the Oriental environment in which it existed and with which it interacted, we should avoid two temptations. The first and least dangerous one is that since multiculturalism is now a trend and everybody wants to find as much of it as possible in the past, there is a nineteenth-century tendency to deal almost exclusively with the *Italian presence* on the Black Sea, largely ignoring the role of the Orientals. Another temptation, which only became possible in present times after decolonization and with the trend of multiculturalism and migration studies, is a postcolonial tendency to deny all kinds of vertical connections and social hierarchies (and, in our case, the basically colonial character of the Genoese settlements overseas), substituting it by the studies of the horizontal interactions, personal networks, etc. In my opinion, both must be avoided.

In order to understand the role of the Orientals in the formation of the Genoese Caffa we should ask the following question: was there any kind of continuity between the medieval Genoese citadel and the ancient Greek acropolis on the one hand, and between the burgs populated mostly by the Orientals and the ancient *chora* on the other? Were the very birth of Caffa *qua* community and its urban development in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a result of the interaction and equal or almost equal collaboration between the Latins and local people? The ethnic, confessional, and religious structure of the city was complex; the Genoese Caffa was by no means ‘a city of (just) Genoese’, and as a result of its remoteness from the metropolis and arguably because of the integration of the local population into its Latin society, the colonies tended to become relatively autonomous with respect to the metropolis, even if this was not a conscious strategy. Did, however, the Orientals take an active part in and contributed to the formation of the Commune of Caffa from the outset?

For the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries we can say with no doubts that it is implausible that the Oriental urban communities of Caffa (those of the Greeks, Armenians, Muslims, and Jews) either performed a considerable self-organization or enjoyed a large
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624 Genoese Caffa took form in the course of time. The power in Caffa was monopolized by the patriciate and therefore Caffa sometimes disobeyed the metropolis, e.g. when the Guelfs took over there, remaining faithful to the Ghibellines party. This eventually led to a certain degree of autonomization of Caffa, which, remaining a Genoese colony, developed a separate and distinctive colonial identity of its own.
degree of self-government under the Genoese rule. Conversely, there was indeed some kind of ‘representation’ of the Orientals of the hinterland – a previously mentioned officer called a tudun or titanus chanlucorum. The same does not look to be the case for the urban communities of the local people in Caffa. However, was had been the same in the earlier stage, when Caffa was still in the making, and if so, how far did the local people contribute to shaping the Commune of Caffa? From what we know from the sources, there are no grounds to think of Caffa as an independent Commune or city-state, born from the egalitarian union and collaboration of local and Western elements. Indeed, besides the Latins there were the four above-mentioned communities of the Orientals, which enjoyed some privileges. Apparently, each of them also had its own religious leader. However, the existence of the religious leaders of each religious community even with some kind of representatives (if we assume that they existed) who could speak on behalf of the communities before the Genoese authorities does not mean that Caffa was not a colony of Genoa, or that it was a political marriage of newcomers with local people building a common urban community. We obviously cannot deny the role of the Orientals in shaping urban and social environment of Caffa, but it seems preposterous to deny the essentially Latin, Western, and colonial essence of the city, commune, and administration.

In the thirteenth century, Caffa could appear relatively stochastically, but this does not deny its colonial nature or its essentially Western character of city-formation. The local communities of Orientals, who cohabitated with the Italians in Caffa, never had equal rights with the Latins and were not part of a ‘social contract’ in the process of the emergence and formation of the city of Caffa. Perhaps the best proof of their initial legal and political inferiority is the fact that in the 1310s the Genoese had to ‘regain’ or ‘re-appropriate’ the land outside the citadel walls, that is to re-establish their rule over it, and that the consul had full rights to dispose of this land in the name of the Commune, which clearly means that the Genoese initially regarded these lands populated by Orientals as a property of the Commune. Thus, Caffa was a colonial project of the Genoese rather than an initially democratic formation deriving from a voluntary union of the Genoese citadel with the local population. The constitution of Caffa, its administration and bureaucracy were modelled on the patterns of Genoa, and one of the best proofs of this is the fact that they preserved a predominantly aristocratic form of constitution throughout their entire history, notwithstanding the political changes taking place in the metropolis.
From the outset, the Genoese Black Sea colonies had dual subjection. On the one hand, Caffa was subject to the suzerainty of the Tatar Khans since it was founded on the territory under their jurisdiction and formally thanks to their permission, however, after 1360s–1380s this ‘subjection’ became something of a formality. On the other hand, Caffa and all of Genoese Gazaria under its authority were subject to Genoa and made up its Black Sea colonial empire (imperium Gazarie). This suzerainty over Gazaria was taken very seriously by the Genoese even in spite of their somewhat loose administration and state machine both in the colonies and the metropolis, which was characteristic for Genoa in general. Balard wrote that although Caffa suffered from all the same vices as its metropolis (the Commune was constantly in debt, the courts were corrupt, the consuls and other officers belonged to the oligarchy and pursued their own private or corporate interests rather than public ones). Moreover, the administration of Caffa fulfilled its main function of dominating the local Orientals, exploiting the area, and applying all possible diplomatic and military measures to secure maximum success for Genoese commerce. Thus, notwithstanding the formal suzerainty of the Khans, there is no doubt that the Genoese Caffa began, evolved, and ended as a Genoese colony.

The same applies to the nature of the legal system of Gazaria. Genoa law applied in Gazaria was derived from Roman law without any synthesis or Germanic element. It inherited the Codex iuris civilis and had its own extra codifications of 1229 (by podestà Jacopo Baldovini), and the civil statutes of 1375, amended in 1403 and 1413–1414. The principles of law applied in Caffa were entirely, and exclusively Genoese, and the law and legal procedure themselves were the law and legal procedure of the Republic of Genoa, with certain inclusions deriving from the adaptation to local customs and practices, which were not of major importance, i.e. they functioned within the Genoese system of law without changing its foundations. We should not be misled by certain rights, guarantees and privileges enjoyed by the Orientals and the limited degree of autonomy enjoyed by their

625 The jarligs of the Tatar Khans were considered by the Genoese as treaties (the chrysobulls of the Byzantine and Trebizond Emperors likewise), while from the point of view of the giving side this was a grant of privileges made by a charter addressed from a superior (Tatar Khans) to the inferior (the Genoese). The attitude towards the gifts to the Khans, their ambassadors, and other local rulers that ate a considerable part of the budget of Commune of Caffa varied as well: the Genoese called these gifts exenia and not tributum, thus highlighting that they were voluntary presents rather than a tribute as a sign of dependence.
626 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 356-357.
627 Барбашов, Суд и право в генуэзских факториях Причерноморья (XIII-XV вв.): гражданский судебный процесс, PhD thesis (Moscow, МГУ, 1997), 12-14.
religious communities, as well as obligations and even oaths pronounced by the Genoese and concerning the Orientals. In the same way we should not refer to the shortage of sources and conclude, incorrectly, that the nature of the law of Gazaria is ambiguous. The colonial cases were judged in situ and not brought to the higher, supreme courts of Genoa. They remained internal affairs and rarely became matters of scandal that had to be settled in the metropolis. However, from what we know we have no grounds to doubt the Genoese nature of the law of its colonies. All in all, the metropolis applied the legal system of the metropolis in the colony.

What were the aims and tasks of the governing bodies of Caffa? First and foremost, the colonial administration had to implement general functions: it represented the Commune of Genoa, it applied its policies locally, rendered justice, and managed finances. Genoa already had an experience of managing an administration overseas in the crusader kingdoms. The constitution was strongly influenced by the Genoese political development and struggle. Thus, magistrates were appointed/elected keeping the balance between the nobility and the popolo, as well as between the parties of Guelfs and Ghibellines. Since on the one hand the Genoese regarded their overseas domains as the possessions of the Republic of St. George, and, on the other hand, the ruling class of Genoa did not always have a clear understanding of the constantly changing situation in Gazaria, the Genoese had to combine the appointment of officers and their assistants from the metropolis with the election of the magistrates by the local community of Genoese citizens. Another factor that gave more political rights to the local Genoese living in the colony and their magistrates was the constant lack of money in the communal budget. This was made up for by the private funds of the Genoese Caffiotes, and since they contributed to the budget they also needed to have a vote. This shows clearly that while being a fully-fledged colony, Caffa was in essence, much like Genoa itself, more a combination of private initiatives than a rigid apparatus of governance.

Studying the administrative connection between the metropolis and the colonies, in our case – Genoa and Genoese Gazaria with a centre in Caffa, we should take into account space, time, distance, infrastructure, and intensiveness of communication. In good weather the naval voyage from Genoa to Caffa took from one and a half to two months. In bad conditions it could take up to four months. Some local conflict and an interruption of communication
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629 Karpov, “New Documents on the Relations between the Latins and the Local Populations in the Black Sea Area (1392-1462),” 35.
630 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 473.
could lead to even greater delays, and the instructions of the Genoese government could lose their relevance after several months because of the change in the political situation. Genoese officers in Caffa had to act and take decisions in a difficult political reality relying pretty much on their own following the guidelines from the metropolis. Thus, on the one hand, Gazaria was a colonial domain subject to the authority of the metropolis, while on the other it enjoyed considerable autonomy, or rather, was deemed to have it. Moreover, all the settlements and their administrations were deemed to the same autonomy to a certain extent – Caffa maintained the administrative connections in the Black Sea region, sending orders and controlling their execution, but the local authorities often had to rely on their own means. Occasional couriers, mainly not office-holders but travelling merchants, could pass some documentation from metropolis to the colonies; however, this was certainly not enough to direct and administer all aspects of colonial life. Nonetheless, Genoa exercised its power over its overseas colonies, and the best example of it was the administration of Gazaria, that was appointed and annually renewed by the metropolis.

The institutional evolution of the administrative system of Caffa began in the 1310s with the establishment of the Major Council (twenty-four members – twenty cives and four burgenses) and the Minor Council (six members elected by the Major Council – five cives and one burgensis), and in general terms was formed by the late fourteenth century – the time when the Genoese colonial empire of Gazaria was established. The consul, who headed the administration appointed from Genoa, and had a vicarius (normally be a professional lawyer who dealt with the lawsuits of the colony, see below) and special law enforcement helpers, and was assisted by a number of lower-ranking specialized councils and commissions called official. These were composed of the inhabitants of the city and functioned on a voluntarily and non-salaried basis. In/After the 1390s a new office called the Council of the Six (with six and, later, eight members) appeared. This was made up of the members of officia and the massarii, who also controlled the treasury with the help of six notaries-scribes. Besides the military officers who were called the captains of the burgs and antiburgs, of the towers, and of the city gates, who resided in Caffa, and of the heads of hundreds and tens, there were consuls and castellans who ruled the towns and castles in Gazaria beyond Caffa. Over time
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we can see that the administrative apparatus of Caffa had grown in quantity and complexity, becoming more detailed and for that times apparently more efficient and its magistrates more specialized.

As for the bureaucratic machine of the metropolis, in the periods of independence of the Republic of St. George, the supreme authority over the colonies was in the hands of the Genoese doge and the Council of Elders who decided on crucial issues. For more technical administration, there were two commissions in Genoa regulating the life of the Black Sea colonies and sending the instructions to the colonial administration.632 The Officium Gazarie that had to take care of developing the city of Caffa was created around 1313–1314633 (initially the Officium octo sapientium super factis navigandi et Maris Maioris). In 1316, it was this commission that began taking care of general planning and development in Caffa, replacing the previous stochastic urban growth.634 Later in the fourteenth century, another commission, Officium Provisionis Romanie was created (first mentioned in 1377,635 and its first known decisions are dated to 1424).636 After magistrates of Caffa were appointed by the doge and the Council of Elders and accepted the appointment,637 they received instructions from these commissions,638 particularly from the Officium Gazarie, and swore to act according to the laws and statutes of Genoa, implementing the instructions received.

**Consul.** The consul of Caffa represented the highest hierarchical position in the system of the colonial authorities of Genoese Gazaria. The office is first mentioned in the documents dating to 1281,639 when it was still subordinate to the podestà of Pera, which was the case until 1300.640 The consul was appointed to Caffa from Genoa for a term of one year, and legally could not remain in office for longer, although in practical terms the new consul often did not arrive in time due to difficulties in transportation and communications.641 Normally,
the consuls came from a noble family background. Having taken the oath, the consul also had to pay a pledge of 4,000 livri called stallia, and at the end of his term he was obliged to give a detailed report to be sent to Genoa about all the violations of Genoese law in the colonies, and his performance was meticulously examined by the inspectors. If some misdemeanour was discovered, as was often the case, all the fines for the violations he committed were deducted from his initial deposit.

On his arrival in Caffa a new consul was obliged to summon the council and present the patent confirming his mandate, publicly reading the instructions that he had received. He then had to take the oath again, promise to observe the Genoese laws and to exercise justice according to them, familiarize himself immediately with all the Genoese and colonial statutes and legislation, and rule on decisions on all unfinished lawsuits. In particular, the consul had personal financial responsibility for the justness of the decisions that he took in these lawsuits, as well as for postponing them. At this early point, the consuls were salaried at 1,200 aspres per month, from which only 200 were paid from the treasury to cover his household costs, while other 1,000 were levied from the merchants modo consuetum. However, if the consul engaged in any commercial activity (completely forbidden as of the fifteenth century), he lost the right to these 1,000 aspres levied on the merchants. Any private gifts exceeding the price of 10 soldi given to consul were considered bribery, and the consul who accepted them would be liable to a fine of 200 libri and dismissal from the chance of being given the position of consul for a further ten years. Although the Ordo of 1316 forbids the consul of Caffa from meddling in the affairs of other Black Sea colonies (limiting his jurisdiction and authority to Caffa alone), as early as 1343 the consul of Caffa was called ‘and of all Gazaria’. Thus, effectively, with 1343 as a terminus ante quem he became the true head of all Genoese colonial domain on the Black Sea, actually the magistrates to other Genoese settlements and Solkhat appointing by the end of the fourteenth century and being called consul Caffe et januensium in toto imperio Gazarie.
The consul was in charge of the colonial budget, taxes, and fines, but here a checks-and-balances system worked, since he could dispose of it all only together with the council and *Officium Monete*, also being responsible for the expenses of the defence, building, garrison, and armaments. The consul also had to dispense justice, deal with the lawsuits, appoint curators for the property of deceased Caffiotes, and take part in organizing auctions to sell their property to cover their debts, which was a part of the inheritance procedure. From 1398, he also received pleas from the people of Caffa and had to judge on cases of abuse. He also represented Caffa in diplomatic relations, supervised the armaments of the garrison and fleet, mobilized the home guards, headed fortification projects, ensured that the legislation on trade was observed and that the Genoese merchants did not break the law and the treaties and respected all the limitations. In addition, he levied taxes, minted coins, controlled all the other magistrates and brought them to trial in cases of abuse, ran the public auctions, including those selling empty land, controlled the activities of the notaries and *massarii*, confirmed Genoese citizenship and granted the status of *burgensis*, supervised the water supply and building of cisterns, and supervised the Genoese in the neighbouring cities.650

Besides the consul of the city, who enjoyed paramount ruling rights, the sources occasionally cite people called *consules burgorum* in the sources. Early on in the history of Caffa in 1316, the *consul burghi* were head of a quartier, or an emerging burg. Unlike the main consul of Caffa, they lived in the burgs rather than the citadel and apparently had very limited functions. They could rule on cases of petty crime, could dispose of the lands of those who died without heirs, and organized building projects, especially for fortifications.651 Probably their role was only important in the 1310s, when the Genoese returned to Caffa to launch a big project to demarcate land and to build city walls.

By the early fifteenth century, the consul of Caffa is listed in the rolls preceding the *podestà* of Pera,652 to whom he was a subject a century before. This reflected the growing role of Caffa as well as the centralization of Genoese Gazaria around its administrative hub. His salary was more than that of other officials, but only amounted to 4,800 *aspri* a year in
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651 Balard, “Les formes militaires de la colonisation génoise (XIIIe-XIVe siècles),” 76.
1316, plus 2,400 per year to fund his servants, and an exemption from taxes connected to any commercial activity; otherwise, he could receive 12,000 aspri per year\(^\text{653}\) (which is indirect evidence that his incomes from trade could be at least five times higher than his salary, because this was simply a reimbursement for the tax exemption). In 1363, the *famiglia* of the consul was paid a total of 320 sommi per annum.\(^\text{654}\) However, by the fifteenth century his salary had risen to as much as 56,000 aspri, plus around 6,000 aspri for extraordinary expenses, and various privileges and services that were due to him. In addition, we should not forget that the consul engaged in various trade operations, often sacrificing more time and energy to them than to his official duties, and presumably earning more money from them than from his official salary (see above; judging from the sum of an equivalent exemption from taxes the consul could earn much more than his salary by trade in 1316). Thus, the growing prestige and economic importance of Caffa as an administrative centre of Genoese Gazaria can also be seen in the prestige, economic wealth, – and especially – the legally determined and *ad hoc* established power of its consul.

As the role of Caffa increased in the fifteenth century the consul became the virtual head of the Genoese colonial empire of Gazaria, and perhaps the best paid Genoese officer in the entire Eastern Mediterranean. The consul had to be in office and preside over the sessions of the curia of Caffa every Monday, Thursday, and Saturday. Unlike earlier times, he was forbidden under penalty of a fine to engage in trade and tax farming, to abuse his seal, to take bribes, and he was also explicitly forbidden to buy slaves; on his departure for Liguria he could only take two servants and was obliged to leave two full sets of arms to the Commune.\(^\text{655}\) Since the consul of Caffa was very well paid, he could maintain a considerable entourage. By 1449, the consul’s *famiglia* had grown substantially compared to previous times, and now included knights, squires, servants, bodyguards, trumpeters, musicians, and a chaplain; he also had stables with six horses at his disposal. There was also a mounted Tatar guard that he used for the defence of the fortress of Caffa, and a special category of military men called *orguxii*, who composed his entourage, acted as police, provided an escort to ambassadors, and inspected the *casalia* of Gothia. In 1375, there were six *orguxii*, in 1382 – ten, and in 1387 – seven. On taking up office, the consul had to swear an oath to observe the statute and to leave after a year on the same ship on which he arrived. His performance at the
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\(^\text{653}\) Ordo de Caffa (1316), 387.

\(^\text{654}\) Regulae Communis Ianuae (1363), col. 360-362. In 1448, consul funded the household pretty much like in the fourteenth century. Statutum Caphe (1448), 581-582.

\(^\text{655}\) “Statutum Caphe,” 582-585, 642, 679.
end of this year was carefully investigated in Genoa. Quite often one and the same person would occupy the position of consul one year and that of massarius the next or the other way around. Thus, Girolamo Giustiniani was appointed consul of Caffa in October 9, 1422 and in 1423, while a burgensis Caffe Frederico Spinola de Luculo, who was a massarius Caffe under Girolamo Giustiniani, otherwise for a while acted as a tax farmer, and was also at a certain point sent on a ship to Cembalo, and became a consul in 1423. Similarly, the consul of 1424 Pietro Fieschi served before as a massarius together with Frederico Spinola de Luculo. In 1461, Guiraldo Lomellino is mentioned in two ways – as a consul and as a prouisor et massarius; the same was true for Raffaele de Monte Rubeo, who then held these two positions.

**Council.** According to the *Imposicio Officii Gazarie*, the Major Council of Caffa was made up of twenty-four city inhabitants permanently residing there, twenty cives (which effectively meant Genoese noblemen) and four burgenses (i.e. the burgers of Caffa), which is five-sixths noblemen to one-sixth commoners. Initially, this council formed the legislature of Caffa, and took all the major decisions. The councillors of the Major Council (anziani), elected in a closed hall and without the intervention of the consul, elected in their turn by a Minor Council of six members. The Minor Council elected the commercial supervisors for the markets and two syndics; the Minor Council also had responsibility to help the consul in cases where people died without a will, as well as in organizing public auctions. Although these two councils were established in 1316, the Major Council became obsolete, or at least it cannot be found in the later sources. In the council (hereafter meaning the Minor Council), the six positions were divided as follows: there were two nobles (cives), two representatives of commissions (*Officium Guerre* and *Officium Provisionis*), and two engaged in tax collection. The role of the council was vitally important in financial affairs, especially those
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656 If the consul died before the end of the year, the officers of Caffa together with the members of the commissions had to elect four Genoese citizens and then a choice was made with a ballot for the temporary consul.
657 MC 1423, 1r, 16r, 44r, 52r, 55r, 55v, 58r, 59r, 68v, 82r, 90v, 91v, 93r, 94r, 122v, 123v, 126v, 127r, 146r, 152r, 160r, 194v, 206v, 226r, 231v, 231v bis, 253r, 243v, 244v, 264v, 271v.
658 MC 1461, 1r, 16r, 16r, 44r, 46r, 46v, 47r, 69v, 70r, 71v, 76r, 77v, 95v, 96v, 97v, 99r, 99v bis, 100r, 100r bis, 165v, 170r, 173r, 201r, 204v, 206r, 206r bis, 407v end/408v reg, 407v end/408r reg.
659 MC 1461, 1r, 16r, 44r, 46r, 46v, 69v, 70r, 71r, 77v, 95v, 97v, 101v, 148r, 173r, 173r bis, 180v, 201r, 204v, 206r, 206r bis, 239v, 311r, 407v end/408r reg, 408r end/407v reg, 408r end/407r reg bis.
660 Ordo de Caffa, 346-350.
662 Ordo de Caffa, 349, 354.
connected to the budget of the colony, but it also assisted the consul in all other political matters.\footnote{663}{ASG, MC 1374, ff. 7r, 8r, 9r, 55v, 56r. MC 1386, f. 40r, f. 657r.} By the fifteenth century, the council had grown from six to eight members, and had become slightly more ‘democratic’, since the \textit{burgenses} had an equal share with the \textit{cives}. According to the Statute of Caffa of 1449, the \textit{anziani} of the council had to be elected by the consul, \textit{massarii}, and previous members of the council.\footnote{664}{“Statutum Caphe,” 585 – 586.} All the significant decisions passed through the council.

\textbf{Syndics} shared responsibility with the consul for administering justice and were, to a certain extent, the ‘Supreme Court’ of Caffa, especially for criminal affairs. This body was composed of two \textit{cives} and two \textit{burgenses}, both bodies elected for three months. They were elected by an assembly composed of consul, \textit{massarii}, councillors, and members of commissions, eight \textit{cives} and eight \textit{burgenses}. Syndics judged all lawsuits of more than 5 \textit{sommo}, while the rest were dealt with by the consul and his vicar. They held daily sessions in which two of them had to be present, and twice a week all four met together. A syndic could be excluded from this body if the consul, \textit{massarii}, and \textit{Officium Monete} voted to do so. The syndics could be punished for an abuse of authority by a fine ranging from 25 to 100 \textit{sommo}. The syndics could bring any of the officers of Gazaria to trial, they supervised all the magistrates, fined councillors and officers if they broke the law, took oaths from all the officers, monitored the prices in the market judging from the amount ‘of the products available in city, took decisions concerning granting freedom to fugitive slaves looking for asylum, investigated and judged any abuses made by bureaucrats at any level (even including complaints about the consul and his vicar).\footnote{665}{“Statutum Caphe,” 585–593, 600–602.}

Besides these main, ‘general’ syndics, there were other four syndics who were appointed to inspect the performance of the officers of the Commune. They could be either \textit{cives} or \textit{burgenses} and were elected every year by the consul, council, \textit{massarii}, commissions, six \textit{cives} and six \textit{burgenses} of Caffa. Upon their election, during the first month of their office they received and investigated all complaints against any officer of Caffa whose term had ended and whose performance therefore had to be evaluated, applying torture where deemed necessary to the witnesses and those accused of bribing officers, ruling decisions on these lawsuits, mainly where officers’ corruption was concerned, and sentencing
officers to fines to be collected by the Officium Monete. Another body called the Sindicatores officialium maris Maioris functioned in a similar way, but which had more scope even extending to the whole of Gazaria: in each case the new consuls and councils of the Genoese towns had to elect two auditors who received and dealt with complaints against former officers in their first ten days of office. These auditors, however, had more limited power than the syndics, since they did not sentence the officers themselves, but instead sealed the documents and passed them on to the general syndics of Caffa and the consul. The consul, council, and massarii elected three syndics, who announced that the complaints had been received during the following fifteen days; after that, the syndics investigated the cases and ruled relevant decisions and sentences within one month.\footnote{666}{The Massaria Caffae 1423 mentions three syndics: Melchiorre di Vultabio (referred to as the ‘most experienced judge’, \textit{iudex peritus}),\footnote{667}{Agostino di Marini (a syndic of the Bank of St. George, \textit{sindicus et procurator Officii Sancti Georgii de Ianue}, and combined this position with that of a tax farmer, \textit{emptor commerchii magni Caffe}),\footnote{668}{and a notary and treasury guard Niccolò de Matteo (\textit{notarius… scriba et custos[s] sacristie Caffe}).\footnote{669}{In 1461, only one syndic is mentioned; his name was Giovanni Bartolomeo di Collis, and he was at the same time acting as a \textit{vicarius (dominus vicarius, sindicus comunis Caffe)}}.}

\textbf{Vicarius.} The vice-consul, or \textit{vicarius}, was primarily the consul’s deputy and assistant; moreover, and the colony’s judge. Although the right of supreme justice belonged to the consul and the syndics, in technical terms justice was more often rendered by consul’s \textit{vicarius} for minor cases (or even for major ones, since he could sentence a person to corporal punishment). The \textit{vicarius} received the pleas of the Caffiotes, made inventories of the deceased, and confirmed the notarization of documents.\footnote{671}{He also imposed fines together with the consul. The first \textit{Ordo} of Caffa (1316) did not mention the \textit{vicarius}, but this office was repeatedly mentioned in the notarial deeds of Niccolò Beltrame (1343–1344) and Niccolò de Bellignano (1382). In the late fourteenth century, the \textit{vicarius} was paid 4,500 \textit{aspri} a year. In the fifteenth century, \textit{vicarius domini consulis civitatis Caffe} is mentioned as part of the consul’s \textit{famiglia}, whom the consul chose himself before his departure from}
Genoa, selecting a sufficiently knowledgeable Genoese citizen, and whose candidature was then confirmed by the *Officium Provixionis Romanie*. The *vicarius* was constantly next to the consul rendering justice to all the lawsuits for less than 5 soldi, including those connected to the taxes and tolls. His salary was 40 *sommo* a year, and although having a somewhat subject position in relation to the consul on whom he entirely depended, the vicar was one of the most important figures in everyday life of Caffa. He also had heralds and messengers, who could summon people to court and who made public announcements. It was necessary to be a university graduate in law to apply for this position; many of the *vicarii* were even doctors in law. This was the case with Prospero di Ovada in 1423, a nobleman and a doctor of law (*dominus, legum doctor*), and with Giovanni de Tortis de Castronuovo (*legum doctor*). The sources of the same year also mention three former *vicarii*, who continued to life in Caffa: Giovanni Bombello, Ricialbano Donati de Ricialbanis, and a judge Antonio de La Cavana (*iudex peritus*). In 1461 we find two active *vicarii*, Lorenzo de Calvi, formerly a scribe of the *massaria*, and then Giovanni Bartolomeo de Collis, who was also a syndic, alongside them we find evidence of two former *vicarii* Lansaroto de Beccaria and Alberto Bulla.

*Judiciary officer* (*quarelerius*) was responsible for law-enforcement, and similar to bailiff, or sheriff, or marshal, or *landdrost*. He executed all the court sentences including corporal punishment. His salary was 24 *somni* a year, but he also had additional irregular sources of income. Notably, in 1423 this position was occupied by a Greek (*Savasterius quarelerius*). Interestingly enough in terms of studying the penitential system and practice in Caffa, this Greek *quarelerius* had to execute humiliating punishments against noble...

Massarii. The first prototype of massarii appeared early on in Caffa. They were elected by the Major Council from among its members and were in charge of the treasury. Then, this developed into an institute of key importance in all spheres of governance not limited to the treasury or even only to financial affairs. Two accountants (massarii) were elected each year when the new consul came to Caffa by this new consul, previous massarii, and the councillors. Their term of office lasted six months, during which each of them acted for three months as a senior massarius with the guardianship of the seal and three months as a junior massarius. The responsibility of these officers was to manage the treasury of the Commune. They also took part in the work of most of the other bodies, including the council. Like many other officers, they remained in office during the same term as the consul, and had to leave their books of accounts (massariae) for their successors. The massarii held their massariae in double entry bookkeeping system, which allows us to reconstruct many aspects of colonial life. The Massariae were sent to Genoa so that the metropolis could control the situation in the colony, and many of them are preserved in the Archivio di Stato di Genoa. Massarii were elected to represent the [Italian] population of Caffa, so that one would be a nobleman and another a popolanus, one a Guelf, and another –

---
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Together with massarii and on the same working conditions we find a scribe, one of the Genoese notaries, and also two other people, one of whom acted as a messenger. They were paid 45 sommi per year plus some other incomes. Although the massarii had to record the colonial budget, the balance of administration was almost constantly in deficit (the massarii themselves rarely calculated the balance, which creates a problem of attribution of the ledgers within the double-entry bookkeeping system). They were not just treasurers – one of their most important functions was also to act as syndics (indeed this is a frequently discovered formula massarii et syndici communis Ianue in Caffa), and had to meticulously control all the activity of their predecessors. As mentioned above, it was not uncommon to occupy a position of massarius after serving a term as consul. Thus, on October 1422, two new massarii formally accepted office and remained in it during most of 1423: they were a nobleman and a burgensis Caffe Frederico Spinola de Luculo, who later became a consul in 1423, and Pietro de Fieschi Count of Lavania [sic], who later became a consul in 1424. Moreover, Massaria Caffae 1423 mentions Girolamo Giustiniani as a massarius, Paolo Media, Corrado Cigalla, a tax farmer (emptor introitus commerchii magni Caffe), used to be massarius in the past (olim massarius Caffe), and in 1423 was appointed an ambassador the Tatar Khan’s court (itturus ad dominum imperatorum Magni Horde). Giovanni de Candia is mentioned as a nuncius presentis officii massarie Caffe, that is the office. For 1461, we know three names of people, who occupied, subsequently and/or together, the office of massarius: Geraldo Lomellino (who in another term served as a consul), Raffaele de Monte Rubeo (who also served as a consul in another term), and Baldassarre Doria; besides them, the ledger mentions a nuncius massarie Giorgio de Comago.
Consul's curia, notaries, and scribes. I will not focus on the essence and functioning of the Italian notariate; but it is indispensable to illustrate the role of the notaries in the life of Gazaria. In 1289–1290, the staff of the curia of Caffa consisted of a notary, who was also a chancellor of the consul’s curia, and two clerks. It worth noting that, unlike Venice, where most if not all notaries belonged to the clergy, the Genoese clerics were explicitly banned from taking part in notarial activity, which was restricted to laymen. Besides the notaries, the consul’s entourage included an interpreter and five servants. The Ordo of 1316 mentions other minor officers, who (unlike e.g. massarii) did not need to be elected in Genoa by the government, but were appointed locally by the consul in agreement with his council. In the same year the Officium Gazarie also made certain dispositions about the notary and the curia: they introduced a requirement of mandatory membership of the guild of notaries and a pledge of 800 livri before departure (the practice of pledge was common for all officers, and was called stallia in the case of the consul); the notary’s income consisted of payments for deeds that he arranged for individuals and a percent levied during the auctions held after someone’s death as per the inheritance procedure. By the early fifteenth century, as the city of Caffa and the colonial domain grew, the number of minor officers of curia increased.
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sharply: there were already three notaries-scribes, one crier (cintracus),\textsuperscript{705} the head of the law-enforcement system, five interpreters, and six judiciary officers. In the mid-fifteenth century, there were about fifteen scribes and over twenty notaries. Normally, the positions of notaries and scribes were filled for one year, and they had to pay special taxes on their positions. The curia had court functions dealing with the cases punished with a fine of over 500 aspres. The notaries and scribes of the curia worked in the loggia and drew up litigation protocols, lawsuits, court sentences and decisions, administrative documents, and private notarial deeds.\textsuperscript{706} The notaries had to draw up every deed from a sketch (scheda) often preserved in a special notebook (quaternus schedarum). Then the notary drew two copies of the full text; one was also given to the client on a separate sheet of parchment, and was called instrumentum, while another one, looking somewhat less solemn, but sometimes containing the full text of the deed was called imbreviatura and was recorded in another notebook, which the notary had to preserve. A notebook with imbreviature meant that the deed could be restored if the instrumentum was lost. Normally, the scribes, who often acted as public notaries, graduated from the universities in Ars notaria. The consul’s curia seems to have employed a large number of people, at least in 1423. The head of the curia was a chancellor – this position in the specified year was held by a notary Matteo de Dominico (notarius et cancellerius Caffe, scriba Caffe).\textsuperscript{707}

The numbers of notaries and scribes working in Caffa in this year, whether in the curia or other branches of the administration such as the officii are indeed striking and account for thirty-two people: Antonio de Ansaldo,\textsuperscript{708} Antonio de Bonincontro,\textsuperscript{709} Antonio de Camogli,\textsuperscript{710} Antonio de Pagani,\textsuperscript{711} Battista de Recco,\textsuperscript{712} Gregorio de Labiano,\textsuperscript{713} Girolamo de Sancta Agneta,\textsuperscript{714} Giovanni de Recco,\textsuperscript{715} Giovanni de Spigno,\textsuperscript{716} Lombardo de Sancto Stefano,\textsuperscript{717} Niccolò de Lazarino,\textsuperscript{718} Oberto Garetti (scriba officialium Officii capitum Sancti
Antonii), Pietro de Recallo, Giovanni Balbi, Antonio de Monte, Giorgio de Caneto, Giacomo de Palodio (who worked in Soldaia – socius burgi Soldaye/socius Soldaye), Francesco de Canicia (who was the actual scribe writing massaria that I was studying notarius et scriba presentis massarie), Giacomo de Podio (in Samastro – olim socius Samastri), Oberto Grasso (scriba officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii/olim officii capitum Sancti Antonii), Niccolò de Mateo (also serving as a syndic and a treasury guard – sindicus comunis Ianue in Caffa, scriba et custode sacristie Caffe), Antonio de Millia (in Samastro – socius Samastri), Giacomo de Palodio (in Soldaia – socius burgi Soldaye, socius Soldaye), Giacomo de Podio (in Samastro – olim socius Samastri), Bartolomeo Greppo, Battista de Castilione (scriba deputati, who was a scribe, but not a notary), a Greek Cosma Scanigia (scriba galleote Marci Spinulle/scriba galleote olim patronizate per Marcum Spinulla, who was a scribe, but not a notary), Sisto Cattaneo (scriba Officii capitum Sancti Antonii de Caffa, scriba officii capitum sarracenorum; a scribe, but not a notary), Antonio de Goano, Antonio de Sancta Agneta, Bartolomeo de Framura, and Pier Giovanni Maynerius.

Even though three of these thirty-two people are not notaries, even though some of them were not constantly or even predominantly in Caffa, and even though probably not all of
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them worked together at one single time (within a year some of them were leaving, others were arriving to Caffa), the figure ‘thirty-two scribes and notaries’ looks astonishing. It certainly helps destroy the image of the Genoese colonies in 1400–1452 as dominated by the long-term effects of the fourteenth-century crisis and being unprofitable and decaying in economic terms. A comparison of the number of notaries in 1423 with those in 1461 helps us to understand whether the reasons for the decay and final fall of Caffa were political or economic. Instead of thirty-two clerks in 1423, we find eight in 1461 – three times less: Gandulfo de Portofino, Melchiorre de Garbarino, Guiralde de Vivaldi (notarius massarie nostrre), Baldassarre de Garbarino, Giovanni Bogiolo, Tommaso de Airolo, Cristoforo de Canevalli (who wrote the actual massaria, scriba massarie Caffe, notarius et scriba huius cartularii), and Giacomo Rattono (who worked in Soldaia – prouisionatus Soldaie, scriba curie Soldaie). We will not make this number ‘eight’ much bigger even if we add two ‘former scribes’ and, apparently, brothers or relatives, who anyways were not notaries, namely former scribe of the Commune Emanuele Calvi (olim scriba commune) and former scribe of the massaria Lorenzo di Calvi, who was acting in 1461 already as a vicarious (egregius dominus, dominus vicarius, olim scriba massarie). We cannot take numbers of notaries in the city as an absolutely accurate statistical indicator of its commercial dynamics and prosperity. However, the conclusion is clear: in 1423 Caffa was a prosperous city far from being in decline or decay; the conquest of Constantinople – a political event – influenced the trade, and by 1461 the number of notaries was four times less than thirty-eight years before.
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To finish with the curia, we should mention public criers, special scribes of Oriental languages, and an important group near to the latter, translators and interpreters. Cintracus was a town crier, whose task was to announce to the city population news and decisions of the administration.\textsuperscript{750} This position was not unknown in the rest of Latin Romania outside Caffa: “[I]n Constantinople Greeks were included among the town criers, called plazarii or precones, who delivered official proclamations in public and summoned individuals to appear in court, among interpreters in judicial institutions and at the customs, as well as among official weighers and official middlemen.”\textsuperscript{751} In Caffa, in 1423, this position was held by Niccolò Berguglio, burgensis of Caffa and a tax farmer of terraticorum (emptor terraticorum communis Ianue in Caffa),\textsuperscript{752} and Andrea Cipollino (Cepulinus), also a burgensis of Caffa and a tax farmer of wine (emptor cabella vini Cimballi).\textsuperscript{753} In particular, since Andrea Cipollino is directly referred to as alter cintracus Caffe, we can infer that, like the massarii, cintrachi worked in twos and there must have been at least two of them at the same time. Another interesting fact is that Andrea Cipollino used to be a soldier for Bartholomei de Levanto in Cembalo (socius Cimbali subrogatus loco Bartholomei de Levanto), perhaps because of the death or wounding of the latter. It seems that being a soldier in Cembalo (we do not know for how long) he did not lose his position of town-crier in Caffa. In 1461, there were still, as previously, two town-criers: Bartolomeo de Boliasco\textsuperscript{754} and Niccolò Luxardo.\textsuperscript{755}

The scribes of Oriental languages were an important nexus in the colonial administration. Even the existence of such profession distinct from the interpreters who served the needs of basic communication with Oriental paperwork in Oriental languages. The evidence proves that the colloquial language of the local population, irrespective of its religious and ethnic identity, was Greek rather than Armenian or Tatar (not to mention other languages) – three out of four special scribes in the Genoese apparatus in 1423 were scribes of Greek, only one being a scribe in the ‘Saracen’ language, which is a Turkic language connected to or the same as Tatar. This is also evidence that the lingua franca of the
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commercial affairs with the Latins in the Black Sea area was Greek, and to a lesser extent ‘Saracen’, rather than, for instance, Armenian. Apparently, this was the language was widely spoken and written among the Oriental merchants from the Genoese colonies and beyond in their business life. The number – four scribes in 1423 – is also quite impressive; this is a direct evidence of an intensive involvement of the Orientals into the commercial contacts with the Westerners. In 1423, these scribes were a Greek Vassili Clapoto (scriptor litterarum grecalium), a Greek Kaloyan Triandafili (Caloiane Triandafilus scriba litterarum grecalium), a Greek Papa Christodorus (scriba litteratum romeorum sive grecalium), and a certain Iohanes de Alexandria otherwise known as Saraf-ad-din (aliax vocatus Sarafadinus), scribe of the ‘Saracen’ language (scriba litterarum sarracenorum). What is interesting, the formula applied to Papa Christodorus, scriba litteratum romeorum sive grecalium, implied both a continuing use of the self-identifier Romaioi (Ρωμαίοι) by the Greek population of the Black Sea area, i.e. the fact that although the Byzantine Empire shrank almost to the city walls of Constantinople and was to fall in thirty years, the Greeks still largely considered themselves ‘Romans’ even in such a remote periphery as Crimea. In 1461 the sources mention just one scribe, this time acting as an interpreter in ‘Saracen’ and living in Cembalo, Hasan Sic (Asansic saracenus interpres Caffe, scriptor litterarum saracenorum). From the fact that Cembalo, not being a large city, needed such an officer, we can suggest that there was an intensive diplomatic correspondence between Cembalo and the Khans of Crimea.

Interpreters. The role of the translators and interpreters in the Genoese colonial administration merits particular attention. The operation of governmental institutions in multilingual societies posed problems of verbal and written communication other than those existing between individuals. This often required more precise formulations, a broader use of written instrumenta, and involved a variety of strategies differing according to the specific circumstances. Communication was especially complex in those territories experiencing the superposition of cultural and linguistic layers as a result of conquest and the imposition of
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long-term rule by foreigners over indigenous populations. This is why the role of the interpreters, actual brokers between the administration and the local population, was so crucial.

In the late thirteenth century, the consul of Caffa had only one interpreter, called Pietro from Milan. At the same time, besides the curial officers, many people in this mixed ethnic environment probably learned at least a certain basic level of each other’s languages, and acted either as private interpreters (in the same period, 1289–1290, a handful of people are described in the deeds as dragomani, including some members of the consul’s famiglia) or as occasional interpreters: this was the case of Iohaninus (Bulgarian), another Iohaninus de Ponterachia (Greek), Muhammed Baiacharounus (Muslim), Stephanus, Costamir, and Barroxa (Armenians). As in the case with the other officers, as the city grew, the number of the interpreters in the curia increased: in 1344, there were already interpreters – Percivalle from Verona and Samuele from Asti, and in the 1380s there must have already been several officers of this kind, since there was a separate interpreter of ‘Uyghur’, that is, Cuman or an early dialect of Tatar based on Cuman-Kypchak, called Francesco de Gibelet; he was not the only interpreter of Tatar, however since in 1381 and 1387 during the treaty-making he was helped by another interpreter of Tatar, Giuliano Panissaro. In 1386, we can note yet another person who was dealing with Tatars as an interpreter and a go-between; he was an Armenian called Ivanixius de Persio – a very interesting case of borrowing an Armenian name Ivanixius (Ovanes) by a (presumably) Genoese; similar to this is the case of Ivanissius di Mari, consul of Caffa in 1381. In 1370s–1380s, interpreters of Greek in Caffa: Luchino Caligepalio, Giovanni Riccio, and Filippo di Sant’Andrea are mentioned several times (the latter perhaps spoke several other languages too, since people of all major nationalities found in Caffa turned to him for help). Other settlements also had their interpreters, such as Demerode de Savasto in Soldaia in 1379–1386, and Antonio Clavexano and a Greek clerk and priest, Papa Nichoforo, in Cembalo also in the 1380s. There are also some cases of
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language teachers in Crimea; thus, a teacher of grammar in Caffa was described earning 1,200 aspri per year, and there is another mention of a **gramaticus grechorum** Cristodorus de Auramisera. In 1449, the Statute of Caffa evidenced the presence of three interpreters and two **scribae – litterarum grecarum** and **litterarum saracenarum** who served the needs of the local population in lawsuits. Besides the scribes of Oriental languages there were also several Oriental notaries: the field of notarial practice was not completely monopolized by the Westerners, since several Greek ones, **tabeliones grecorum**, worked in Caffa, authorized to do so by the Genoese. The payment for curial scribes was negotiable in cases of private clients, but was fixed when they worked for the administration, and if also had the use of a horse in order to move to any point where the consul would order them (it is likely they had much work to do outside Caffa in the *casalia* of Gothia). These scribes were effectively brokers between the Genoese authorities and the local Oriental population.

There are a significant number of curial interpreters both before and after the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. In 1423, these were Benedetto Negro, Guglielmo de Asti, Gianotto de Bassignana, Niccolò de Bassignana (with a title *magister*), Argono Alliata (who worked in Samastro – *socius Samastri*), Giorgio de Lazzari (who worked in Cembalo – *provisionatus Cimbali*), Antonio Zoagli (who worked in Soldaia and was a former tax farmer – *provisionatus Soldaye interpres, olim emptor introytus capitum sclauorum et sclauarum*), and Savva Drago (who also worked in Soldaia – *provisionatus Soldaye, dragomanus*). In 1461, the interpreters’ corps slightly shrank, but was still considerable: Battista de Martiros, Niccolò Birro, Rolando de Guizardis, and Hasan Sic (*Asansic saracenus interpres Caffe, scriptor litterarum saracenorum*) worked in Caffa, while a
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prouisionatus Soldaie Antonio de Benedetti served the needs of Soldaia, as did a former interpreter in Soldaia Domenico de Negro, before him (olim interpres Soldaye).

Switching from the curial staff to other officers, we must mention the Tatars who were in one way or another involved in the Genoese colonial administration of Gazaria. Titans canluchorum was not entirely a part of the Genoese administration – he was an Oriental (a Tatar, Armenian, or Greek) who was appointed by the lords of Solkhat (later on by the Khans of Crimea) upon consultation with the authorities of Caffa; nonetheless, the Genoese equated this officer to a vicarius in terms of the judicial power he could exercise, with a difference that while vicarius was acting in the city of Caffa, this officer had jurisdiction over the rural population subject to Genoese rule. The sources mention titanus canluchorum starting from 1374, that is, from the time that the Genoese occupied the hinterland (casalia Gothie) and thus a vast amount of the former subjects of the Khan (Greeks, Armenians, Tatars, Goths, etc.) found themselves within the borders of Genoese Gazaria. This population was called canluchi, and although they became feudal dependants of the Commune of Caffa and were widely exploited through taxes and public works. Judicially they had to be judged by the joint appointee of the Genoese and the Tatars (titanus canluchorum, in Tatar this office was called the tudun or todum. His responsibility was to collect commerchium canluchorum, to defend the interests of the khanlucks before the Genoese, and to try khanlucks who appeared before him in court. As a figure linked to the court of Solkhat on the one hand, and acting on a daily basis in Genoese Gazaria on the other, the titanus was an intermediary acting as broker with the Genoese administration with the lords of Solkhat/Khans of Crimea and the Genoese administration with the local population.

Other Tatar officers and ambassadors were part of the ruling elite of the Golden Horde and later on of the independent Khanate of Crimea. This group indeed was not a part of the Genoese colonial administration, and included people from the Khan (styled imperator like the emperors of Byzantium and Trebizond) and the lords of Solkhat (domini Sorchati) to the lower nobility – beys, oglans, darogas, as well as official ambassadors and casual.
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messengers. However, in order to make the account complete of how the colonies were ruled complete I will now discuss these people. They are mainly mentioned in the Genoese documents while they came to Caffa and received daily allowances (alapha, alafa, or alaffa) or gifts (exenia – mainly horses, clothes, or weapons).\textsuperscript{789} Massaria Caffe 1423 mentions, first of all, Dawlat Berdi (Dolat Berdi, Odolat Berdi)\textsuperscript{790} of the House of Borjigin,\textsuperscript{791} the Khan in 1419–1421 and 1428 – 1432. While Dawlat Berdi was residing in Crimea, his rights were challenged by a rival Khan of the Golden Horde, his own cousin Ulugh Muhammad, who also received gifts from the Genoese of Caffa and is mentioned in the sources as Macomet Cam imperator l’Ordo Magni tartarorum.\textsuperscript{792} The vassals of the Khan and the subordinate rulers of Crimea, that is, the lords of Solkhat (domini Sorcati, domini Sorchati) are also frequently mentioned: Orda Coicha,\textsuperscript{793} Tegene bey,\textsuperscript{794} Balta bey,\textsuperscript{795} Sa’id Ismail (Sayto Ismail),\textsuperscript{796} Bactobissaibi,\textsuperscript{797} and Kutul Bulat (Catollus Polat).\textsuperscript{798} Besides the Khans and the lords of Solkhat, we find in Caffa in 1423 lower-ranking Tatar nobility: ambassadors Süleyman (Solimanus de Sorchati, ambaxador domini Orda Coicha domini Sorchati),\textsuperscript{799} Botalbey (tartarus missus Caffam)\textsuperscript{800} Sa’id Mansur (Sayto Mansor nuncius),\textsuperscript{801} Tashames (Tashames nuncius Odolat Berdi),\textsuperscript{802} Suscolac Isoc (tatarus ambassadorus),\textsuperscript{803} a tax collector and an ambassador Sartoc (Sartoc darroga tartarus, ambaxador imperatoris magni horde),\textsuperscript{804} a collector of commerchium Edil bey (Edilbey commerchiarius),\textsuperscript{805} other minor Tatar nobility that received gifts or daily allowances like Bocalli bey,\textsuperscript{806} Hacı Hamid (Agi Comet),\textsuperscript{807}
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Besdabey, Bolat Soffi, Chuxcolac, Cutullu, Ismail, Paysanu, Sa’id Muhammad (Sayto Macomet), and an Armenian [sic] Tadoul Bulat (Tatollus Polat).

Additionally, there is another Armenian who was not part of the Tatar apparatus, but who held a senior position in one of the Turkish states of Asia Minor – it was subaşı Hovhannes, subaşı being an administrative title used for the head of a castle or fortress. Yet another reference to an Oriental high-ranking authority can be found in Massaria Caffae 1461, which mentions Biberdi, lord of Zikhia (Biberdi dominus Zichie). Besides this, in the same year the Genoese sent a lesser Tatar nobleman, the nephew of the tax collector, to the Khan to arrange payment of/to offer the customary novenas (Chelisca Mirza nepos deroga missus ad imperatorum [tartarorum] adrequerendi novenas ut moris est).

Having discussed the Oriental authorities which were part of the colonial administration of Gazaria, or whom the Genoese had dealings in one way or another, we should say a few words about the Genoese ambassadors and other brokers. In 1423, the envoys seemed to have come to the Tatars and other external powers quite often; among the ambassadors we find Andrea de Goasco from Soldaia (ambassador, socius burgi Soldaye), Giovanni de Sancto Donato, who was sent to Solkhat (burgensis Caffe emptor cabelle sive introytus vini, missus Sorchatum), Francesco de Fieschi, also sent to Solkhat (civis Ianue missus Sorchati ad dominum imperatorum), Corrado Cigalla, who was sent to the Great Khan of the Golden Horde (civis Ianue emptor introytus commerchii magni Caffe, olim massarius Caffe, itturus ad dominum imperatorum Magni Horde), Leonardo Spinola, also sent to the Great Khan of the Golden Horde (burgensis Peyre officialis Officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti
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Antonii de Caffa, capitaneus, icturus ad dominum imperatorem magnum de l’Ordo),\textsuperscript{823} and yet another envoy to the Golden Horde Carlo de Romeo (burgensis Caffe officialis provisionis Caffe, icturus ad dominum imperatorum Magni Horde),\textsuperscript{824} and two envoys without a specific destination – Battista Panizarius (ambassador)\textsuperscript{825} and a Greek Nicolla, who was a captain of the burgs in Caffa (Nicolla nuncius capitaneus burgorum).\textsuperscript{826} In 1461 the flow of envoys was not as intensive; however, a Genoese nobleman Sisto Centurione was dispatched to the Tatar authorities (ambassador ad dominum ChiJhibei).\textsuperscript{827}

One of the most important roles in the colonial administration was that of the commissions, or officia, each of which dealt with some particular dimension of colonial life and functioned on a voluntary basis. Some scholars have described the creation of commissions as a result of the development of the administration and its growing complexity, which naturally generated the emergence of more specialized institutions and establishments. This is indeed a reasonable way of looking at things, but it is only part of the story. The importance of the commissions should not be underestimated. The consul and a large part of the administration were a link between the metropolis and the colony, but since the Genoese community was spatially separated from Genoa, it was important for the colonizers to be able to act on their own in what were predominantly hostile surroundings. This challenge meant that the Genoese living in Gazaria either permanently, or long-term, and having a better image and understanding of the local situation must have had a greater share in the colonial administration. This was exactly why the commissions were created. Initially, they were created for emergencies or exceptional circumstances such as war or famine. Later on, some of them became more stable institutions, but inherited the same pattern of functioning and taking ad hoc decisions, depending on the circumstances.\textsuperscript{828}

In the functioning of the commissions we can identify idiosyncrasies in both the Republic of Genoa and the Genoese colonies. These idiosyncrasies were both strengths and
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weaknesses. Genoa was a weak state, but it had a strong oligarchy with strong interests either of private or of corporate nature; Genoese colonization was basically a private initiative. In other words, it was a network of private initiatives. In this sense, Genoa was quite different from its rival Venice, which was also colonizing in the East. Venice, had an outstandingly consolidated political elite and a very strong and stable, but somewhat rigid and sluggish, political system. This determined the ways in which the Venetians colonized and shaped the Venetian model of colonization, which was state organized and centrally-managed. On the contrary, the Genoese simply do not seem to have had a notion of *raison d’état*. What they did have, however, a very strong understanding of their private and corporative interests, which correlated with the need to maintain a colonial empire on the Black Sea. This is why, while the Venetians relied on their state and their metropolis, and their colonial administration brought in an organized framework of annual galleys of *muda* from the *Serenissima*, the Genoese colonizers had to organize their life themselves; and in the challenging circumstances in which they found themselves, in hostile surroundings, this proved to be more efficient than the Venetian model. The Genoese colonies thus functioned to a large extent thanks to the self-organization of the colonial elite, and one of the reflections of this self-organization took the form of the commissions, which grew from ‘rescue organizations’ or ‘emergency commissions’ into influential colonial establishments.

Perhaps the most well-known commission was the *Officium Monete*, which was in charge of colony’s finances. It consisted of four people – two *cives* and two *burgenses* elected for six months by the consul, council, *massarii*, and former members of the *Officium*. From 1398 on, all the extraordinary expenses in Caffa had to be agreed with the *Officium Monete* and sealed by its seal. The commission was also in charge of receiving incomes from the taxes, managing monetary affairs, and minting coins, as well as checking the *massariae*, monitoring tax and auction revenues, debt collection, collecting taxes from the hinterland rural areas, checking the registers of all the tax collectors, arranging budget reports and sending them to Genoa, making inspections in Soldaia and Cembalo, paying the soldiers their salaries, and supervising certain types of trade. When elected the members of the
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commission swore on oath that they would comply with the law and elected the presiding member, who guarded the seal and changed every one and a half months so that each member of the commission took it in turns to preside. In particular, while the consul headed the colonial administration, he had to ask for the permission of the Officium Monete for any expenses over 500 aspres. Commission members dealt with the system of taxation of the rural campagna, as well as deciding on the issues of tax farming (both from the campagna and for the public debt), on issues of selling offices in cases of emergency where money was needed urgently, and on issues of the equipment for naval expeditions that were arranged by public auction.\footnote{832}

The Officium Mercancie was first mentioned in 1330, in the documents of the Genoese Officium Gazarie. It was expected to deal with issues of commerce, to supervise trade with Tana, and to send vessels there.\footnote{833} It was composed of two cives and two burgenses from Caffa, elected by the consul, massarii, syndics, and the members of other two commissions for a period of four months. It also controlled taxation and trade in general, imposed fines, passed tax-collecting rights to the tax farmers, and reported violations of law to the general syndics of Caffa.\footnote{834}

The Officium Victualium dealt with provisioning and was composed in much the same way as the other commissions, although with a longer term of service, which was unusually long, no less than eighteen months.\footnote{835} It dealt with the patrons of the ships which supplied Caffa with food from all over Black Sea, organized the sale of food, and actively managed its redistribution among the colonies and within Caffa in times of emergency and food shortage. The commission was not allowed to reduce the amount of grain stored without the permission of the magistrates, and could be punished by a fine of 50 aspres for each illegally sold modium of grain plus a refund for it.\footnote{836} The activities of this officium and its officers were described in detail by Origone.\footnote{837}
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The Officium Provisionis was elected in the same way as the other commissions, and, like them, was composed of two cives and two burgenses who were elected for six months, and members alternately took the position of president, treasurer and guardian of the seal. The Officium dealt with public works such as the construction and repair of the city walls, towers, gates, roads, official buildings, aqueducts, cisterns, and fountains, with a custos seu superstans aquarum in charge of the water supply infrastructure. The commission was also expected to keep the city clean and to make sure that all the inhabitants contributed their due share in constructing roads near their houses. Its expenses were linked to these construction activities, and its income was mainly composed of the tax revenues from the city tens and hundreds four times a year, stalia paid by different magistrates, and a tax called terraticum commonly collected by the tax farmers who bought a right to it through a public auction. Like the other commissions, it had its own books of accounts that had to be submitted for inspection at the end of their term.\textsuperscript{838} Two people referred to as officers of this institution in 1423, were Luchino Dentuto\textsuperscript{839} and Carlo de Romeo,\textsuperscript{840} the latter being sent as an ambassador to the Horde.

Caffa was the centre of the Black Sea trade,\textsuperscript{841} and there is a great deal of evidence of this kind of activity from early on in its history.\textsuperscript{842} Therefore, the Officium Capitum Sancti Antonii, first mentioned in the Massariae Caffae of the 1370s–1380s,\textsuperscript{843} was a commission that supervised the slave trade throughout Gazaria. All slave trade traffic had to go pass the port of Caffa as a transit point, which explains why the commission monitored all the ships there, ensured that the Christian slaves or those who wanted to be baptized would not be sold to Muslims, levied tolls imposed on the slave trade, issued permissions to transport slaves to their final destination, and engaged in relations between Genoa and the regional rulers regarding the slave trade. Sometimes, especially in periods of political instability and wars in

\textsuperscript{838} “Statutum Caphe,” 597–600. Besides that, captains of the ships had to bring to the commission a certain amount of stone bricks for free.

\textsuperscript{839} MC 1423, 101v.

\textsuperscript{840} MC 1423, 58v, 63r, 101v, 126r, 77v, 132r, 206v.


\textsuperscript{843} ASG, MC 1374, ff. 71v, 145v, 262v, 320v; MC 1381, ff. 103 r, 116 v, 134r, 149r, 277v, 329r, 355v.
the surrounding areas, the supply of the slaves was very high.\textsuperscript{844} In periods such as these the commission functioned very intensively, at least in 1420s, and in contrast to the lack of indications of the officers of other commissions, those of the \textit{Officium Capitum Sancti Antonii} are quite frequent. There are at least four known officers of the commission in one year (while for most other commissions there are just none): Giacomo de Diano (\textit{officialis introytus Officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii}),\textsuperscript{845} Leonardo Spinola (\textit{officialis Officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii de Caffa}),\textsuperscript{846} tax farmer Barnaba de Marco (\textit{collector introytus capitum sclauorum et sclauarum Caffe, officialis Officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii}),\textsuperscript{847} Andrea de Ottovogio (\textit{officialis capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii}).\textsuperscript{848} Besides this, the \textit{Officium Capitum Sancti Antonii} had three scribes at its disposal – a formidable staff for a mere commission: notary Oberto Grasso (\textit{notarius, scriba officii capitum sarracenorum Sancti Antonii}),\textsuperscript{849} Oberto Carretto (\textit{scriba officialium Officii capitum Sancti Antonii}),\textsuperscript{850} and Sisto Cattaneo (\textit{scriba officii capitum sarracenorum}).\textsuperscript{851} No doubt, the frequency with which the commission officers are mentioned is a clear sign of the intensity and profitability of the slave trade.

There were a number of other commissions, but their activity is reflected in the sources to a lesser extent. The \textit{Officium Misericordie} was composed in a same way as the other commissions and dealt with social policy and charity. As far as possible, it had to care for the poor and for the release of prisoners.\textsuperscript{852} In 1423, this commission had at least three officers: Gregorio de Aldemur,\textsuperscript{853} Giovanni de Ursetis,\textsuperscript{854} and an Armenian Begijbey\textsuperscript{855} (the latter is a notable exception, since normally Orientals were not allowed to hold ruling positions in the administration). The \textit{Officium super rebus sarracenorum} managed the public auction to sell
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\textsuperscript{852} MC 1381, ff. 15 r, 62 r, 65v. MC 1386, f. 94v.
\textsuperscript{853} MC 1423, 44r, 55r, 81r, 103v, 130r, 136r, 205v, 225r.
\textsuperscript{854} MC 1423, 44r, 81r, 82r, 108r, 120r, 170v, 172v, 242v.
\textsuperscript{855} MC 1423, 81r.
the property of those Muslim Tatars who had fled from Caffa to Solkhat during the war between the two powers in 1386–1387.\textsuperscript{856} There was also an \textit{Officium super rebus grecorum}, of which we know little; it probably dealt with the protection of the Greek Orthodox community.\textsuperscript{857} The \textit{Officium guerre} was often created in times of war and dismissed when the war came to an end. The same is true for the \textit{Officium sanitatis} created in the times of pandemics. The \textit{Officium della campagna} was occasionally created to solve issues in the rural hinterland. Besides that, we can even find particular short-term institutions such as the commission to repair the smaller bridge in Caffa (Giovanni Adorno was an \textit{officialis super reparacione pontis parve Caffe}, as well as \textit{emissarius delegatus et ordinatus per redificazione castri Simisso}),\textsuperscript{858} the commission for the annuities (Antoniotto Lercari, \textit{custos subabarbarie et darsine referred to in 1423 as a former officialis deputatus super officiis que annuati sortizantur}),\textsuperscript{859} and a supposedly more established commission of the mint (Pietro de Roncho, \textit{ponderator auri et argenti ad bancum comunis Ianue in Caffa}, was also a \textit{officialis ceche Caffe}).\textsuperscript{860}

From the senior magistrates we were in charge of ruling the city of Caffa or even the whole Genoese colonial empire of Gazaria, to more lower-ranking officers dealing with various aspects of the daily life, we should first of all take a look at those who had to supervise the market, logistic issues, and guardianship. The \textit{ministralius} or \textit{ministralis} was a person who technically levied the tolls on goods brought to the city, as well as the taxes from the shops, inns, and mills. He also set the prices for bread and meat, and kept order in the city markets. The \textit{Ministralius} was helped by two other minor tax collection officers called \textit{caput ihegatariorum} and \textit{ihegatarius lignaminum herbarum et carbonum}.\textsuperscript{861} In the fifteenth century there were probably already several \textit{ministrali/ministrales}, since the one of them mentioned in the sources was called \textit{superministralis Caffe}, and in 1423 there are two of them holding the post: Battista Doria, son of the deceased Napoleone, tax farmer (\textit{emptor introytus sive cabelle pannorum, superministralis Caffe}),\textsuperscript{862} followed by Giovanni de Petra
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\textsuperscript{857} G.L. Oderico, \textit{Lettere Ligustiche con le memorie storiche} (1792), 192. Ропомарев, “Население и территория.”
\textsuperscript{858} MC 1423, 53v, 62v, 63v, 68r, 84r, 84r bis, 85r, 92v, 122v, 124v, 134r, 132v, 134v, 208v, 209r, 273v, 288v, 437v
\textsuperscript{859} MC 1423, 2v, 56v, 133v, 245r, 264v, 268v.
\textsuperscript{860} MC 1423, 45r, 56v, 59r, 196r, 226v, 242v, 245r, 248r, 253r, 262v, 268v.
\textsuperscript{861} “Statutum Caphe,” 591, 625, 647-649.
\textsuperscript{862} MC 1423, 30r, 30v, 41r, 44r, 54v, 62v, 63r, 105r, 120v, 126v, 127r, 146r, 148r, 170r, 241v, 244r, 245r, 245v.
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Rubea (magister, superministralis Caffe). The fact that the Caffiotes had a superministralis and, therefore, several people under his command, is evidence of the urban growth of Caffa and an increasing intensiveness and profitability of trade in the first half of the fifteenth century (whereas after 1453, e.g. in 1461, the post is not mentioned at all). Finally, to sum up the account of minor civil officers, we should mention the magister aquarum who was in charge of the public fountains and the city water supply. In 1423 six people were involved in this activity, four of them in Caffa and two in Soldaia. In Caffa these people were a Greek Ajax son of Attabey (Ayacius filius Attabei), a certain Antonio (Antonicius), an Armenian Mgrditch, and Guglielmo Beccaria (who, unlike the others, is specified more precisely, not simply magister aquarum, but obligatus conducere aquam ad fontem logie). In Soldaia, there were two magistri aquarum: a Greek Ajax, son of the deceased protomastor Dimitrius (Ayacius filius quondam Dimitrii protomastori provisionatus Soldaye, magister aquarum), and a certain Astelano (Astelanus magister aquarum olim provisionatus in Soldaya). In 1461, however, we find just one person in this post instead of six or at least four. This was Giorgi from Naples, and he was working in Soldaia, which can mean that at this point Caffa did not have a magister aquarum whatsoever. This is yet another sign of the colonies’ prosperity before 1453 and rapid decay and depopulation afterwards.

Switching from civil servants to the garrison, we should mention the captain of the burgs (capitaneus burgorum), who was the head of the local police and night guards. Not being in position to decide much on the higher level of the city life, this man was always of crucial importance on the everyday level. He was chosen by the consul in Genoa from among the Genoese citizens, and had to be approved by the Officium Provixionis Romanie and took an oath when taking the position pretty much in the same way as more senior officers. Since the captain of the burgs was perhaps one of the people with whom the inhabitants met more often, his rights and responsibilities were annually announced in public places in both Latin and Tatar, and normally not being from the local inhabitants (with a notable exception of a
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certain Greek Nicolla, see below), the captain was always accompanied by an interpreter speaking the local languages to facilitate communication with the Orientals. Captains of the burgs ruled the city guards, supervised firefighting, punished his subordinates who were negligent or who performed poorly with fines, fined inkeepers who kept their inns open at night and did not extinguish lights in their houses (only two inns were allowed to remain open and to sell alcohol at night, and only the warehouses could keep the lights burning), levied tolls from certain types of shops, arrested inhabitants who were found in the street at night or who were caught visiting harlots (prostitution was allowed only in the daytime, and the harlots had to pay a special tax), reported all the violations to the consul’s curia and brought the guilty ones to the vicar (though captain himself had very limited judicial rights and could fine for the minor offences as of up to 100 aspres). In 1423, the position of capitaneus burgorum Caffe was then filled by Girolamo de Franchi olim Figonus, Pietro de Marco, and, in particular, a person with a Greek name Nicolla (Nicolla nuncius capitaneus burgorum). In 1461, Constantino de Malta and Giambattista Calvi are mentioned as holding this post. Besides capitaneus burgorum, there were other positions of the captains. One of these officers was capitaneus murorum et sociorum Caffe – in 1423 Domenico Acorniero. Another one was capitaneus antiburgorum in charge of the gates of the suburban antiburgs – first Leonardo de Oliverio and then his successor Battista Sacherio in 1423; and Lazzaro Beraldo (elected on the place of a previous capitaneus porte antiburgorum Niccolò de Camogli) and Giovanni Manier in 1461. We should also mention two other references: Massaria Caffae 1423 holds a Greek centurionus Manoli de Goasco and a military commander called magister armorum Giovanni Erberico.
If the captain of the burg was still close in his standing to the magistrates, the *cavallarius* and *subcavallarius*, who technically headed the troops of local guards, were the lowest-ranking officers. They were both appointed by the consul and did not even need to have a status of *burgensis* or *habitator*, not to say that they did not have to be noblemen or citizens of Genoa; the only requirement was that they could not be slaves. The responsibility was shared between these two in such a way that a *cavallarius* with one troop of guards was responsible for patrolling the citadel in the first half of the night, while the *subcavallarius* did the same in the second half of night with another, fresh troop of guardians. So, the *cavallarius* with his troops guarded the citadel, made sure that its gates were closed and patrolled its streets in the night, catching anyone wandering about there, and ensured that the lights were extinguished and that the innkeepers did not sell anything, and besides keeping the order, *cavallarius* also executed the magistrates’ sentences including torture, mutilation, corporal punishment such as flogging, poking out an eye, removal of ear, nose or other part of the body, or even the death penalty. The latter was generally carried out by hanging or beheading, though Genoese justice tended to avoid using the death penalty and commonly applied monetary fines or banishment. Thus in fact the functions of *cavallarius* in the citadel were almost the same as those of the captain in the burgs, the main difference being that captain had some authority and even judicial rights which *cavallarius* lacked, and the requirements for the captain were stricter. The *cavallarius* in 1423 was Giovanni from Milan, who probably substituted Antonio Ferretto de Castro Novo, who is referred to as *olim cavalerius domini consulis Caffe*. Giovanni was assisted by a *subcavallarius* Bartolomeo de Semino, who substituted Pietro Pelacia (*olim subcavallarius*). In 1461, the *cavallarius* of Caffe, was Gregorio Priano. We should also mention a mounted mercenary corps or *cazachi*, i.e. Cossacks. These were local Oriental people, often nomadic or at least familiar with the steppe, who were hired by the Genoese authorities, normally bearing either Tatar or Armenian names.
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In addition to the guards, the garrison of Caffa included mounted warders. This kind of cavalry or mounted police was called *orgusii* or *orguxii*. They were well-armed and headed by a captain and worked as the consul’s bodyguards and ceremonial entourage and as the Commune’s envoys. They also took an oath of allegiance. They probably came from the Genoese *burgenses* or *habitatores* of Caffa. Besides the above-mentioned troops, the citadel and the burgs had special – and separate – guards, gatekeepers, and captains for the most important towers and gates such as the armoury in the citadel, the Tower of St. Antony, the Tower of St. Constantine, the Tower of Crisco, the Khachatur’s (*porta Caihadoris*) Gate, and the Gates of the Antiburgs. These soldiers are referred to in the sources as *socii, servientes, milites*, or *stipendiarii*, the head guardians are called *capitanei* and *custodes*. Some categories of the military forces or guards could include Orientals, especially *orguxii*, who were largely hired from the local population. Hiring Orientals for military service was a risky solution, because they were less reliable than the compatriots. On the other hand, they would work for much lower salaries than the professional soldiers brought from Genoa. In actual fact, service among the troops of city guards was a part-time job for many local artisans. From *Massaria Caffae* 1423 to *Massaria Caffae* 1461, we see a sharp increase of quantity in many of the groups composing the garrison, which can be easily understood if we take into account the Ottoman threat and the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

Although Balard wrote that ‘up to the last years of the Genoese domination not a single Oriental was enrolled among those 200 mercenaries, who were charged with assuring the defence of the trading station (this author’s translation, E.Kh.),’ some Orientals indeed did serve as fully-fledged soldiers (*socii*), not only as the local police. For example in 1423 *socius Caffe* and *fractor lapidum* Chiriacus Constantinus Christodorus was probably a Greek; *socius Caffe* Tangriberdi, who was a servant of Antoniotto Lerchari and served together with his master, could be Muslim, or Greek Orthodox, or Pagan; Nicolla, who in the same way followed his master maestro Francesco, must have been Greek; other obvious Orientals among *socii* Caffe include Bolat, an Armenian Hovhannes. In the

---

892 “Statutum Caphe.” 612–613, 627.
893 M. Balard, Les formes militaires, 76-78.
894 M. Balard, Les Orientaux à Caffa au XVe siècle, 235.
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same year, a Greek Nichita from Simisso served as a *socius* of Cembalo,\footnote{MC 1423, 56v.} as well as another person of Turkic origin probably belonging to the Greek Orthodox community Chilichibey Cimichus elected instead of Piergiorgi Manier,\footnote{MC 1423, 194r, 248v, 412r, 414v.} and a *socius additus* Isgropolos from Pera.\footnote{MC 1423, 11r, 13v, 44v, 232r.} In addition, some Greeks may have been already domiciled in Italy and returned to the Black Sea area partaking in the colonial enterprise together with the Italians, like a former *socius Cimbali* Vassili from Montacuto (Piemonte).\footnote{MC 1423, 11r, 13v, 44v, 232r.} Also in 1423, an Armenian Assabitus was serving as socius in Samastro.\footnote{MC 1423, 4v.} The same was true for *servientes*: among them in Caffa in 1423 we find Armenians Mogalichi,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 325v, 337v.} blacksmith Karapet,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 329r, 337v.} Khatchig (*Cachel*),\footnote{MC 1423, 248r, 413v, 414v.} Hovhannes Doria,\footnote{MC 1423, 248r, 413v, 414v.} and Hovhannes son of Karapet,\footnote{MC 1423, 49r, 324r, 337v.} as well as Greeks Georgios son of Caloian,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 325v, 337v.} Georgios Spinola son of Papa Georgios,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 325v, 337v.} Pandaseni Spinola son of Papa Nichita,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 325v, 337v.} another Pandaseni the Cellarer,\footnote{MC 1423, 135r, 325v, 337v.} Sava Benedetto,\footnote{MC 1423, 49r, 324r, 337v.} and drummer Corsoli de Vassili.\footnote{MC 1423, 49r, 324r, 337v.}

In 1461 among the *socii Caffe* we find Greeks Isidoros from Chios,\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} and Antinodoros;\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} at the same time, the relative proportion of the Orientals among the *servientes Caffe* increase sharply. Out of twenty-one *servientes* there is only one Latin, Domenico from Sarzana (Liguria),\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} the remaining twenty are all Orientals, five Greeks (Vasili,\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} another Vasili,\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} Ordabei,\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} Stefanos,\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} and Theodoros)\footnote{MC 1423, 13r, 41v, 51r, 92v, 133r, 360r, 367v.} and fifteen Armenians.
The conclusions of this transformation are, however, not meant to deny Balard’s main intuition: among the numerous garrisons of Caffa the Orientals were an invisible minority – the military guarding of the colony was entrusted to the compatriots of the colonizers and other reliable people belonging to Latin Christendom. Nonetheless, the transformation of the contingent of stipendiarii from 1423 to 1461 is a sign of both increasing trust by the Latins towards at least to some groups of Orientals, first of all the Armenians to a lesser extent the Greeks, and of the increasing need for defence, and even eagerness to hire people who are not completely reliable. This, in turn, makes us think about the cohesion of the Latins and Orientals in the view of the Ottoman threat and shaping a common shared colonial identity.

The last important thing to be mentioned about the garrison of Caffa is that in the fifteenth century it grew considerably. In 1423, the garrison had 56 socii plus thirteen people are mentioned as former socii. In 1461, however, there are 248 socii Caffe [sic], an almost of 4.5 times the original figure. This increase of garrison troops is even more striking when we recall that after 1453 the city was depopulating, and the overall number of people mentioned in Massaria Caffae 1461 is much lower than in Massaria Caffae 1423. Thus, the military threat of the Ottomans provoked a rapid increase in the garrisons of Caffa.

As mentioned some gates and towers of Caffa were of key importance and therefor had their own captains and garrisons, sometimes quite numerous. One example here is the Khachatur’s Gate (porta Caihadoris) named after a certain Armenian Khachatur. In 1421, its
captain was first Ignacio *federarius*,\(^939\) and then, after his death, wounding, or dismissal, Leonardo de Oliverio (*capitaneus porte Khatchadouris subrogato loco Ignacii federarii*), who previously served as *capitaneus porte anteburgorum Caffe*.\(^940\) We do not know the exact number of soldiers guarding it in 1421, but two are mentioned: Bartolomeo Catolicus son of Aguchi,\(^941\) and Greek Costa caramella.\(^942\) Besides Ignacio and Leonardo, we know that in one of the previous years the captain’s position was held by Lodisius de Camogli (*castellanus turris Sancti Constantini de Caffa, olim sabarbarius, olim capitaneus porte Khatchadouris*).\(^943\) In 1461, the captains of the Khachatur’s Gate were Simone de Sauli\(^944\) and Giovanni Spinola, son of the deceased Andrea.\(^945\)

Another object that was crucially important was *St. Constantine’s Tower* (*turris Sancti Constantini*). In 1423, the position of its castellan (*castellanus turris Sancti Constantini*) was held by Andrea from Cremona,\(^946\) Lodisius de Camogli,\(^947\) and Andrea de Cossano,\(^948\) while the soldiers serving in the tower (*socius turris Sancti Constantini*) were a tailor Bartolomeo de Parma,\(^949\) Georgius de Mongiardino son of the deceased Costa,\(^950\) Leonardo de Oliverio (later transferred to the Khachatur’s Gate),\(^951\) Oberto Forco,\(^952\) Giovanni de Romayrono,\(^953\) Niccolò Roystropo,\(^954\) and Battista Aura son of the deceased Antonio.\(^955\) In 1461 no soldiers of St. Constantine’s Tower are mentioned, and the tower now had a *custos* to replace the *castellanus*, whose name was Chirico de Castiglione (*Quilicus de Castilione custos turris Sancti Constantini*).\(^956\)
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Besides general troops of soldiers, Caffa and its dependencies had more specialized military servants. First of all there are the crossbowmen or arbalesters (ballistarii): twenty-five people in 1369, reduced to twenty in 1398 following a request of the burgers of Caffa regarding the extent of military expenses.\(^{957}\) At least seven crossbowmen served in 1423: Battista from Albenga,\(^{958}\) Domenico from Mantua,\(^{959}\) Antonio,\(^{960}\) another Antonio de Sancto Romulo,\(^{961}\) Giorgio Pinelli,\(^{962}\) Bartolomeo from Parma (who served in St. Constantine’s Tower),\(^{963}\) and Antonio de Sancto Georgio.\(^{964}\) In 1461, there are just two mentions of the crossbowmen – Antonio Cepolla\(^{965}\) and another maestro (magister) Antonio.\(^{966}\) With the development of the firearms, the Genoese colonies began hiring specialist in artillery, i.e. bombarderii; in 1461, there are two of them in Caffa, Jean or perhaps Janin from France (Ianinus de Francia)\(^{967}\) and Bartholomeo Campanario;\(^{968}\) at the same time, Gaspare de Giovanni there was a bombardarius in Cembalo.\(^{969}\) While these highly qualified specialists were brought from Western or Central Europe, the axeman (magistri axie, magistri assie, magistri acia) were mainly hired from the local people. In 1423, they are all or almost all Orientals: Greek Attabey son of Michali,\(^{970}\) protomastro Alexius from Simisso protomastro,\(^{971}\) Greek Saua,\(^{972}\) another Greek Sava Platerassi,\(^{973}\) Muslim coppersmith Amii,\(^{974}\) Filippo,\(^{975}\) and Niccolò.\(^{976}\) In 1461, there were two magistri: maestro Guglielmo\(^{977}\) and an Armenian Eminbey Cassapa from the quarter Vonitica.\(^{978}\) Drummers (nacharati) were mainly hired from among the local population, and there could be one or two of them in
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Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo. Thus, in 1423 in Caffa there were two of them, Afendici979 and Yusuf;980 one nacharatus in Soldaia, Corsoli de Vassili,981 and one nacharatus in Cembalo, Battista son of Giacomo Cibini.982 In 1461, only one nacharatus of Caffa is mentioned, a Greek Christodolus,983 while Cembalo had two of them and both were Armenians, Mgrdich984 and Agop.985 Besides the drummers, the Caffiote military forces had two other categories of people with something to do with the music, namely – trumpeters. Like the drummers, they were mainly hired from the local people. The first of these two categories is the sonatores: it comprised four people in 1423 (Paolo de Troya,986 Prefetici,987 Saul Samarre,988 and Sotericus Sattarioni)989 and two people in 1461 (Cazar990 and Sotiricus).

The trumpeters of the second category were called tubetae: this included nine people in 1423 (Lazarus,992 Nichita,993 another Nichita,994 Constantinus,995 Narces,996 Ianicha de Bavalo,997 Niccolò de Bavalo or Bavaro,998 Sava,999 and his replacement Constantinus de Simisso provisionatus Caffe subrogatus loco Save tubete)1000 and two people in 1461 (Giannino de Brennero,1001 Astellanus,1002 Bairabei,1003 Norces,1004 Georgius or Gregorio de Axereto,1005 and Georgius Sicbei).1006 Both sonatores and tubetae were found in Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo.
After a general overview of the civil administration and garrisons of the Genoese colonies in Gazaria with a special focus on Caffa, we should mention the other major cities. Soldaia, which was the second largest city in Gazaria, and with even more impressive fortifications than Caffa, was governed by a consul, who was subordinate to his Caffiote colleague. The rest of Gazaria outside Caffa normally had more modest bureaucratic apparatus, and the consul therefore had to combine many roles that would be assigned in Caffa to several different officers. Thus in 1423, the posts of *consul, castellanus, capitaneus et massarius civitatis Soldaye* were filled by Oberto de Benessea1007 followed by Tommasino Italiano.1008 In 1461 Francesco de Sauvignone1009 was consul of Soldaia, but a *castellan* (castellanus Soldaie) became a different position held by Adamo Centurione1010 and Damiano de Chiavari.1011 Soldaia also had a *cavalerius* – Giovanni from Cremona1012 and Giovanni de Porta1013 in 1423, and a certain amount of the curial official (such as maestro Agostino Adorno),1014 and curial scribes – like Giacomo de Sancta Agneta1015 and Niccolò de Zoagli.1016

Cembalo did not seem to be a large city, but it was a point of key strategic and military importance because it was constantly challenged and contested by the Principality of Theodoro. Therefore, the both garrison and the civil administration had to be robust. As in Soldaia, in 1423 the consul of Cembalo held many roles; he is referred to as *consul, castellanus, capitaneus, massarius et scriba Cimbali* and sometimes as *consul et retur Cimbali*. The consul of 1423 was Pelegrino de Mulazana,1017 his predecessors being Bonavei de Monleone1018 and Segurano de Franchi.1019 In 1461, Barnaba Grillo (referred to as
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1009 MC 1461, 75v, 174r, 237v, 286v, 328v, 407v end/408r reg, 407v end/408r reg.
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1015 MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 43r, 133r, 248v, 354r, 357v, 382v, 385v.
1016 MC 1423, 170r, 355v, 357v.
1017 MC 1423, 13v, 17v, 123v, 123v, 126v, 191v, 194v, 197v, 198r, 395v, 397v.
1018 MC 1423, 8r, 33v, 45v, 54v, 59r, 62v, 92v, 93r, 105r, 123v, 130r, 149r, 159v, 196v, 245r, 395v, 397v.
prefecturus consul Cimbali) changed on this post the previous consul Agostino Marruffo, moreover, as in was the case with Soldaia, castellanus castrorum Cimbali was already a separate post in Cembalo by 1461 filled first by Pietro de Monte Negro and then by Filippo Lomellino (castellanus precessurus castrorum Cimbali).

Unlike Caffa with its several dozens of churches and many Roman Catholic clergy, Cembalo had one chaplain (capellanus Cimbali) – in 1461 this was Fra Giacomo de Lu from the Franciscan order (frater ordinis minorum). The curia of Cembalo was, as in Caffa, an institution attached to the consul; again, like in Caffa, it also had notaries, like notary Pier Giovanni Mainerio, who was a scribe there in 1423 (Petrus iohanes Maynerius notarius, scriba Cimbali, socius Caffe). The regular garrison of Cembalo, or more correctly, of the citadel of Cembalo, called socii castrum Cimbali, was not too large. in 1461 it housed eleven people: Antonio Boggio, Battista Marchesani, Bartolomeo Carbono, Bonia de Goterio, Giacomo Figono, Giovanni de Petra, Johannes from Germany (de Alamania), Giuliano Porsano, Johannes from Germany (de Alamania), Giuliano Porsano, Johannes from Germany (de Alamania), Giuliano Porsano.
Lazzaro de Porta, Tommaso de Ancona, and Daniele Ercherio, while the other two, Niccolò de Varagino and Giovanni de Camurana, are referred to as former socii castrum Cimbali.

We should also make a brief mention of Tana which seemed to have a more or less autonomous life even as part of the colonies of Gazaria, since it was subordinate to Caffa and part of the Genoese possessions. In 1461, two people were sent to Tana, a new consul (profecturus consul Tane) Carlo Spinola and a commissar (comisarus Tane) Lanzarote from Parma. The same reference can be made to the consul of Sinope (Andrea Usodimare in 1423), and the consul, castellanus and massarius Samastri (Bartolomeo de Zoagli followed by Borbomo Centurione in 1423, and Marco Spinulla de Lucullo at some earlier date). One thing that attracts attention is a considerable amount of the garrison in Simisso, that is, stipendiarii siue prouisionati Simisso, sent there to rebuild the castle in 1423. Three persons receive a describer emissarius delegatus et ordinatus per redificazione castri Simisso: Battista Vayrolo, Carlo de Goasco, Giovanni Adorno. Three others are listed as stonemasons, namely Caloiane son of Teodori, Nicolla de Coichaise, and the head of the stonemasons Teodorus (protomastor murator), and they were sent to Simisso for the building project (the describer here is icturus Simisso murator). Finally, there is a crossbowman Antonio de Sancto Romulo, and three other persons serving in Simisso – Raffaele de Monleone, Giovanni de Sancto Michael, and Giovanni Toppo.
Military expenses were always the biggest item of the budget in Caffa, generally amounting to around half of the total budget, and it grew constantly. Not just the arbailesters, but also some other military contingents were cut due to financial constraints, caused by the crises in the second half of the fourteenth century. The trend towards hiring the Orientals for non-core military positions partially made up for the gap. However, these reductions were an exception rather than the rule. Pressure from the Tatar Khans/Lords of Solkhat, the lasting threat of rebellion by local Oriental subjects of the Genoese colonies, piracy and privateering, the constant rivalry and warfare between Genoa and Venice, and finally because of the increasing Ottoman threat in the Black Sea area the general tendency in both fourteenth and fifteenth centuries all meant an increase in the number of mercenaries recruited in Genoa and sent to Gazaria to serve there as colonial armed forces.

Thus, the core parts of the garrisons of Gazaria were protected by salaried mercenaries hired in the metropolis. The arms and armour for them was purchased in bulk from Genoa, along with cannons and other military material, despite the presence of armorers’ workshops in the colonies, which often exported swords or cuirasses to other places in Gazaria. Besides these regulars, the captains could use local civilians for guardianship, and mobilized them during emergencies or a military threat to the troops of the local militia (Balard concluded that although the civilians were used in warfare, otherwise the garrison tended to be packed by mercenaries). Some soldiers could be sent from Caffa to the rest of Gazaria, mainly to Gothia, to strengthen the local garrisons;\textsuperscript{1055} in this case they came under the command of the consuls or captains of the respective towns or castles and, more generally, under the command of the Captain of Gothia.

Besides the overland garrisons, the Genoese colonies had \textit{armed galleys and brigantines of the guard} with a mariner/sailor corps on board. These were used to facilitate connections among the cities and to patrol the city to protect the commercial roots from pirates and the encroachments of their Venetian rivals. Unlike the city guards, a large part of the vessels’ crew was often composed of Greeks, Armenians, and Tatars. In the 1374–1375 the mariners/sailors were actively used in a war with the Principality of Karvuna. During the

\textsuperscript{1054} MC 1423, 42r, 115r. \textsuperscript{1055} ASG, Antico Comune, Magistroram rationalium No. 56, ff. 25 v, 36r.
War of Chioggia, Caffa sent five galleys in 1379 to take part in the campaign, a brigantine to patrol Tana, and many smaller ships to various parts of the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{1056} In 1386, during a war with the Tatars, the consul of Caffa had two armed galleys patrolling the Black Sea, sent some ships to Licostomo and one brigantine to Matrega, and also ordered the construction of yet another brigantine.\textsuperscript{1057} The vessels were built in the port of Caffa under the supervision of a \textit{sabarbarius} and packed with the mariners headed by captains, patrons, \textit{comites}, \textit{subcomites}, and \textit{supracomites}. The Genoese naval infantry were indeed the special rapid reaction forces, which were applied not only for the defensive, but also to protect or attack. In 1423, the \textit{sabarbarius} of Caffa was Lodisio de Camogli,\textsuperscript{1058} and Antoniotto Lercari, was a \textit{custos subabarbarie et darsine}.\textsuperscript{1059}

One galley of Caffa (\textit{galeota}) is mentioned in \textit{Massaria Caffae} 1423 with all its crew (however, both the captain and the crew served there in the previous year). The captain (\textit{patronus galeote armate}), Marco Spinola de Lucullo, was a former consul of Samastro.\textsuperscript{1060} Besides the captain, on board we find a scribe Cosma Scanigia (\textit{scriba galleote}),\textsuperscript{1061} a barber Lodisio Grilacio,\textsuperscript{1062} and other mariners/sailors: Lazzaro Aserbo,\textsuperscript{1063} Domenico Acorniero,\textsuperscript{1064} Giorgio de Mongiardino,\textsuperscript{1065} Raffaele de Monleone,\textsuperscript{1066} Michael de Rappalo,\textsuperscript{1067} Antonio de Ceva,\textsuperscript{1068} Bartolomeo Grosso,\textsuperscript{1069} Gregorio de Torriglia,\textsuperscript{1070} Giovanni Restano,\textsuperscript{1071} Giuliano de Bobio,\textsuperscript{1072} Paulinus de Pavia,\textsuperscript{1073} Paolo de Plebe,\textsuperscript{1074} Pietro Senestario,\textsuperscript{1075} Simone Pecheto,\textsuperscript{1076} Paolo de Beluedere,\textsuperscript{1077} and an inn-keeper Giorgio de
Bobbio.\textsuperscript{1078} In 1423 yet another galley was captained by Giovanni Borraxino (\textit{comittus galee Caffe})\textsuperscript{1079} and Norasco de Naullo was his vice (\textit{subcomittus galee Caffe}).\textsuperscript{1080} In 1461 we find references to a patron of a galley of Caffa called Gregorio de Allegro,\textsuperscript{1081} a \textit{comitus} of another one Niccolò de Moneglia,\textsuperscript{1082} and two sailors, Andrea\textsuperscript{1083} and Niccolò.\textsuperscript{1084}

Mobility was a characteristic feature of most Genoese mercenaries. To avoid too close contacts between soldiers and the Oriental environment. Most garrison troops besides the guards recruited from the local civilian population were hired for a year in Genoa. Most of them were Ligurians, but there were occasionally people from Lombardy, Veneto, Emilia-Romagna, Southern Italy, Catalonia, and the rest of Iberian Peninsula, and later on also from Germany, France, the rest of the Western Europe, as well as from the Eastern European countries such as Poland and, Bohemia, etc.. They arrived with the consul, and left with him. They were always Latins, and normally Latins without any Levantine or Eastern Mediterranean/Black Sea background – the core of the colonial armed forces had to military men not rooted in the local environment and loyal only to the rotating colonial authorities – which at the end of the day means to their metropolis, the Republic of St. George. Moreover, the soldiers would be often shuffled and redistributed throughout the settlements of Gazaria. This was probably done to increase their caution and to prevent carelessness on duty, and also served for the regional cohesion of the Genoese overseas colonial domains.

Now we can turn to the economic aspects of the colonial administration, starting with the important dimension of provisioning and logistics. Redistributing military force and weapons among the other colonies was one aspect of the regional colonial cohesion that made Caffa a true head of Gazaria. Another one was control over the distribution of food supplies. In the atmosphere of constant insecurity, of a need for the \textit{ad hoc} decisions and emergency measures, Caffa for a long time managed to fulfil the role of the provisioning centre for Gazaria, supplying food from different sources and distributing it among the other colonies. Institutionally, a key role here was that of the \textit{Officium Victualium} of Caffa (see
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above). In times of peace, food supplies were normally abundant in Caffa. However, its authorities always had to store enough extra food for emergencies, and, on the other hand, to redistribute food throughout the rest of Gazaria. The Genoese colonies on the Danube, the Crimean steppes, and Zichia were the main suppliers, but obtaining grain from these sources was always in jeopardy to a greater or lesser extent by the conflict with the Tatars or other local rulers (in which case grain was imported from Thrace or from Genoese Pera); therefore the politics of provisioning was a constant issue for the Caffiotes, as well as the diplomatic relations with Solkhat. The significance of Caffa as a centre of redistribution was already reflected in the massariae of the late fourteenth century.1085

Caffa constantly experienced economic hardship. This was not on the level of individual or corporative trade, which occurred rarely, but on the level of the authorities’ finances. The main part of all incomes of the administration was composed of the tax levies. The Orientals of Caffa (Greeks, Armenians, Tatars, and Jews) occasionally had to pay a direct tax per head (cotumum),1086 but it looks as if it was created temporarily in case of emergency, as in 1381; the canluchi in the rural Gazaria paid their suzerains commerchium canluchorum; otherwise, the budget of Caffa was mainly replenished by the indirect taxes most of which were conventionally called cabellae. Moreover, the indirect taxes, collected by the Commune itself and via the tax farmers1087 were very numerous: introitus cabelle grani et liglminorimi, cabella olei, cabella vini,1088 cabella salis, cabella pannorum, introytus pannorum, introytus cabelle censarie, introytus pontis et ponderis Caffe, commerchium Sancti Antonii, introitus mineaticorum, and many countless minor permanent or local taxes, duties, fees, and tolls, as well as some rents gained from leasing public property, monopolies (such as salt), fines, and the sale of confiscated goods.1089 There were sales taxes, evaluation taxes, transportation taxes (especially in the slave trade), ship taxes, and taxes on fishing and winemaking. In the fifteenth century, Caffa began to issue bonds (loca, sg. locum, meaning the place in the accounts book),1090 and this was yet another mechanism for securing income. At times Caffa introduced mandatory loans, mainly to cope with emergencies, as well as

1085 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 184v, 206r, 329r, 341v, 360r-362v, 366v, 369r, 382v, 400v, 413v, 414v, 421r, 455r, 457r, et passim. See also on this subject: Manolescu, Le commerce sur le littoral, 24. Iliescu, Notes sur l’apport roumain, 105-116.
1086 ASG, MC 1381, f. 277v, 328v, 335 v, 337r.
1087 For the fifteenth century, see section on tax farmers in the chapter on society. For the earlier period see e.g.: ASG, MC 1386, f. 383r.
1089 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 410-415.
additional taxes and tolls.\footnote{Buongiorno, L’amministrazione genovese nella “Romania”, 187-230. See also: Balard, “The Greeks of Crimea under Genoese Rule in the XIVth and XVth Centuries,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 49 (1995): 30. Balard concluded: “The loan raised by the Genoese authorities in 1455 upon the Oriental ethnoi indicates the scale of fortunes among them. One hundred fifteen Armenians had to pay 75,746 aspri, that is to say an average of about 660 aspri each; one hundred two Greeks were taxed at 31,070 aspri, an average of 305 aspri each, and 50 Jews at 29,950 aspri, that is to say 600 aspri per person. We gather that the Greeks’ wealth was comparatively less than that of the others, though it may be possible that the Jews had to pay heavier taxes per person than the others.”} Another source of income was composed of the fines levied on decisions made by the syndics of Caffa. Since the 1420s, the magistrates of Caffa began to pay income tax on their salaries (stalia).\footnote{On the other hand, paying stalia the magistrates were normally exempt from cabella and avaria.} All Genoese ships had to make a stop in Caffa and to pay a respective tax commerchium;\footnote{Belgrano, Cinque documenti, 250.} from 1351 on this amounted 1% of the value of the goods entering and 1% for leaving the port.\footnote{Vitale, Le fonti del diritto, 144.} The sources also mention commerchium of Tana.\footnote{Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 409.} As already mentioned, there was a direct tax per head as an emergency measure, and normally applicable only to the Oriental subjects of the Commune. Then there were some other direct taxes, such as the terraticum which was a wealth tax normally amounting to around 1.8% of the value of real estate. The Latins ran the taxation system in Caffa and only exceptionally allowed the natives to take part in their fruitful business.\footnote{Balard, “The Greeks of Crimea under Genoese Rule in the XIVth and XVth Centuries,” Dumbarton Oaks Papers 49 (1995): 30. The sources, however, show us that the expenses of the administration, which were already quite heavy and often aggravated in the times of war, often outstripped income.\footnote{Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 401-402, 416-419. ASG, Antico Comune, Massaria Comunis Ianue, No. 18, f. 126; No. 20, f. 18. Magistrorum Rationalium, n. 58, ff. 411, 218. See also: H. Sieveking, Aus Genueser-Rechnungs-und Steuerbüchern (Vienna, 1909). Sieveking, Studio sulle finanze genovesi, Gioffrè, Il debito pubblico genovese.} Moreover, corruption was present at all levels, even in spite of annual investigation of the service of magistrates by their successors, as well as by occasional inspections.\footnote{Annales Genuenses, 156. ASG, Not. cart. No. 307, ff. 209r - 218v. ASG, MC 1374, f. 161v. Saraceno, L’amministrazione, 229, n. 159. Brătianu, Recherches sur le commerce, 99. Bertolotto, Nuova serie, 500–511.} Caffa was therefore indeed a second Genoa also in mirroring all vices of its metropolis – the incredible incomes and riches of some individuals and corporations contrasted with the weakness of the state and its administrative machine, which existed only because it was needed to protect commercial interests.

Briefly summarizing, we can state that although the Genoese colonial administration in Gazaria seem rather loose and inefficient (chiefly due to corruption), the Genoese managed to keep their possessions as a single colonial domain with fairly centralized administration and
with full links to the source of power and system of law and legislation of the metropolis. The commissions were a necessary accompaniment of the colonial life, since only the integration of local population into the bureaucratic apparatus could ensure its flexibility and ability to react swiftly in extreme circumstances. Thus, administratively and legally the Genoese settlements were indeed colonies of Genoa, since according to Reinhard “the minimal content of the term ‘colony’ is settlement or rule”, whereas the maximal content is “settlement and rule”, 1099 and both conditions were fulfilled in the Genoese Crimea. The fifteenth century with the Ottoman menace and the shrinking room for manoeuvre brought changes in Caffa’s system of administration in particular and in Gazaria in general. The garrisons were generally enlarged, and the functions of certain officers were changed. Nonetheless, the colonial administration preserved its colonial nature throughout the first half of the fifteenth century as well as in the last twenty-two years under the rule of the Bank of Saint George.

1099 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 3.
CHAPTER 5. THE WORLD OF ENTANGLED IDENTITIES: THE DYNAMICS OF POPULATION OF CAFFA IN ITS ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS CATEGORIES

“A distinguished feature of cities through the world-system, and from its very beginnings, is their cosmopolitan nature, which only increases as the network develop. This went hand by hand with religious tolerance: tolerance at the level of political authorities and also, at certain moments, through the intermingling of religious networks, and although it may not have been the general rule, it is nevertheless a remarkable feature”. (Beaujard, Philippe. “The Indian Ocean in Eurasian and African World-Systems before the Sixteenth Century,” in Journal of World History 16, 4 (2005): 452).

“Settlers are the most effective vectors of cultural change; therefore, to understand the formation of early colonial societies, we have to isolate their parts and trace the provenance of the individuals who composed it.” (Felipe Fernández-Armesto, The Canary Islands after the conquest: the making of a colonial society in the early sixteenth century. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1982, 13).

The Eastern Mediterranean as a whole and Italian colonies in particular appear before us as a multicultural world of mixed, complex, and multiple identities, a great diversity of ethnic, religious, and linguistic groups, each probably with its own varied criteria of defining self-identity and otherness. The Caffiotes lived in socioeconomic environment shared with a local society comprising a broad circle of different confessional, ethnic, and social groups. The mixed environment, lively trade that attracted and involved all kinds of people, and at the end of the day the mixed marriages only contributed to this complication. This is why we should now discuss the population of Caffa in its ethnic and confessional dimensions. Particular attention will be given to characterization of the major ethnic groups and ethnic identities. The first and most immediate aim of this chapter is to give an overview of the ethnic groups and identities in Caffa. An additional aim is to discuss the issues of demography and to trace the construction and transformation of identities as well as the interaction of the ethnic groups in dynamics.

In terms of classifying people found in the sources in different groups based on their identity, I will distinguish between macrogroups and microgroups, the first being linked to a person’s religion and the second to a person’s geographical and ethnic place of origin. The higher-level identity in Caffa, as in most other mixed medieval societies, was largely, albeit
not exclusively, defined by a person’s religion. This was not the only identity-shaping factor and obviously it did not always correlate clearly with other factors and criteria that we would consider important for identity shaping today, such as geographic origin, racial appearance, mother tongue, or material culture. After all, identities were constructed and negotiated. Nonetheless, religion defined a person’s membership of one of the five communities, which were a legal and social reality of the life of Caffa reflected in the sources. Thus, since the administration of Caffa had divided the population into five communities, we can safely follow it. The introduction of these five macrogroups is a starting point in the coordinate system of identity and otherness. I will therefore base my aggregation of individuals in macrogroups exactly on the grounds of their religion and belonging to a certain religious community. Thus we will have:

1. Latins (i.e. Roman Catholics, including Westerners and recent Oriental converts),
2. Greeks (i.e. all Greek Orthodox people),
3. Armenians (i.e. all those belonging to the Armenian Gregorian Church),
4. Muslims, and
5. Jews.1100

Besides these five macrogroups, we also find people of various ethnic backgrounds more fragmented than the ones determined by religion, in different Caffa sources, mainly massariae and notarial deeds. I will refer to these as microgroups. Apart from the Genoese and other Ligurians, there are all kinds of Italians from different states of the Apennine peninsula, Catalans, Mallorquins, Castilians, Aragonese, French, Burgundians, Englishmen, Scots, Germans, Hungarians, Polish, Walachians, Bulgarians, Russians, Greeks, Arabs, Persians, Syrians, Jews, Armenians, and people from the Caucasus.1101 Nonetheless, the sources produced by the Genoese administration, notaries, and merchants, have certain limitations as regards to reflecting the ethnic composition of a multi-ethnic city like Caffa. This creates certain methodological problems for research on the ethnic composition of the urban population. The main limitation of the sources such as massariae, notarial deeds, or

---

1100 Various Pagans, mainly from Northern Caucasus, as well as some remaining Pagan nomadic Tatars to not constitute a group, since they never had any community.
commercial and private correspondence is that they were produced by Latins and thus underrepresent the local Orientals unless they contacted the colonizers in a specific case for business or other purposes, making it necessary to mention them in a source. We can only conclude on how many of them could have actively interacted directly with the Italians under the latters’ law and authority. Consequently Orientals appear in much lower numbers in these sources than was necessarily the case, and the majority of names were Latin.

**Presentation of the microgroups of the population of Caffa**

The majority of the male adult free Genoese and otherwise Latin colonists were reflected in the archival sources such as *massariae* in one way or another, because they had to deal with notaries and *massarii*. The same was true for the Orientals, albeit with certain limitations. A number of Oriental scribes served in the contacts between the administration and the local population generally in cases where the latter had to put their contact with Latins into a legal document. There were, for instance, a number of Greek notaries in the cities of the Black Sea including Caffa, but mostly their records are not preserved. In many cases the transactions between the Latins and the Orientals were oral, and therefore not recorded, not to mention the transactions between the Orientals themselves. The business culture of Greeks, Tatars, Armenians, Jews, etc. was not illiterate, but neither was it a highly-developed notarial culture such as we find in medieval Italy, Spain, and Provence. We can therefore infer that some part of the Oriental population is not reflected in the Latin archival sources at all. Nonetheless, although sources such as *massariae* do not technically reflect the entire urban population of Caffa, they do reflect to a certain extent the approximate ethno-religious situation in the colony. To discover the exact percentages of ethnic groups in the overall population we must use specific quantitative and mathematical methods, judging indirectly on the distribution among different ethnic groups and the quantity of each.

When we begin discussing the identity on the level of microgroups, we face a serious limitation of our sources. I have already mentioned that we have a starting point – the population of Caffa was officially divided into five communities corresponding to people’s religion. Nonetheless, this division into five macrogroups does not cover the whole issue of identity. How did people identify themselves in terms of ethnic identity in pre-modern

---

1102 Here the term ‘Latin’ includes people of Western origin and baptized slaves or other converts who adopted Genoese or Latin identity.
1104 “Statutum Caphe (1449),” 609, 677-678.
societies, and what do the terms ‘ethnicity’ and ‘nationality’ mean applied to the Middle Ages? Both onomastic and the ethnic describers used in the sources can help when we categorize people into macrogroups, but they can also be misleading. First, the describers referring to ethnic or territorial origin are often omitted. Second, what we mean when we talk of an ‘ethnic’ describer is generally a religious one (this is why e.g. the ‘Greek’ macrogroup of our sources equally comprises Russians, Crimean Goths, Alans, and everybody who professed Greek Orthodox Christianity, while e.g. saraceni could mean Muslim Tatars, but also any other Muslims). Third, even when an ethnic describer referring to a more particular group (microgroup) is specified, it gives us more information on how the scribe categorized a person rather than how the person perceived himself: a ‘Russian’ could have been Orthodox or Catholic, Muscovite or Lithuanian, and in many cases even a person of Turkic origin. We learn more about what the scribe thought about a person’s identity rather than what his self-identity was in reality. Yet we have some idea of what was the scribe’s notion of ethnic, national, racial, territorial, or religious identity, but even this idea is pretty vague. Was the scribe (a notary or massarius) motivated to distinguish the members of local population in this mixed multicultural society based on their ethnic or other identities, and to what extent? In fact, his aim was to describe his client or a person otherwise mentioned in what are now our sources sufficiently well for practical purposes of the time, so that other members of that society would be able to identify him or her. It goes without saying that this sort of identification did not necessarily imply the use of all possible describers.

Indeed sometimes a scribe could use a nickname in he thought this

1105 Therefore we often find Italian people whose territorial describers are not specified, and thus we cannot put them into the ‘Genoese’ category by default, because they could originate from any other locality of Liguria, Italy, or even the rest of the Mediterranean. It is also often a case that we really discover their origin from some documents, while in the others they are given just in the form “personal name – family name (or a nickname).” An additional problem is that a scribe could sometimes omit even such identifiers as personal or family name, and even when he did not do that, some widely spread combination of this two (e.g. Giovanni Doria or Giacomo Contarini) could also have pertained to one person or two homonyms (like ‘John Smith’). One of professors who taught me gave a good example of homonymy: sometimes in Russian medieval sources one finds in the list of people in passages like “Ivashka, and also his son Ivashka, and also his son Ivashka” (i.e. John). I faced a similar situation when I and a group of backpackers were on a walking expedition in the Carpathian Mountains and arrived late in the evening at an alpine pastoral homestead. The people working in such homesteads for a large part of the year are an example of a living traditional rural society. I discovered that all three generations of women living under the same roof (grandmother, mother, and daughter) had one and the same name ‘Ivanka’ (a female version of the English ‘John’).

1106 Here there is another tricky issue, because the notion varied by geographical area, time, case, and probably the scribes themselves.


1109 Thus, if at a certain point there was just one caulker called Martinus in Caffa, the scribe mentioned him as such, leaving us in bewilderment whether this Martinus was a Genoese, a Venetian, a Catalan, or a Russian.
was sufficient to identify someone. For slaves and freedmen, the Genoese scribes often specify what they thought were their ethnic origin, yet in cases such as freemen, the situation is much more complicated and ambiguous. In applying terms such as *grecus*, *armenus* or *ermineus*, or *iudeus*, he meant the confessional affiliation rather than their racial, linguistic, or cultural characteristics. Therefore, I must underline once again that hereafter in terms of macrogroups ‘Latin’ stands for any person belonging to Latin Christendom, ‘Greek’ for those professing Greek Orthodox Christianity, ‘Armenian’ for those belonging to the Armenian Gregorian Church, ‘Jew’ for those professing Judaism in any of its versions, and ‘Muslim’ or ‘Saracen’ for those belonging to the Muslim religion. We will also deal with these five macrogroups, alongside the microgroups which they encompass and which I will discuss alongside the macro ones. The key factor for defining macrogroups is religious affiliation since it was religion-based identity as far as the macrogroups are concerned, and place of origin for the microgroups\textsuperscript{1110} or other indicators of ethnic background.

The first and most obvious thing to do when studying issues of identity is to create an onomastikon based on the sources, since ethno-religious identity is normally reflected to a certain extent in the names used in certain communities with a certain logic and frequency. Thus, Anselmo, Bartolomeo, Benedetto, Enrico, Filippo, Gabriele, Giacomo, Giovanni, Lorenzo, or Luciano are normally Latin (or used by a convert or a freedman who becomes part of Latin Roman Catholic social environment); Konstantinos, Dimetrius, Giorgos, Yanis, Leo, Sava, Theodore, or Vassileos must be Orthodox (i.e. ‘Greek’ in broader meaning, including all Greek Orthodox people like Russian, etc.);\textsuperscript{1111} Khachatur or Hovhannes are Armenians; Arslan or Ayrat must have Turkic roots, and may be Tatars, although without a clear specification of religion, which adds the problem of choosing in which group to put them, while Abdullah, Ahmad, or Mohammad are clearly Muslim, even if we do not know from which ethnic background.

Here we face another problem: what should we do with the given names, if some of them are common for different traditions? Fortunately, we can distinguish people of different ethnic groups based how they spell their name. For instance an Italian Giovanni or otherwise

\textsuperscript{1110} This does not necessarily coincide with place of birth or place of actual living before coming to Caffa. I take for the ‘place of origin’ the place specified by the notary, although perhaps it was an actual place of birth or the father, grandfather, or even more remote ancestor of an actual person. However, it is not one’s biography that is important here for us: the key thing here is that even if some ‘Giacomo di Camogli’ did not live a single day in Camogli, he was identified as a person of a camogliese origin; and this describer could be on the way of becoming a family name.

any kind of Western ‘John’ will normally be in the Latin sources Iohannes (or Giovanni in the vernacular), a Greek – Iane (=Yanis, Γιάννης, Ιωάννης), an Armenian – Ivanixius or Ovanes (=Hovhannes, Հովհաննես), a Muslim – Yahya (=يحيى). Same difference can be seen e.g. among Latin Manuel (Emanuele) and Greek Manoli (Μανουήλ), Italian Nicolaus (Niccolò) and Greek Nicolla (Νικόλαος or Νικόλας), Latin Michael (Michele) and Greek Michalli (Μιχαήλ). Nonetheless, even here we often face ambiguity, since the tradition of writing changed over time, and the spelling of a foreign name (especially one which is not widespread) largely depended also on the individual experience or even the whim of a scribe.1112 To make things even more complicated, the ‘Latin’ or ‘Western’ spelling of a name did not necessarily mean that a given person was not an Oriental. Finally, the scribe often did not distinguish the social or religious title (e.g. Greek Papa-, παπάς, or Kir-, Cur-, κύριος), joining it with a personal name to make a single name. Interethnic marriage creates another problem, both regarding the identities of the husband and the wife, and the identity of any children.

Furthermore, before beginning to deal with the Latin macrogroup and the Italian and non-Italian microgroups, I should make a brief remark. While the Latins distinguished among Tatars and Mongols, Zikhs and Circassians, Laz people and Mingrel people, for the local population all Westerners were treated as one and the same group. Following the Byzantine and Orthodox Slavic historiographers would call this group ‘Latins’. For a local Greek or Tatar there was probably little difference between a Genoese and a German or Sicilian. Moreover, even the terminology of the most educated Byzantine writers is very blurry, as well as their political geography. For instance, Pachymeres, in spite of his knowledge of European political affairs, calls all Latins (that is, Catholic Christians) Italians and uses these two words interchangeably, whereas e.g. for Gregoras ‘Italy’ meant just the kingdom of Naples, though he also uses several times the word ‘Italian’ in a sense of ‘Roman Catholic.’1113

Speaking about the male Latin onomastikon of Caffa, we can compare the data for the years 1381, 1423 and 1461. In Massaria Caffae 1381, a total of 876 are identifiable as Latins (since the table in the Ponomarev’s article unfortunately does not distinguish names by ethnic group and only gives the total numbers of use for each name here in the whole population, I

1112 This does not pertain to most of the Western names familiar to a notary; however, even in such cases there was a difference between the Latin and the vernacular form (the first one was generally used in deeds).
1113 Laiou, ‘Italy and the Italians in the Political Geography of the Byzantines’, 73–80, 90.
have made list including the names that very probably belonged to the Latins and omitting some ambiguous names that are relatively, although not predominantly frequent, but hard to identify with any single ethnic group. Moreover, I do not claim that these figures clearly correlate to the real numbers of people in each ethnic group, here I am instead speaking about the respective *onomastikon*). Hereafter (and elsewhere in this study) the names are given in the Italian form rather than in the Latin one. Although some, albeit not many, of their possessors came from parts of Latin Christendom other than Italy, they were still probably identified in a spoken language of the predominantly Italian social environments through the Italianized forms of their names rather than, for instance, with the German or Polish ones, or through the Latin one:

up to 107 times: Giovanni or otherwise any kind of Western ‘John’,

up to 89 times: Giorgio,
73 times: Antonio,
56 times: Niccolò,
43 times: Francesco,
39 times: Giacomo,
30 times: Bartolomeo,
up to 29 times: Pietro,
25 times: Domenico,
up to 22 times: Andrea, Simone,
21 times: Michele,
19 times: Lodisio, Raffaele,
17 times: Benedetto,
16 times: Martino,
up to 16 times: Stefano,
12 times: Luchino-Luciano-Lucino,
11 times: Guglielmo, Giuliano, Oberto,
up to 11 times: Paolo,
10 times: Astellano,
up to 10 times: Tommaso,
up to 9 times: Cristoforo,

\[1114\] Since these 107 “Iohannes” by default include both the representatives of non-Italian Latins, Orientals, and non-identified people; I will hereafter put “up to X” instead of “X” in such cases.
9 times: Gaspare, Lorenzo,
8 times: Bernabo, Cosmaele,
up to 8 times: Zaccaria, Marco, Matteo, Pasquale,
7 times: Enrico, Filippo, Gabriele,
6 times: Lanfranco, Manfredo, Manuele,
5 times: Leonardo, Sorleone,
4 times: Angelo, Gentille, Gerardo, Gianino, Gianotto, Napoleone, Vescunte,
3 times: Alnardo, Angelino, Agostino, Battista, Bernardo, Bonifacio, Clemente, Corrado, Chirico, Demerode, Franco, Gasparino, Gotifredo, Gianuccio, Raffo,
2 times: Anfreone, Anselmo, Babilano, Baldassare, Bertono, Branca, Carlo, Cesare, Daniele, Dixerino, Frederico, Lanzaroto, Lazarino, Oppecino, Rizardo, Teramo, Ugolino,
1 time: Adamo, Ambrogio, Andriolo, Andriotto, Ansaldo, Beda, Bellengerio, Bertino, Bruno, Carlino, Carlotto, Cristiano, Costanzo, Dalmazio, Donato, Ettore, Egidio, Gabriotto, Gavino, Gaetano, Girolamo, Gianone, Giardino, Geoffroy (Iofredus), Luca, Maurizio, Michellino, Niccolò Antonio, Ottobono, Edoardo (Odoardus), Oliverio, Paganino, Pasqualino, Percivale, Ruffino, Rolandino, Sardellone, Segurano, Seravino, Spagnolo, Stellano, Terami (Tiranos, Tiramos, Theramus), Valeraine (Vallaranus), and others.

In Massaria Caffae 1423, a total of 869 identifiable as Latins:
101 times: Giovanni (plus two Gianantonio, one Gianbattista, one Gianello, one Gianino, one Gianone, and one Gianotto),
79 times: Antonio,
48 times: Niccolò,
43 times: Giorgio,
34 times: Battista,
33 times: Pietro plus one Pierantonio, one Pierbattista, and one Piergiovanni,
28 times: Bartolomeo, Marco,
26 times: Francesco,
24 times: Giacomo,
22 times: Domenico,
19 times: Andrea,

\[\text{1115 Double names were not yet characteristic for the fourteenth century (1380s), but appear in a considerable quantity in the fifteenth century (1420s onwards).}\]
17 times: Michele,
15 times: Lodisio, Tommaso,
14 times: Oberto,
13 times: Luca/Luchetto & Co., Raffaele,
12 times: Simone,
11 times: Stefano,
10 times: Benedetto, Guglielmo, Giuliano,
9 times: Girolamo, Paolo,
8 times: Filippo,
7 times: Leonardo,
6 times: Carlo, Martino,
5 times: Ambrogio, Agostino, Gregorio, Lorenzo, Melchiorre,
4 times: Biagio, Corrado, Dagnano, Gabriele, Emanuele, Lanfranco, Matteo, Vincenzo,
3 times: Baldassarre, Barnaba, Costantino, Alessio, Galeazzo, Gaspare, Leone, Percivalle, Zaccaria,
2 times: Argono, Astellano, Angelo, Baldo, Cristoforo, Erminio, Ludovico, Pambello, Pellegrino,

In Massaria Caffae 1461, a total of 673 identifiable as Latins;
56 times: Antonio,
36 times: Bartolomeo,
33 times: Niccolò,
30 times: Battista,
28 times: Giacomo,
25 times: Francesco,
23 times: Andrea,
20 times: Domenico,
18 times: Pietro plus one Pierbattista,
16 times: Giorgio, Tommaso,
13 times: Cristoforo,
12 times: Paolo,
10 times: Gregorio, Lodisio,
9 times: Guglielmo,
8 times: Giuliano,
7 times: Ambrogio, Agostino, Biagio, Lazzaro/Lazzarino, Matteo, Michele, Raffaele,
6 times: Bernardo, Gaspare, Giraldo,
5 times: Benedetto, Cipriano, Girolamo, Filippo, Luca/Luchetto &c, Lorenzo, Oliviero, Pellegrino, Simone,
4 times: Baldassarre, Lansaroto, Emanuele, Marco,
3 times: Barnaba, Damiano, Galeotto, Martino,
2 times: Abramo, Anselmo, Carlo, Cristiano, Costantino, Donato, Genovino, Melchiorre, Pasquale, Ciriaco, Rodrigo, Rolando, Stefano, Teodoro, Teramo, Valentino, Vincenzo,
1 time: Adamo, Agnello, Alarame, Alberto, Alessandrino, Andriolo, Anastasio, Angelino, Ansaldo, Babilano, Bastiano, Basilio, Beda, Beltramo, Bertone, Caluccio, Carlinio, Carlo, Centino, Centurione, Clemente, Costantino, Cornelius, Daniele, Ettore, Edoardo, Enrico, Frederico, Gabriele, Gandolfo, Giusto, Illario, Innocenzo, Leonardo, Merialdo, Parisino, Raddo, Raimondo, Rainardo, Remeneto, Ruggero, Rosetto, Silvestro, Sorleone, Taddeo, Teodoro, Tristano, Zaccaria, and others.

As we can see, the majority of the names are reflecting the general onomasticon typical for Italy and Genoa. Obviously, minor changes in the Latin onomasticon caused by the colonial environment were possible as a result of interaction with the Oriental environment. Sometimes the Genoese borrowed names which were more characteristic for the Oriental (Theodoros, Darius, Christodorus, Niketas), like the consul of Caffa in 1381 bearing an Armenian name Hovhannes (Ivanissius) di Mari.\textsuperscript{1116}

\textsuperscript{1116} Ponomarev, “Население и территория.”
Italians. My aim here is to map the flows of migration of Italians and, afterwards, other Latins to the Genoese Black Sea colonies. ‘Italy’ is taken here as rather a geographic term, and the word ‘Italians’ stands for all Romance-speaking inhabitants of the Apennine Peninsula. Balard wrote that the emigration overseas had in Genoa a national character, was a ‘national fact’, since all of Liguria was involved in it, at the same time inferring that all those Italians who came to Caffa in 1280s–1290s were just passing merchants, that the society was unstable, in a state of flux, constantly renewing itself, and very open, yet without much privilege or social difference. Later on, ever greater numbers of Genoese settled in Caffa permanently or long-term. The percentage and quantity of the Italian population in Caffa throughout the centuries is long ago ardently debated. The two extremities in the views are: that Italians constituted the absolute majority of the population (i.e. far more than half), or that Italians were a tiny, almost unnoticeable minority in the city’s ethnic composition. Both views are incorrect. The Italian population was relatively numerous, although it declined in certain periods, and although it probably did not always outnumber the non-Italian one.

The majority of Italians were Genoese or other Ligurians (sometimes the Genoese are recognizable because of the indicator civis Ianue or judging from other describers). In fact as early as the thirteenth century people from almost all towns and hamlets in Liguria could be found in the notarial deeds. Those from the coastal towns outnumbered those from inland areas, the leaders being Chiavari, Rapallo, Sestri Levante, Arenzano, Finale, Varazze, and Savona; the inland towns involved, although supplying less people, were quite numerous. According to R. Lopez, the closing decades of the thirteenth century were a ‘golden age’ of Genoese expansion with its extension over the Black Sea region, which preceded the period of systematic exploitation of the first half of the fourteenth century. According to the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto researched by Michel Balard, in 1289–1290, 79% of all Western Europeans in Caffa were from Italy, and 74% among them from Genoa and Liguria. In the 1290s, at least two-thirds of the Italians of Caffa are from
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1117 Balard, La Romanie génoise, 248.  
1118 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 355.  
1120 Among them Bobbio, Campo Ligure, Gavi, Millesimo, Ottone, Pontremoli, Rezzo, Ronco, Savignone, Spigno, Val di Taro, etc.  
1122 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 248.
Liguria, others being from Asti, Alexandria, Bergamo, Milan, Parma, Piacenza, and Cremona; we also find non-Italians such as people from Valencia, Montpellier, although many of them lived in Genoa or had worked there long before coming to Caffa.\textsuperscript{1123}

It is interesting to note that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the colonization of the Black Sea area was done to a great extent not only by the Genoese, but also by almost all the population of Liguria. According to Balard, the same was true for Famagusta in Cyprus,\textsuperscript{1124} and probably also applied to the rest of the Genoese colonies, i.e. Pera and Chios. Moreover, the Genoese settlement of coral fishers in Marsacares, North Africa (yet another direction of the Genoese colonialism) was also composed mainly of the people from Ligurian towns and hamlets rather than from Genoa proper.\textsuperscript{1125} Genoa was a melting pot that mixed the Ligurian population, gave them a new identity and dispersed them over the Eastern and African colonies.\textsuperscript{1126} According to Balard, most of the people mentioned in the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto (1289-1290) came from Genoa, Liguria, and the neighbouring areas. Here is a brief summary of his tables, reflecting the initial stage of the colonization of Caffa.

\begin{quote}
Geographical distribution of the Italians in Caffa according to the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto (1289-1290), based on Balard, La Romanie Génoise, vol. 1, 238-243
\end{quote}

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Area of the Apennine Peninsula & People \\
\hline
Genoa & 128 \\
Immediate suburbs of Genoa & 77 \\
Riviera di Ponente (i.e. west from Genoa) coastal area & 63 \\
Riviera di Ponente (i.e. west from Genoa) mountainous area & 88 \\
Riviera di Levante (i.e. east from Genoa) coastal area & 65 \\
Riviera di Levante (i.e. east from Genoa) mountainous area & 100 \\
Apennines to the North from Genoa & 35 \\
Valley of Po (Piedmonte, Lombardy, Emilia, Veneto) & 95 \\
Ancona & 11 \\
Florence & 1 \\
Gubbio & 1 \\
Lucca & 1 \\
Pietrasanta & 1 \\
Pisa & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{1123} Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, vol. 1, No. 795, 770.
\textsuperscript{1126} Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 353.
Thus, the colonizers of Caffa on the early stage went from Genoa, Liguria, Northern Italy, and almost nobody came from the other areas of the Western Europe; in the late thirteenth century the population of Caffa was mostly Liguria. Balard’s calculations are also based on the Genoese source material (i.e. sources from Genoa, not Caffa) that most of the investments to the trade in Romania (and, then Gazaria) went from the Genoese and other Ligurians, while the rest of Italians (chiefly from Lombardy), Catalans, Corsicans, and Provençales were of minor importance. For us, however, there is no point in tracing particularly the percentages of participation of each Ligurian town in the enterprises in the Black Sea in terms of investments. What is more important are those people who actually went to Caffa, the groups of travelling merchants (i.e. those who made technically made deals on the spot rather than in Genoa, and therefore, what is important for us, were present in Caffa) where the Genoese had over two-thirds of the contracts connected to the Eastern colonies, and 85% of the invested capital. Here non-Ligurians were also a tiny minority with 5% of all contracts and 2% of invested capital. The same was true for other Genoese settlements on the Black Sea: even in Tana, which was Venetian par excellence, the Venetians outnumbered the Genoese only later on in the fifteenth century. In Caffa, Venetians were based in and around the convent of the fratres minores. Venetians occasionally sent their consul to Caffa, together with officers of the curia such as notaries and chancellor. Obviously the Venetian consuls of the city were just the representatives of the Serenissima and did not have any considerable significance. The Florentines (as well as some other Italians) often appeared in the Black Sea, mainly heading to Tana rather than Caffa, and even establishing some settlements there. However, they were not very numerous. Thus,

1129 Although Genoese retained their quarters acquired as early as fourteenth century; Skrzhinskaja, “Венецианский посол в Золотой Орде (по надгробию Якопо Корнаро, 1362 г.)” [Venetian Ambassador to the Golden Horde; the Gravestone of Jacopo Cornaro, 1362], *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 35 (1973): 103.
1131 In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Florentine republic did not yet have any fleet. Nonetheless, according to Giovanni Villani the Florentines frequented Trebizond and Tana, and they were the first ones to bring the news about plague (perhaps together with the virus?) in 1347 (the same author actually reported that only one out of five survived in Tana). Villani, *Historia universalis condita Florentiae usque ad annum MCCCCXLVII* (Milan: Stamperia Palatina, 1728), 964-965. The Black Sea trade is represented in the Florentine merchants’ guide written by Pegolotti: Pegolotti, *La Practica della mercatura*, ed. Evans (Cambridge, Mass., 1936), 29-32. *Libro de mercantantie et usanze de’paesi*, ed. Borlandi (Turin, 1936), 31. The documents of
in this period, by referring to ‘Italians’ we in fact by default implying that the majority of them were ‘Genoese or otherwise Ligurian’.

In the notarial deeds of the fourteenth century, we also find a few people from outside Liguria – around twenty people from Lombardy, some from Piemonte (among them three from Asti), some from Emilia-Romagna (four of them from Piacenza), two Florentines, three Catalans, three persons from Montpellier.\textsuperscript{1132} At the same time, while we see the activity of the Ligurian merchants (and to a much lesser extent those of Lombardy) in the Genoese Caffa, the situation for the area where the Venetian influence was considerable was totally different. The deeds of Benedetto Bianco, who was a Venetian and worked in Tana in 1359–1360, reveal the greater role of the inland areas of the Central-Northern Italy and the Adriatic coast, thanks to the proximity of Venice and the activity of Prato in the Levantine direction. In these deeds, apart from the Venetians and people from Veneto, twenty-nine people come from the settlements of Tuscany, fourteen from Emilia-Romagna, four from Lombardy, two from Marche, two from Piedmont, one from Abruzzi, one from Trentino, and 1 from Umbria.\textsuperscript{1133}

In 1381, we find a fair amount of non-Genoese Italians such as Giacomo\textsuperscript{1134} and Bernardo\textsuperscript{1135} from Piacenza or Giovanni from Mantua,\textsuperscript{1136} as well as many others. In 1386, we find people from Corsica, Asti, Alexandria, Bergamo, Milan, Cremona, Piacenza, Pavia, Vercelli, Florence, Siena, Naples, and Venice. Moreover, the Iberian nations become more visible, thanks to the Genoese relations with the Hispanic kingdoms: three persons from Catalonia, seven from Valencia, three from Seville, one from Murcia, and one from Galicia.\textsuperscript{1137} At the same time, in 1386–1387 there were also some Latins from the Orient: three from Rhodes, three from Pera, two from Matrega, two from Tana, two from Illice, two from Vicina, and two from the Horde (i.e. the Golden Horde).

\textsuperscript{1132} Balbi, Raiteri, Notai genovesi, No. 7, 14, 68.
\textsuperscript{1134} MC 1381, 328r.
\textsuperscript{1135} MC 1381, 25r.
\textsuperscript{1136} MC 1381, 103r.
Geo Pistarino believed that in Caffa in the fifteenth century the Latins were an absolute minority in the city – some several thousand people out of the overall population of 100,000; Geo Pistarino, “Due secoli tra Pera e Caffa,” Bulgaria Pontica Medii Aevi 3 (1992): 52. these 100,000 reported by Schiltberger in his travelogue is certainly not an accurate number; however, it may look plausible that the general trend of the demography of Caffa was the overall growth of population with a diminishing specific share of the Italians; it was, however, not the case, as I will show below. On the basis of his research of Massaria Caffae of 1381 Ponomarev concluded that Latins constituted over 50% of the overall population of Caffa: 933 adult male Latins mentioned in massa plus the application of his cunning mathematical method, see below. 1139 The Massaria Caffae 1423 mentions 892 or slightly more; the Massaria Caffae 1461 mentions 717 or slightly more.

The studies by Balard1140 and Ponomarev1141 focused on fourteenth-century Caffa reveal a very high percentage of non-Genoese Ligurian people in the Genoese colonization of Latin Romania and, in particular, the Black Sea area. The Genoese Black Sea colonization was largely done by the people from the minor towns of the Genoese Riviera or even those from distant villages in Piedmont, Lombardy, Tuscany, Emilia-Romagna, etc. These people migrated to Genoa in search of the fortune that could be made in a maritime trading city, or just looking for a better quality of life and higher status than in the poor countryside. In Genoa, these migrants to a certain extent took a Genoese identity, but retained their local identity as well. For the Orientals they were all Latins and Genoese, whereas for the native Genoese a migrant from Savona remained, e.g. ‘Giacomo di Savona’. Indeed, as has been stressed in earlier scholarship, quantitative prevailing of non-Genoese Italians in the Genoese colonization was a trend in the Black Sea colonial life in the fourteenth century. Nonetheless, judging from the sources, this trend is slightly weakened by the 1420s and disappeared by the 1460s. In Massaria Caffae 1423 the non-Genoese Italians are visible and numerous, but somewhat less than earlier on, while by the 1460s they become a minority. This can be explained by either of the two factors (or indeed a combination of both): 1. The migrants to Genoa and then from Genoa to Caffa were abandoning their initial identity and amalgamating into the Genoese community, 2. The flow of the non-Genoese migrants began to weaken first

---

slightly in the 1400s and 1450s, and then abruptly from 1453 onwards because of the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople. To compare the presence of the non-Genoese Italians in Caffa, let us take a look at the table comparing their number and origin in 1423 and in 1461. As elsewhere, the attribution of people to a certain Italian province is based on the modern borders of the provinces, since in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the state borders changed significantly, and therefore assuming the current frontiers is the most logical way to categorize them. ‘Italy’ here stands not for the current state of Italy, but for a geographical entity including the Italian Peninsula, the Po Valley, and the southern slopes of the Alps (Sicily, Sardinia, and other islands are dealt with separately, as well as territories such as present day French Savoy and the Côte d’Azur or Croatian Dalmatia). Southern Tirol and Southern Switzerland are treated as part of the geographic entity of Italy, so although Ticino is not politically part of Italy, and while people from Brenner and Bulla may have been ethnically Germanic, they all constitute part of the same geographic entity.

Table: A comparison of numbers and provenance of the non-Genoese Italians in the Genoese Black Sea colonies, years 1423 and 1461 (based on the respective Massaria Caffae 1423 and Massaria Caffae 1461)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical region (without Genoa)</th>
<th>MC 1423</th>
<th>MC 1461</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liguria</td>
<td>A total of 100: 9 Castiglione Chiavarese (Genoa); 8 Recco; 5 Monleone (Cicagna); 4 Carretto (Savona); 4 Levanto (Spezia); 4 Passano (Spezia); 4 Rapallo; 4 Savignone (Genova); 4 Torriglia; 4 Zoagli; 3 Benessea (Savona); 3 Camogli; 3 Chiavari (Genova); 3 Framura; 3 Luni (Ortonovo); 3 Caneto (Imperia, one of them <em>olim</em>); 2 Albenga (Savona); 2 Andora (Savona); 2 Diano Castello (Imperia); 2 Groppo (Spezia); 2 Muldeo (Genoa); 2 Pino (Torrazza); 2 Sarzana; 2 Semino (Genoa); 1 Balestrino (Savona); 1 Bardinetto (Genoa); 1 Bogliasco (Genoa); 1 Carcare (Savona); 1 Castelletto (Genoa); 1 Comago (province of Genoa); 1 Fegino (Rivarolo, Genoa); 1 Forte Belvedere (Sampierdarena, Genova); 1 La Spezia; 1 Maddalena (Savona); 1 Manarola (Spezia); 1</td>
<td>A total of 44: 5 Semino (Genoa); 4 Camogli; 4 Chiavari (Genova); 4 Pino (Torrazza); 4 Rapallo; 3 Torriglia; 2 Albenga (Savona); 2 Castiglione Chiavarese (Genoa); 2 Framura (Moneglia, Genoa); 2 Savignone (Genova); 2 Varazze (Savona); 2 Zoagli; 1 Arenzano (Genoa); 1 Bogliasco (Genoa); 1 Diano Castello (Imperia); 1 Monterosso al Mare (Savona); 1 Portofino (Genoa); 1 Sarzana; 1 Vernazza (La Spezia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1142 Besides being a logical form of aggregation, this is a common practice in the field, see Balard, *La Romanie genoise*. 219
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Cities</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Marchesano (Spezia); 1 Oneglia (Imperia); 1 Pareto (Genoa); 1 Pineo (Suvona); 1 Saglieno (Genoa); 1 Ventimiglia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A total of 12: 4 Vigone (Turin); 3 Ceva (Cuneo); 1 Gabiano (Alessandria); 1 Garessio (Cuneo); 1 Montaldo Torinese (Turin); 1 Novara; 1 Vallestura (Alessandria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Piedmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Garessio (Cuneo); 5 Bassignana (Alessandria); 4 Spigno Monferrato (Alessandria); 3 Ceva (Cuneo); 3 Montacuto; 3 Novara; 2 Alessandria; 2 Asti; 2 Cossano (Cossano Belbo OR Cossano Canavese?); 2 Mongiardi Ligure (Alessandria); 2 Montezemolo (Cuneo); 2 Olivero (Olivero, Asti OR Olivero, Turin); 2 Ovada, Alessandria; 2 Podio (Cuneo OR Turin); 2 Ponzzone, Alessandria; 2 Rigoroso, Asti; 2 Serravalle Scrivia, Alessandria; 1 Alba, Cuneo; 1 Montechiaro (Montechiaro d’Asti OR Montechiaro d’Acqui, Alessandria); 1 Rivoli, Turin; 1 Serra, Cuneo; 1 Tonengo, Asti; 1 Tortona, Alessandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A total of 12: 4 Vigone (Turin); 3 Ceva (Cuneo); 1 Gabiano (Alessandria); 1 Garessio (Cuneo); 1 Montaldo Torinese (Turin); 1 Novara; 1 Vallestura (Alessandria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A total of 21: 4 Bobbio (Piacenza); 4 Parma; 3 Ferrara; 2 Corlo (Ferrara); 2 Merlano (Savigno); 1 Bonello (Ferrara); 1 Canesano (Parma); 1 Pereto (Parma); 1 Pineto (Vetto, Reggio Emilia); 1 Reggio Emilia; 1 Spagnano (Parma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emilia-Romagna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A total of 6: 3 Parma; 1 Bologna; 1 Camurana (Modena); 1 Pessola (Parma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lombardy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A total of 15: 3 Milan; 2 Barisondonzo (Pavia); 2 Cremona; 2 Mulazzana (Lodi); 2 Pavia; 1 Como; 1 Monza (Monza e della Brianza); 1 Barona (Lodi); 1 Mantova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>A total of 12: 1 Lombardus; 3 Milan; 2 Erba (Como); 2 Tirano (Sondrio); 1 Bergamo; 1 Cremona; 1 Mulazzano/a, (Lodi); 1 Varese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuscany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>A total of 15: 5 Panzano in Chianti (Greve in Chianti, Florence); 4 Castelnuovo di Garfagnana (Lucca); 2 Castellaccio (Livorno); 2 Cavo (Livorno); 2 Pastino (Lucca); 1 Florence; 1 Galluzzo (Florence); 1 Pomino (province of Florence); 1 Sassorosso (Lucca)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A total of 13: 4 Castellaccio (Livorno); 2 Florence; 2 Pisa; 2 Sassorosso (Lucca); 1 Cavo (Livorno); 1 Podenzana (Massa e Carrara); 1 San Gimignano (Siena);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuscany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A total of 18: 5 Venice; 3 Verona; 2 Cavana (province of Vanice); 2 Padova; 2 Vicenza; 1 Albaro (Verona); 1 Macia (Verona); 1 Scalabrin (Vicenza); 1 Treviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A total of 2: 2 Verona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veneto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A total of 4: 1 Ancona; 1 Macerata; 1 Taro (Macerata); 1 Terro (Macerata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A total of 2: 2 Ancona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marche</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A total of 3: 2 Pagani; 1 Faracchio (Salerno)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A total of 9: 2 Pagani (Salerno); 2 Salerno; 1 Naples; 1 Campora (Salerno); 1 Capriati a Volturmo (Caserta); 1 Caserta; 1 Giugliano in Campania (Naples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A total of 1: 1 Pico (Frosinone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A total of 1: 1 Tarquinia/Corneto (Viterbo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A total of 1: 1 Troia (Foggia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A total of 1: 1 Troia (Foggia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A total of 3: 1 Amelia (Terni); 1 Todi (Perugia); 1 Ripa (Perugia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trentino-Alt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A total of 6: 3 Brennero (Bolzano); 2 Fornace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adige Margone (Trento) (Trento); 1 Trento
Friuli-Venezia Giulia – A total of 1: 1 Udine
Basilicata – A total of 1: 1 Lavello (Potenza)
Ticino A total of 1: 1 Solario (Blenio) A total of 2: 1 Airolo; 1 Bellinzona

Rest of the Latin world:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical region</th>
<th>MC 1423</th>
<th>MC 1461</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>1 Palermo; 1 Messina</td>
<td>1 Sicily in general; 1 Palermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 Sardinia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsica</td>
<td>2 Forco, Vico</td>
<td>3 general corsi; 5 Bonifacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>1 Malta</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmatia</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 Dubrovnik (Ragusa); 1 Capodistria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Mediterranean</td>
<td>8 Byblos, Lebanon; 1 Cairo; 1 Famagusta; 1 Pera</td>
<td>5 Byblos, Lebanon; 3 Pera; 1 Chios; 1 Famagusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German states (mainly Holy Roman Empire)</td>
<td>1 todescus; 3 Ulm; 1 Bavaria</td>
<td>7 de Alamania and 1 todescus; 1 Ulm; 1 Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgundy, Flanders, and the Northern Netherlands</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 Burgundy; 1 Bruges; 1 Holland; 1 Zeeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1 de Francia; 2 Montpellier (Languedoc-Roussillon); 1 Roussillon; 1 Marseille (Provence); 1 La Rochette (Savoia); 1 Vayrols; 1 Vignon (Soyans OR Saint-Vincent-en-Bresse)</td>
<td>3 de Francia; 3 Marseille, Provence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1 Seville; 1 Cordova; 1 Peromingo (province of Salamanca); several Catalans</td>
<td>1 iberius; 1 spagnolus; 1 Seville; 1 Murcia; several Catalans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (incl. the Serbs)</td>
<td>2 Buda</td>
<td>6 generally from the Hungarian kingdom, but not more than three of them were Roman Catholics; the other three are Greek Orthodox, two of them Serbs from Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech lands</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 de Bohemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7 de Polonia; 1 Lublin; several pollani</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To understand better the dynamics of the structure of the extra-Italian Latin migration to Genoese Gazaria, we should visualise the places of origin of the colonists on the respective maps.
Massaria Caffae 1423: Places of origin of the Latin migrants to Caffa coming from outside Italy.
Massaria Caffae 1461: Places of origin of the Latin migrants to Caffa coming from outside Italy.

As we can see from the maps, and as will be confirmed below in the analysis of microgroups, the structure of the colonisational migration from Latin Europe to the Genoese Black Sea underwent a considerable transformation in the thirty-eight years separating 1461 and 1423, particularly when the pivotal date of 1453 is taken into account. In 1423 Italians were still the majority among the colonists; the largest share of 58% being Ligurians (39%) and Piedmontese (19%). People from other Italian provinces were much less numerous, and those from outside Italy accounted for only 12%, of which 8% from the rest of Latin Europe and 4% from the Eastern Mediterranean. This picture coincides in general terms with the one of the fourteenth century according to the work of Balard and Ponomarev: colonisation is mainly performed by the Genoese and Piedmontese, other Italians being secondary and other Latins ranking third in importance.
This picture changes dramatically by 1461. The share of Ligurians has fallen from 39% to 25%, the share of Piedmontese, from 19% to 8%. The number of people coming from other areas of Italy has increased considerably, whereas non-Italians amount for 35% instead of the previous 12% of the total, i.e. almost triple. As we will see, many of these people come not from the Mediterranean, which was the case in earlier times, but from non-Mediterranean Western Europe (Germany, Burgundy, Flanders, and Holland) and Central and Eastern Europe (Poland and Czech lands). Thus, we should speak of the internationalisation of the Latin colonisation of Crimea. If Balard said that this colonisation was a ‘fait national’ for the Ligurians, after the mid-fifteenth century it had indeed acquired not a Ligurian, nor even Italian, but a European scale. Looking for plausible explanations for this transformation and this internationalisation of the structure of migration, we should begin by mentioning the closure of the straits after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the increasing obstacles for navigation from Genoa to Caffa, and the consequent increase of importance of the overland route via Eastern Europe. Apparently, Caffa was considered one of the bulwarks of Latin Christendom against the menace of Ottoman expansion; therefore defending it became at a certain point a ‘European’ matter.

Moving from the general observations on the Latin macrogroup, I will discuss the presence of each of first Latin and then Oriental microgroups of the population of Caffa before coming back to all five macrogroups and analysing the interaction of these macrogroups and the overall composition of the urban population.

Sicilians. The Sicilians regularly appeared in Caffa, Pera, and Famagusta in the course of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In 1289-1290, we find one person from Messina. For the fifteenth century, the history of the Sicilians on the Black Sea is studied in detail by the Catalan scholar Daniel Duran i Duelt. In 1423, we find a burgensis of Caffa.

---

1143 Daniel Duran i Duelt, “De l’autonomia a la integració: la participació siciliana en el comerç oriental als segles XIV i XV,” in La Corona catalanoaragonesa i el seu entorn mediterrani a la Baixa Edat Mitjana (Barcelona: CSIC, 2005), 65-99.

1144 Andrea from Palermo was one of the Sicilians whose stay in Crimea in the fifteenth century is well documented, and was researched by Duran i Duelt. Andrea paid 24 aspres to massarii of Caffa in May 13, 1421. On October 9, 1422, he began serving the Genoese authorities of Caffa. March 28, 1424, he was identified as burgensis Caffe; otherwise he was also called a tailor (sartor). On 9 October 1424 he began to serve as a socius of Soldaia. March 13, 1441 we find someone with a similar name serving as socius Samastri, and another person with a similar name began on the July 5, 1454 to serve as a socius in Cembalo, and stayed at this post at least until January 1455. Yet another Andrea from Palermo began to serve in Caffa in the period between April 25, 1455, and August 8, 1456, and lived in Caffa at least up to 1460. Numerous Sicilians were present in Caffa otherwise, e.g. Stefano de Siracusa (mentioned on 13 March 1441), Antonello di Palermo (who began in June 1446 to serve as a socius of Soldaia), Antonio de Siracussa (1420), Giuliano de Messina (1460), Rolando de
Andrea de Palermo, who was a tailor and occasionally served as a supernumerary soldier in Cembalo (socius additus Cimbali), and in Samastro, on the position of Filippo de Rittilario (socius Samastri subrogatus loco Filipi de Rittilario). We also find another Sicilian, Colla de Messina and Domenichina from Soldaia, daughter of the deceased Sicilian Niccolò (Dominigina de Soldaya quondam Nicolai siculi). Another two other Sicilians can be found in 1461: a socius of Cembalo Andrea de Palermo and a certain Niccolò de Sicilia.

Corsicans, Sardinians, Maltese. The Corsicans seem to take part in the Genoese colonization of the Black Sea throughout the fifteenth century, although in fairly modest numbers. To a lesser extent this also applies to the people from Sardinia and Malta. In 1423 there were two people from Corsica, Battista de Forcho and Oberto Forchus (burgensis Caffe socius turris Sancti Constantini, socius additus Cimbali, copriterius), as well as one Maltese, Leone de Malta, who was a ship-owner (patronus). In 1461, there are three persons each of whom is broadly defined as corsus without a specification of the place of origin: Cipriano, Bartholomeo, and Barnaba, who was a soldier in Cembalo (socius Cimbali). However, alongside these three ‘general’ Corsicans there are five people all from a Corsican town, namely Bonifacio: Bartolomeo, soldiers in Caffa (socii Caffe) Andrea and Giovanni corsus, barber Giacomo, and yet another barber maestro Giovanni. One person of Sardinian origin was socius Caffe Agostino sardus.

Daniel Duran i Duelt, “De l’autonomia a la integració: la participació siciliana en el comerç oriental als segles XIV i XV,” in La Corona catalanoaragonesa i el seu entorn mediterrani a la Baixa Edat Mitjana (Barcelona: CSIC, 2005), 77-78. Duran i Duelt refers in his article to Massariae Caffae of the different years.
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**Latins from the Eastern Mediterranean.** It is quite obvious that the Latins from the crusader kingdoms and Italian colonies of the Near East, Latin Romania, and the entire Eastern Mediterranean might visit the Genoese Black Sea colonies or even settle there. What is more surprising, and what was noticed long ago but without a sufficient explanation, is why the distribution of these people so ‘tall and slim’? In other words, why most of the people from the Eastern Mediterranean who happened to be in Caffa were from one Near-Eastern city which had hosted a Genoese colony, i.e. Biblos in modern day Lebanon, called Gibeletto by the Medieval Latins? I cannot provide a definitive answer to this question here, but I will state and confirm previous common knowledge. In 1423, in Caffa there was one person from the near-bye Pera, one from Crete (Iohanes de Candia, prouisionatus Caffe, nuncius presentis officii massarie Caffe), one from Famagusta in Cyprus (Antonius de Famagusta custos nocturnus Caffe ad porta Bissannis), one from Cairo (Franciscus de Cairo), and eight from Byblos (Gibelleto): Antonio, Costantino, Domenico, Gabriele, Giorgio (who served as an orguxius in Soldaia), Edipo, Giuliano, and Lodisio. The last two referred to as burgenses Caffe, which meant that they were well-established in the city. Moreover, Lodisio was a draper and served in the guards as a socius Caffe. In 1461, there were three persons from Pera, one from Chios, one from Famagusta, and five from Byblos: Tommaso, placierius of Caffa, Battista, socius of Caffa, Lorenzo, socius of Caffa, Aur[elio], and Giuliano. People from Byblos could also be refugees, or simply there could have been a special connection between the merchants of Caffa and those of Gibeletto. To finish with the Eastern Mediterranean Latins, we should add people from Dalmatia who can be found in Caffa in 1461, probably of Italian origin: socius

---
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Caffe Michele from Capodistria (now Slovenia), plus provisionatus Soldaie et socius castrorum Soldaie Tommaso and socius Caffe Luca de Raguxia, both de Raguxia, i.e. from today’s Dubrovnik, Croatia.

Catalans, Majorcans, Spaniards, and other Iberians. The connections of Iberia with the Black Sea were very strong in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. In the deeds of Sambucetto, 1289-90, we find one person from Galicia, and, arguably, one more from the Iberian Peninsula, Iacobus de Valiencia or that is Jacobo from Valencia, who could be from Valenza near Alessandria in Piedmont, or Valence in France, or Valencia in Spain. There was also another Guglielmo di Valiencia, whom Laura Ballettto thought was from Valenza in Piedmont. The Catalans had been present in Caffa since early fourteenth century, and remained a considerable group of European merchants in the following decades. Actually,
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the first bishop of Caffa was the Catalanian Franciscan friar Jeroni. Otherwise, the Catalans often served as mercenaries, although we also find Catalan merchants, chiefly in the slave trade. In 1343–1344, in the deeds drawn up in Caffa by Niccolò Beltrame there are three Catalans. Their presence remained stable throughout the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as they played a significant role in the Levantine trade, and the figures show them frequenting the Eastern Mediterranean ports are impressive. Unlike many other Mediterranean people, who came to Caffa in the fourteenth century mainly as merchants and commercial people, the Hispanic nations had always provided the colony with not only entrepreneurs, but also with quite a number of soldiers. In 1374, there was a Catalan Guillem, who served as a crossbowman (ballistarius) and as a gate guard (custos porterius), and another Catalan called Berenguer. Besides the Catalans, there are people from Valencia, e.g. Pedro and Jaime or perhaps Diego or Iago (Iacobus), and another crossbowman (ballistarius) Pedro from Cordova. Spaniards, Catalans and other Hispanic people are mentioned in Massaria Caffae of 1381–1382. In Massaria Caffae 1386, Hispanic people are in fact the only fairly numerous group of Western migrants to Caffa from beyond Italy: five Catalans, seven from Valencia, three from Seville, one from Murcia, and one from Galicia. Hispanic people appear in the sources until later on and in Massaria Caffae 1387 we find a Juan from Valencia and others. At this point, the involvement of Seville, Murcia and Galicia in the Genoese colonial enterprise can be explained by the expansion of the commercial connections among the Republic of Genoa and the Hispanic states. In 1423,
we find two Catalans: Joan from Roussillon, servant of Manfredo Sauli, and perhaps Antonio from Seva (if this can be identified as a place in Osona, Catalonia). Besides them, there are representatives of other parts of the Iberian Peninsula: a friar and a chaplain of the church of Cembalo Rodrigo from Cordoba, a *socius Samastri* Alfonso (*Alonsius*) from Seville, and perhaps *serviens Caffe* Jorge de Canechaxio (Caneças, Odivelas, province of Lisbon?). In 1461 there are no more references to Catalans or Majorcans, but there are other Hispanic people: *socius Caffe* Juan from Murcia, *socius Caffe* Pedro from Seville, *prouisionatus Soldaie* maestro Juan iberius, and *socius Caffe* Tristán spagnolus. We should also note that a Spanish traveller and writer Pedro Tafur (ca. 1410–1484) was visiting Caffa and left his account on it. The Venetian notarial deeds also mention a certain Gonzales from Seville (*Gonsalnus de Sybillia*), who witnessed drawing up a notarial deed in Tana; this is evidence that the Spanish people could penetrate to the more remote areas in Genoese Gazaria outside Caffa’s city walls.

**French and Burgundians.** These people arrived in the region in two different ways. Firstly, people from the French Côte d’Azur, and especially from the economically lively centre Marseille, were the most immediate neighbours of the Ligurians, and therefore natural commercial partners in their overseas colonial enterprises. On the other hand, as early as the fourteenth century in *Massariae Caffae* we find a person from the remote Gascony called Simon, and this demonstrates an emerging trend which is strengthened in the following century. We know that throughout the fourteenth century people from Southern France participated in the Genoese colonization of the Black Sea in much the same way as people from the Ligurian Riviera or Piedmont. As the sources show, the influx of these people continued into the fifteenth century. In 1423, there are the following people from France in Caffa: Francois from Marseille, Jean or Johneq/Janin from Montpellier, *socius*
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Caffe and a servant of maestro Thoma from Andora near Savona, Guillaume Magnus de Francia, serviens Caffe, olim custos nocturnus,1214 Goarnerio de La Rocheta (La Rochette, Savoia), socius Cimballi subrogatus loco Ricoboni de Unacia,1215 and a person from Gascony called Antoine.1216 The fifteenth century, however, brought some changes. Both before and after 1453 armed soldiers from the French kingdom at large were present along the shores of the Black Sea together with those from Southern France attracted by the commercial interest. This was due to the crusading expeditions of European monarchs against the Ottomans. The best known example of the French (Burgundian) militaries in the Black Sea area is the company of Valerain de Wawrin, who was sent by Duke Philip III the Good and arrived to the Black Sea region in 1445 to launch a new anti-Ottoman crusade; however, instead of fighting against the Muslims, they began plundering the Christians, both Greeks and Latins.1217 Nonetheless, this explains that in Caffa in 1461 there were three persons from Marseille, and all of them were hired soldiers (socii) rather than merchants, Bertrand,1218 Jean,1219 and Dominique;1220 besides these three, there were three other French soldiers without a specification of place of provenance (just de Francia), Guillaume,1221 Galeotto,1222 and Johnq/Janin,1223 and a certain Burgundian Guillaume de Burgundia,1224 who might have remained since the expedition of Valerain de Wawrin. We can therefore see a structural change in French migration, which is in line with the general shift in the structure of migration from the realms of Latin Christendom to Caffa. Throughout the fifteenth century Caffa the number of merchants from Montpellier and Marseille steadily declines. On the other hand, there was an increasing number of mercenaries and other soldiers, mainly those from the North, including the Burgundians.
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English. In general, England supplied the Black Sea area with a certain number of people, mainly clergy and probably also notaries. The first bishop of Cherson was a Dominican friar Richard the Englishman. A recent study of Talyzina suggested that a Venetian notary in Tana Christofforo Rizzo was Englishman Christopher Rice. However, in Caffa there is in 1423 a highly problematic case — a mention of a certain Iohanes de Spenserus. Who could be this person? More research into other archival documents is needed.

Flemish and Dutch. The connections with Flanders and the Netherlands were of importance to the Genoese and, especially, Venetian Black Sea colonies, and vice versa. The textile production of Flanders was still used in Italy and in the Italian settlements overseas, but the main point of trade was in fact high-quality sturgeon and caviar from the River Don. These goods were exported to Flanders and the Netherlands and are mentioned even in the travelogue of Pero Tafur. To make a maximum of profit of the trade connections, the Venetians made the route of their galleys of Romania (Venice – the Black Sea, namely Tana) and Flanders (Venice–Flanders) circular and actively exploited these tandem routes. The Venetians scheduled the time of the arrival and departure of the ships so the galleys going to the Black Sea left only after the arrival of galleys with textiles from Flanders, and vice versa. In the fifteenth century, this trade reached its peak, connecting the space from the Black Sea to Flanders. The Venetian notarial deeds from Tana of the 1430s reflect this trade, mentioning an expedition to Flanders. However, at the best of my knowledge, the presence of the Flemish and Dutch themselves on the Black Sea shores was never attested before. In 1461, however, there is an entire group of these people, mainly as soldiers: Roderik
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from Holland, also known as Drigo de Olanda, socius Caffe, Willem from Zeeland, de Zelandia, socius castrorum Soldaie, Cornelius from Bruges, socius Caffe, and, quite probably, Gregorius from Brussels (if we assume that de Braxolla/Brazola equals Bruxellae).

**Germans.** The German merchants were linked to the Levantine trade rather through Venice than through Genoa, thus concentrating around the Venetian trading stations in Trebizond and Tana. It is not very obvious why medieval people from Germany would be interested in the Crimean settlements; nonetheless, the link between the Genoese colonisation of the Black Sea and the German share in it becomes clear in the light of the shifts in the geography of the European textile production: “Italian merchants... introduced production in southern Germany, which soon superseded the Italian industry. Ulm, Augsburg and Nurnberg became leading export centres, selling fustians all over Europe.” Hence, a certain German from Ulm, a city to become a permanent source of the German migration to Caffa, appears in *Caffa Massaria* as early as in 1374, to be followed by two other Germans mentioned in *Caffa Massaria* of 1381–1382, one of them called Benedict from Bavaria. Nonetheless, in the fourteenth century the Germans are rare guests in Caffa, whereas merchants from Nuremberg, which had especially strong economic links with the Venetians, were intermediaries between Venice and Antwerp, and travelled to the Black Sea through Venice and its *Casa Dei Tedeschi* being junior (according to the most widespread view), or even senior (according to Baron von Stromer) partners of the Venetians. One example is Konrad Stangelin residing in Trebizond, who was mentioned in 1413 as a member of two
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commercial enterprises and was a partner of the house of Sorranzo. In 1436 Konrad’s son Heinrich Stangelin from Nuremberg issued a manumission (granting freedom) for his Russian slave and had commercial affairs with the Venetian merchants, and was appointed as one of the *fideicommissari* in the testament of another German person Albert de Crunut, son of the late Dirkh (this Albert is described as “from the parish of St. Apollinarius” in Venice, so he may have been a naturalized Venetian). As for the Stangelins, among the German names in the Venetian testaments, we also find people with this surname. However, most of those German people whom we actually find in Caffa do not look like entrepreneurs. Actually, most of the Germans mentioned in *Massariae Caffae* are soldiers. Thus, in 1423, we find a German (*todescus*) serving as *socius Cimbali* Laurentius, then Johannes from Bavaria, and then three persons from Ulm, Barnabas, Bernabone (perhaps the same person as Barnabas), and Jakob. In 1461, Caffa is home already for at least ten Germans. Seven people are just *de Allamania* in general: Anton, Innozenz, Johannes, Andreas, Gaspar, Georg, and Matthias. One of them, a certain Peter, is referred to as *todescus*, while for the remaining two we know place of their origin; these are Jakob from Cologne and Johannes from Ulm. From the fact that six out of these ten people are hired soldiers (*socii Caffe*), we can conclude that there had been
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an increasing internationalization of the military mercenary contingent in Caffa in the fifteenth century.

**Hungarians.** Already in the late thirteenth century in Caffa we find a Hungarian called Mairora (perhaps a formerly freed slave), who is mentioned in the context of her dowry. Hungarian Franciscans were involved in the Latin mission in Caffa, and there were diplomatic relations between Hungarian kings and Tartar khans. Two Hungarians were mentioned in *Caffa Massaria* 1381–1382. We also occasionally find Hungarian slaves in the sources later on. However, slaves are not the main contingent of the Hungarians of Caffa in the fifteenth century. The period after 1453 saw a sudden growth in the number of Hungarians in the Genoese colonies. Thus, in 1423 we find two of them, a former *socius Samastri* Mihály from Buda and a homonym to famous Hungarian liquor Unicus from Buda. However, in 1461 there are already at least eight persons from the Hungarian kingdom, although not all of them were ethnic Hungarians and all of them are soldiers: Ferenc, Mátyás, Raddus, Jakab, another Jakab and three persons who are clearly Greek Orthodox, two of them Serbs, Stancho (i.e. Stanislav) from Belgrade and a smith Stoycha (i.e. Stoyan) from Belgrade and one person who may be Serbian or Wallachian, Dimitrius. Thus, an abrupt increase in the number of Hungarians in Caffa after 1453 was basically an influx of mercenaries.

**Czech people** do not appear anywhere in the early period of the history of Caffa, and hardly appear (subject to confirmation) in the sources before 1453. There are few exceptions
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such as Jan de Boemia in 1381. However, they do appear in the city afterwards. In 1461 we find two people de Bohemia, Michal and Mikuláš. Both are soldiers (socii Caffè), but both are also magistri, i.e. either university graduates, or highly experienced artisans or masters, such as experts in artillery or weaponry.

**Polish.** There case of the Poles is similar to that of the Hungarians and Czechs; they are non-existent in earlier sources (prior to the fifteenth century), and are probably not often found before 1453, and appear in greater numbers after the siege of Constantinople. At least, in 1423 there are no Polish people whatsoever. In 1461, however, the situation changes completely. As many as eight people are referred to as ‘de Polonia’, all of them soldiers: Grzegorz from Lublin, Andrzej, Jan, Mateusz, Michał de Premissis, Mikołaj, Jan de Cerros, and Jan Capra. In addition there are seven persons, each of whom is described as polanus or Polanus. It is impossible to think that seven members of a Venetian patrician family Polani could live in Genoese Caffa (which was ancient and in the previous centuries quite influential, but still not sufficiently populous and not very well connected to the Black Sea). Theoretically, these seven people could have been from Pola in Istria, but this was unlikely, so I categorized them as Polish, and we will have to add the following seven names to the other eight Polish people: Andrzej, Jakub, Marcin, Mikołaj, Piotr, Stańko, and Staon three of them explicitly mentioned as soldiers.
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**Walachians.** People from Walachia and Moldova were certain to be found in Caffa. Nonetheless, we occasionally find people with the descriptor *geticus* or *gethicus*, which is an antiquated term for Walachians. Thus, the Walachians were part of the population of Caffa. We will need further research to give a final answer; however I would agree with Ponomarev that the Walachians were part of the population of Caffa. In *Massaria Caffae* 1461, for instance, there is a mention of a certain *Asaus geticus*, who was an *orguxius Caffe*. Some scholars believed that they were organized in a certain community. The latter is, however, unlikely, since being Orthodox Christians of Byzantine tradition, the Walachians naturally formed part of the Greek community and would alternatively be described as *greci* as any other Orthodox people.

**Greeks.** The Greeks are the most numerous group among the Orientals in Caffa, and were probably also the largest group in the hinterland, that is, the rural parts of the Genoese colonies. This can be seen for example, from the fact that re-establishing the Genoese rule over the countryside in 1381, the authorities of Caffa sent a scribe of the Greek language Filippo di San Andrea alongside the officers, rather than his colleague scribe in Tatar Francesco from Gibeletto (*scriba litteris ugoresche*, *scriba communis litteris ungareschis*). Thus, undoubtedly, Greek was the language of daily speech in this region since antiquity and early Middle Ages, and the Greek culture and Orthodox Christianity unified different peoples – actual Greeks, Goths, Alans, and various Turkic peoples. In certain sources Greeks, or rather the Orthodox people were still being called *Ρωμαίοι* or *Romani*, i.e. the Romans, an umbrella term used in the Byzantine Empire for its citizens. The Roman identity of the Greeks did not disappear even after the fall of the Byzantine Empire. Moreover, it was indirectly acknowledged by the Latins: a best example revealing this identity is a description of a scribe Papa Christodorus in *Massaria Caffae* 1423, *scriba litteratum romearum sive grecalium*.
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The statute of Caffa puts the Greeks in first place among all local ethnic groups, and they were indeed a number one group among the Orientals in the course of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. Although some scholars claim that the Armenians outnumbered the Greeks, others argued that it was the other way around in the nineteenth century, until Balard proved that the Greeks were indeed the first group among the Orientals of Caffa. According to Balard, Greeks made up more than 50% of all non-Genoese names mentioned in the documents. In the late thirteenth century, the Greeks constituted the majority of the local population of Caffa, since 50% of the non-Latin names in the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto in 1289–1290 are Greek. Thus, naturally, the Greeks played an important role in the administrative, economic, and cultural life of Caffa, as well as in Soldaia alongside Latins. Many of the Greeks mentioned in the documents were, however, the travelling merchants rather than the local inhabitants. They came from Constantinople, Trebizond, Sinope, Savastopoli, or from Crimean towns such as Solkhat and Karamit (probably Kalamita) and often worked on the ships belonging to the Italians and transported salt or grain, or came to the mouth of the River Kuban to load fish, thus being a significant factor in the trade on a regional level from the very beginning. Nonetheless, some of them
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could be also local people, since they sold the real estate in Caffa to the Italians.\textsuperscript{1309} In the fourteenth century we even find Greek brokers,\textsuperscript{1310} and Greek merchants were still very visible in the social structure. Greek merchants were also involved in the slave trade, especially when the shores of Caucasus and Zikhia were the main source of slaves. However, the Greeks were especially numerous among the artisans and in all the professions linked with craftsmanship, such as caulkers, choppers, sailors, blacksmiths, manufacturers of bombards and arrows, spinners, tailors, weavers, furriers, candlemakers, butchers, and shopkeepers in the bazaar. They did not practice only those professions, which required a high level of mastery, such as making textiles or weapons. Thus, Greeks were mainly involved in the basic crafts, transforming raw materials into products. This engagement with the artisanship was regulated by the Statute of 1449, according to which shipwrights, caulkers, joiners, and \textit{masachani} (bricklayers) were formed into a sort of a guild under the power of a \textit{protomastro}.\textsuperscript{1311}

The study of prosopography of the \textit{Massaria Caffa} 1381–1382 by Ponomarev shows that about two dozen locations specified in the sources as areas of origin for Greek people are actually Levantine Genoese settlements or Italian towns: Ancona, Caffa, Candea (Candia), Cimbalo, Constantinopoli, Firinzolla, Garipolli, Gibelete, Gorzovi, Iallita, Illice (Illia), Keresond, Lambada, Licostomo, Lo Tozo, Matrega, Perpira, Peyra, Roddo, Samastro, Savastia, Sichia, Soldaya, Sorchat, Symisso, Synop, Trani, Trebizond, Tripoli, Vulteo (the list of the cities has been taken verbatim from Ponomarev). However, here he warns that this did not necessarily mean that these countries were the actual origin of the person concerned. Some of these people were initially part of Greek urban commercial networks that were very well connected to the Italians. Nonetheless, some other Greeks migrating from the countryside to big cities such as Caffa had to be flexible enough to integrate into the urban and mainly non-Greek society. This meant that they had to call and identify themselves according to some place name known to Italians and other people, and these were apparently coastal cities and towns. Therefore, many people from the countryside could invent new identities to better fit the geographical knowledge of his new mixed environment.\textsuperscript{1312}
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The Greek community was headed by the bishop of Caffa, who also had some judicial duties. Some civil responsibilities and the presentation of the interests of the Orthodox population could also be taken by the heads of the hundreds and the officers of the locally formed home guard. In Caffa (unlike Cembalo and many other places, especially the hinterland), the Greek community was normally quite loyal to the Genoese at least until the fifteenth century, and this gave the Greeks extra benefits and opportunities to participate both in Genoese business and Genoese administration. Greeks were sometimes present in lower levels of the colonial administration and garrison, often holding offices of heads of the hundreds and tens. They lived everywhere in Caffa, both in citadel and in the burgs, had quite a number of parishes, and were, probably the second largest community of Caffa after the Latin Westerners. However, being important in terms of economy, paying taxes, and often participating in the Genoese military operations or following regular military service (e.g. guarding the city walls), the Greeks hardly ever participated in the upper levels of administration and never obtained senior public office: they did not hold any ruling positions in any council, commissions dealing with defence or provisioning, or office, and did not form part of the consul’s familia (entourage); they could only serve as guards, soldiers, or orguxii (often the case), or hold minor positions in the curia staff (scribes or, most often, interpreters). Balard believes that Greek participation in public office was more important in places where the Latin population was scarce, such as Soldaia, La Copa, and Cembalo. On the other hand, in Caffa, the Latin ruling class gave little responsibility to the Greeks under Genoese power, as it did to the other Oriental components of the population.

Greek entrepreneurs were not outplaced by Italian trade and remained active and prosperous junior partners of the Italians, who, in their turn, relied on the Greek networks of the regional trade. “A sufficiently large group of Greek traders persisted and continued to grow on Byzantine territory and in the cities in Latin Romania in the fifteenth century.” Their role was especially important, because in time of war and unrest, when Italian trade was at risk, the Greek merchants made up for this gap. The cooperation of the Italians and
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the Greeks was permanent and reciprocally beneficial. Apart from commercial contacts, the Greeks were a source of maids and concubines, or rather, temporary wives on contract (cumae) for Italian single (and sometimes married) newcomers. Various sources reveal one and the same thing – the Italians, and in this case both the Genoese and the Venetians, preferred Greeks to any other Oriental ethnic groups as far as the business contacts were concerned (it would be almost impossible to imagine a marriage between an Italian and a Jew, whilst marriages with Greek women were common).

In 1381 there are 570 Greek Orthodox people mentioned in the registers of the Caffa Massaria, including Greeks, Russians and other Slavic people, Turkic people, and Caucasians. Thus, the proportion was similar to that used a century ago: Greeks made up a large part of the local population. Not having a right to participate in the administration, the Greeks nevertheless often had to fight as soldiers or sailors defending Caffa in the times of unrest, since they were subject to taxes and recruitment levies imposed by the Genoese officers. Thus, a Greek Paraschiva was mentioned as castelanus grechus guarding one of the city towers in 1381, and in 1386–1387 eleven among the fifty night guards subsidised by
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1319 Карпов, “Mixed Marriages in a Polyethnic Society; Case Study of Tana, 14th–15th Centuries,” in Tolerance and Repression in the Middle Ages, In Memory of Lenos Mavrommatis International Symposium 10, Athens, Nov. 1998 (Athens: 2002): 207–214. The article by Karpov deals with a larger problem, than the one of a case study. The problem Karpov addressed is the ethnic structure of the society in an Italian trading station neighboring with a city populated by the local inhabitants. The intermarriage in such kind of societies, as well as the problems of identity, self-identification and otherness are dealt with by many scholars who research different issues pertaining to the colonial studies. This article was an important contribution to the scholarship and the development of the field in many ways. Firstly, the problems of ethnicity, identity, and otherness are among those that are most frequently addressed today. Secondly, the text is based on a rigorous study of a huge amount of sources previously not researched (even though the study of the sources was general and finding out the information about mixed marriages was not among the main objectives). Thirdly, the material allows us to make broad generalizations. One could have expected concentration on a shorter period; however, the author accepts broad chronological borders, including the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries. The author’s initial research question was connected rather to the relations among the Western colonists and the nomadic Tatars, but further he shifted his discourse and gave priority to the relations of the Italians with the Greeks, Russians, Jews, and settled Tatars.


1321 Moreover, we face sometimes cases when a person with seemingly “Latin” name and surname could be in reality a Greek; thus some of those whom a researcher counts as Italians might not belong in fact to a different group.

1322 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 39 v, 206r.
Caffa were Greeks. Other sources also mention a Greek contrata with a fortification (castello), and a loggia (loggia).

All the Greek population was divided into hundreds and tens, and subject to levies for military operations, and the three registers of the Massaria for the end of the fourteenth century mention nineteen Greeks as chiefs of the hundreds in Caffa. The military role of the Greeks continued into the fifteenth century. The Massariae allow us to figure out, to what extent did the Greeks participate in the civil and military service of Caffa. Thus, there are 11 Greeks (2.7%) out of the 408 clerks or soldiers in 1410; 7 Greeks (2.4%) out of 294 in 1411; 16 Greeks (3%) out of 537 in 1463; 153 (7.4%) Greeks out of 2050 for the years 1456 to 1460. These Greeks are either provixionati, or orguxii. Among the provixionati, we find guardians of the city gates (porterii), bailiffs (placerii), and bandsmen, such as tubetae, sonatores, and nacarati, who followed the consul as he moved around the city or proclaimed the start of festivities. The orguxii formed a military retinue, which escorted the consul or vicarius along their circuits in Genoese Gazaria: in 1410, a Greek, Carochi, was appointed caporarius orguxiorum. Greeks are mentioned as participating in the city defence until the very last years of Caffa: thus, a Greek tailor Aurani was a chief of a hundred (capud decenus centanarii) in 1469; he and other Greek chiefs of the hundreds were armed by the Genoese Antonio di Rogerio to defend the town gates. Greeks also worked in the administration as technical staff. The Statute of Caffa of 1449 states that the deeds for Greeks must be drawn up by ten notaries and the best scriveners, whom the consul and the councils should elect; it may have taken place in the logia Grecorum.

The Genoese administration tried to be in good terms with the Orthodox clergy of Caffa, which received gifts from the Genoese for Easter and the Epiphany. In the fourteenth century, the Genoese administration took specific care to secure religious peace in the city; thus, in 1316, the Officium Gazarie took care of the reconstruction of the Orthodox churches in the general plan to restore the city. By the 1440s, the situation seems to have worsened; we know that the Catholic bishop Giacomo Campora tried to convert the Orthodox population, and that the consul and massarii had to write in 1455 to the Protectors of the Bank of St George begging for Campora to be removed from Caffa, since his zeal frightened

1323 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 487r-493v.
1324 Musso, Gli orientali, 110.
1327 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 66v.
the Orientals (chiefly Greeks and Armenians), on whom the city largely relied for its prosperity.\textsuperscript{1328} This is why the Statute of 1449 forbids the Latin bishop to meddle in the affairs of the local Christians (either Greek Orthodox or Armenian), so as they would not leave the city.\textsuperscript{1329}

Now we can shift to the male Greek onomastikon of Caffa. In this case we will treat Greeks as a macrogroup rather than as a microgroup. As in the case of Latins, we will compare the data of Massaria Caffae 1381, Massaria Caffae 1423, and Massaria Caffae 1461. In Massaria Caffae 1381 a total of 570 persons are Greek, or rather (see above) these names that \textit{most probably} belonged to the Greek. Thus, the frequency of the use of names is such:

- up to 59 times: Theodoros,
- 38 times: Vassilios,
- 33 times: Konstantinos, 33 Nicolla,
- 32 times: Kostas,
- 28 times: Michail (Michali/Michalli),
- 26 times: Yannis (Iane),
- 25 times: Kaloyan (Calo Iane),
- 24 times: Savvas,
- 16 times: Manoli,
- 15 times: Christodor, Dimitrios,
- 14 times: Niketas,
- 12 times: Leon,
- 11 times: Triandaffullus,
- 9 times: Kyriakos (Chiriachos/Ciracos), Corsoli, Savastos,
- 7 times: Paraskeva (as a male name),
- 6 times: Anastasios,
- 5 times: Danilli,
- 4 times: Chiraseni (= Kir Arseni),
- 4 times: Kiriassi (Chiriaxi),
- 3 times: Alexios (Alexi), 3 Andronikos, 3 Athanasios, 3 Giorgos (Iorgi), 3 Papas, 3 Sonihi.

\textsuperscript{1329} Vigna, “Codice diplomatico,” \textit{ASLSP} 7/2: 631.
2 times: Agapi, 2 Costanda, 2 Minas (Minax), 2 Synodi, 2 Theoffillatus, and others,
1 time: Alexandros, Anastas (Anastus/Avastus), Theodul (Fedolli), Ianaihi, Kirmanolli (= Kir Manoli), Maurodi, Michala (Michalla), Pandaseni, Politissa, Procopi, Scolari, Thenaxius, Theodocius, Theopeffitus, Vasilichus, Varda (Varada), Varsamon, and others.

In Massaria Caffae 1423, a total of 288 are identifiable as Greeks:
19 times: Giorgos,
18 times: Konstantinos/Kostas,
16 times: Vassilios, Theodoros, Nikolaos,
12 times: Savvas,
10 times: Kaloyan,
9 times: Michail,
8 times: Dimitrios, Niketas, Paraskeva (as a male name),
6 times: Kyriakos, Yannis,
4 times: Christodoros, Stephanos, Paschalis,
3 times: Romanos, Samuil, Sotirichos, Corsoli, Lukas, Afendici, Mavrodi,
2 times: Markos, Manoli, Photios, Kosmas, Danili, Manganari, Murad (Morati), Phokas, Ajax, Poli, Theodosios, Theophylaktos,

In Massaria Caffae 1461, a total of 133 identifiable as Greeks;
10 times: Theodoros, Paraskeva (as a male name),
9 times: Giorgos,
7 times: Vassilios,
6 times: Kaloyan, Nikolaos,
5 times: Dimitrios,
4 times: Afendici, Christodoulos, Konstantinos/Kostas,
3 times: Cochi,
2 times: Iakov, Issufi, Eleutherios (Lefteri), Kutlu bey, Manoli, Mihail, Savvas, Sotirichos,
1 time: Yannis, Alecsi, Anastaxius, Andronicus, Antinodorus, Atabei, Chiracus, Colla, Constantius, Cosma, Costa, Festicha, Gregorius, Iolbe, Iolmelich, Isidorus, Luca, Mamat, Marcus, Maurodi, Maurozomi, Niceforus, Nichita, Olobei, Ordabei, Papa Chisti, Papa Georgi, Papa Luca, Sauastus, Sotira, Sotiricus, Stancho, Stefanus, Stilianos, Stoycha, Tatarchuk, Thecla (particularly as a male name, and the person was Russian, Thecla rubeus), Tocebi, and others.

In the fifteenth century, the relations between the Genoese and the local Greeks began to deteriorate. Balard suggested that “the growing importance of the Greek principality of Theodoro-Mangoup in the middle of the Crimea from the second half of the fourteenth century, and the struggle between its princes and the Genoese in the years 1422–1923, spurred a part of the Greek inhabitants of Caffa into seeking refuge in the highlands, away from Genoese Gazaria.” This led to an uprising in 1433 and exacerbated the conflict between the Italians and the Greeks. In the fourteenth century, the Greeks always defended Caffa against Tatar attacks side by side with the Genoese. However, the situation was changing, and in the fifteenth century the rebellions among the local population became common.

The Greeks suffered from the awkwardness of the authorities who left the Greek episcopal see in Caffa vacant. Together with the depopulation, the economic crisis in the last years of the Genoese domination, and with the bribery of officials, the religious crisis following the rejection of the Union of the Churches (after 1453) gave rise to a general passivity in the face of the Ottoman conquest. After a break, we have consistent evidence about the Greek Orthodox diocese in Caffa only in the late fifteenth century. Yet it already existed before and we know that after the end of the Council of Florence (1449) Pachomius, bishop of Amasya loyal to the Union, was appointed to Caffa in 1469, but died before

---

1330 In this case diminutive of ‘Nicolla’ rather than a typical Sicilian name ‘Colla’, since its bearer is Russian, Colla rubeus.
reaching the place. In general, the Greeks in Caffa, apparently, did not recognize the Union, much like Orthodox lower clergy and laymen elsewhere. Once more, the process of colonization collapsed in Crimea; as in Constantinople, the Greeks were ready to accept a new domination with the Turkish turban rather than Saint Georges’ cross of Genoa.1332

**Armenians.** The Armenians had begun to migrate to South-Eastern Crimea and form their own diaspora since the early eleventh century after being forced out of Armenia by the Seljuk threat. By the thirteenth century, especially after the disasters brought to Asia Minor by the Mongol conquest, they became quite numerous in Crimea, and the area was even sometimes called ‘Coastal Armenia’. In 1289–1290, the deeds of Sambuceto mention Armenians living in Caffa, among them a certain Christophanus.1333 Thus Caffa already had a visible Armenian community in the late thirteenth century. During the wars of the fourteenth century (first led by the Mongol and Turkic emirates, and then by the Ottomans), more and more people found asylum first in the Pontic area (chiefly in Trebizond), and then in Crimea. Caffa was one of their main centres of concentration,1334 and already in the early fifteenth century we find in the sources the Armenian bishop and diocese there. Caffa had several Armenian churches, some of which are still standing together with the wonderful masonry of the medieval masters. The city became a centre of the Armenian business and culture, with their monasteries and famous *scriptoria* producing wonderfully illuminated manuscripts.1335

Another wave of Armenian refugees arrived in Crimea from Asia Minor after the 1330s.1336 For some of them Caffa was a point of transit on their way to the Kingdom of Poland, where Casimir III the Great was welcoming Armenians to his realm, granting them the right to profess their religion freely and other rights and privileges in 1367 (since then the Armenian diocese was actually moved from Caffa to Lwow). However, the bulk of Armenians fleeing the Turks remained in Caffa and other Black Sea cities. Yet a new and,

---

1335 In early modern times the Armenians retained an important role in the social, economic, and cultural life of the Southeastern Crimea, especially Caffa (Ottoman Kefe). Besides the cities, the monasteries were important centers of Armenian culture. The best known is the Surp Khach (i.e. the Holy Cross) monastery in Staryi Krym founded in 1358 and a well-known center of stone-carving and wood-carving.
perhaps, the most significant wave of refugees came to Caffa after the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (ruled by the Armenian branch of the House of Lusignan) fell to the Mamluk Sultanate in 1375. Steadily increasing from the 1330s, Armenians became especially numerous in Caffa after the mid-fifteenth century.¹³³⁷ Some scholars think that the Armenian population grew from around 15% in the mid-fourteenth century to 40% in the late fifteenth century, and that they may well have outnumbered the Greeks. The Armenian population indeed kept growing and in the list of the lenders in 1455, the Armenian group ranked first before the Greek one, which was in turn followed by the Jews.¹³³⁸ However, we need precise statistics, which are lacking. And indeed, the area of Crimea and, especially, Caffa, was called sometimes ‘Coastal Armenia’. It does not seem plausible that by the mid-fourteenth century or even by the 1380s the Armenians could have replaced the Greeks as the first ethnic group among the Orientals. As for the fifteenth century, more evidence is needed to support this claim. What we do know is that, for example, Massaria Caffae of 1381 mentions 368 adult male Armenians.¹³³⁹

Further, “Tamerlane’s ravages pushed some of the Armenian population to settle in the Genoese colonies of Crimea, thus shifting the former ethnic balance.”¹³⁴⁰ In the 1380s, the Armenian Caffiotes came second after Greeks among the Oriental ethnic groups, though being by far less numerous. They settled mainly in the burg, like most of the Orientals, having one of the city gates called after them,¹³⁴¹ inhabited the area of St Agnes church, the bazaar, and other quartiers,¹³⁴² and had three churches: of St Trinity, St Sarchis, and St Gregory.¹³⁴³ On that stage, the main occupation of the majority of Armenians was craftsmanship and small-scale trade such as selling slaves, real estate, leather, salt transportation, etc.;¹³⁴⁴ they, however, operated on a much lower scale than the Italians and Greeks. In 1386, only three Armenian brokers are mentioned,¹³⁴⁵ and there seem to be no Armenians among the large-scale traders and ship-owners; as far as the sources show, in the fourteenth century, Armenians did not have any part in the long-distance trade. On the other

¹³³⁸ ASG, MC, no. 590/1236, ff. 394a-406b.
¹³³⁹ Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 386.
¹³⁴¹ ASG, MC 1381, f. 180r.
¹³⁴² ASG, MC 1386, ff. 170v, 193v, 223r, 416v.
¹³⁴³ ASG, Notaio Niccolò de Bellignano 1375, ff. 26r, 27r. MC 1381, ff. 16v, 174r. MC 1386, f. 238r.
¹³⁴⁴ Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 593, 602, 626, 727, 730, 756.
¹³⁴⁵ MC 1386 ff. 4r, 50r, 152 r
hand ‘low’ occupations such as butchery were predominantly Armenian, as were furriers, bazaar shopkeepers, and to a lesser extent smiths.

The social standing of the Armenians was more modest than that of the Greeks. They did not have any offices in the Latin administration apart from perhaps interpreters or messengers to Solkhat. Armenians were mostly artisans or merchants, although in some sources we also find references to Armenian leaders and even ‘nobility’. They collaborated with the Latins and sometimes occupied low-ranking positions in the Genoese administration; they were also levied for military service and public works. As other communities, Armenians had their heads of hundreds (centuriones), who were in charge of the home guards. They had to serve on the Genoese galleys, and were perhaps even more loyal to the Italians than the Greeks, since there are no Armenians in the list of runaway sailors. In particular, in 1455 the bishop of Caffa also noted the loyalty of the Armenians to the Genoese. Nonetheless, there were no Armenians in the military offices, as was the case for the Greeks. However, we know that the Greeks hardly ever figure in the documents as slaves. Armenians, although we find them in bondage, in this sense also seem to be a ‘privileged’ ethnic group. There was a special (and indeed very old) treaty between the Republic of Genoa, the Commune and Levon II, King of Armenia (1187–1198/1199 as lord of Armenian Cilicia, and 1198/1199–1219 as the first king of Armenian Cilicia), which explicitly prohibited to trafficking in Christian slaves. In 1397 an Armenian slave Georgius in Caffa sent a plea to the Genoese podestà, claiming that he was unjustly held in servitude by a certain Dexerino Taburono, although he was free and born of free parents; after one Greek and two Armenian witnesses confirmed it, the podestà took the side of the plaintiff and ordered Taburono to give freedom to Georgius, and since the freedman also had problems with another Genoese, the podestà had to appoint a trustee for him.

1346 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 92v, 502r, 508r.
1349 Balard, La Romanie génoise, 284.
1350 “Statutum Caphe,” 650.
1351 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 622r-630r
1352 Vigna, Codice diplomatico, vol. 6, 365.
1354 ASG, Not. filza No. 497, No. 66, 106.
By the early fifteenth century the Armenians lived in their burg and in others and rarely in the citadel. Like the Greeks, they had built some of their own fortifications. Their community had religious and civil leadership. The religious leader of the Armeno-Gregorians was called ‘Patriarch of all Kypchak’ (meaning Desht-i Qipchaq, which is Cumania). The Armenians influenced the culture, urban space, layout and the entire environment of Caffa and of Eastern Crimea in general.

Both before and after 1400 there is no evidence of Armenian slaves, which suggests it was generally accepted that they could not be treated as slaves. The opinion that Armenians accounted for two-thirds of the total population of Caffa is probably incorrect, It is based on the reports of the administration of Caffa to the protectors of the Bank of Saint George and reflects the relative increase of the Armenian population in the fifteenth century (indeed in the thirteenth century Greeks cam first according to Balard’s analysis of statistical data). It is still unlikely that they outnumbered Greeks. The Armenian community was large, but it did not account for two-thirds of the total population of Caffa, neither did it own thirty churches in the city, and probably the Armenians were outnumbered by the Greeks throughout the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. All in all, the Armenians must have owned about ten churches in Caffa in the fifteenth century. As skilled artisans and builders, they played an important role in building projects and in embellishing the city; thus, in 1467 they made a big contribution to the reconstruction of city walls, gates, and towers. However, by the second half of the fifteenth century the Genoese lost much of their Armenian support, since the latter contributed to the fall of Caffa in 1475.

Armenians are a problematic group in terms of identity. They could be Armenian-Gregorian (that is, when a person fits into the Armenian ethnic group without any caveat), Orthodox (or bearers of a Greek name, like Christophanus, with or without the desrier specifying Armenian identity), Armenian-Catholic (they would normally retain their

1356 Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 400.
1358 Balard, La Romanie génoise, 270-274.
1361 Pistarino, I Gin dell’Oitremare, 123
1362 The Armenians probably converted to Roman Catholicism thanks to the Dominican friars. The first known union between Roman Catholics and Armenians was in 1198. However, an established Armenian Catholic
Armenian identity rather than being absorbed by the Latin group; they even had a separate a
bishop,\textsuperscript{1363} who was considered a second Catholic bishop of Caffa), converts to Roman
Catholicism (normally non-distinguishable from the Latins), or converts to Islam (normally
non-distinguishable from the \textit{saraceni}). They could have names common to all Christians,
and besides their onomastic system had already been influenced by Arabic, Persian, and
Turkic for centuries (especially for the suffixes). We can distinguish the Armenians judging
from the directly written in the document ethnic describer, or thanks to the fact that the
Armenians had the system of synthesising the family name/surname from the person’s
patronymic, or thanks to the idiosyncrasy of the ethnic forms of names: thus “Solomon in
Armenian would be Sogomon, Nicholas – Nikogos or Nigghos, John – Hovhannes or
Ivanixius, Serge – Sarchis, Paul – Pogos, Theodore – Toros, Baptist – Mkrtchy, Matthew –
Matevos, and Lazarus – Cazar.”\textsuperscript{1364}

Normally Armenians separated themselves from the Roman Catholic and Greek
Orthodox communities. However, the confessional borders were not absolutely distinct even
among the Christians of Gazaria. The papacy recognized some congregations of St.
Antony\textsuperscript{1365} and St. Augustine\textsuperscript{1366} in Caffa composed of Armenians (although they were
probably just recent converts to normal Roman Catholicism rather than Armenian-Catholics).
In general the Catholics struggled with the ‘schismatic’ Greeks and Armenians, but they were
slowly moving towards the idea of union, often allowing the Armenian converts to Roman
Catholicism to retain some of their rites and traditions, which did not mean an Armenian
Catholic Church – these converts were just Roman Catholics of Armenian ethnic background.
John XXII refused to accept the existence of an Armenian-Gregorian diocese in Caffa, to
which the Armenian Catholicos appointed in the 1320s bishop Thaddeus.\textsuperscript{1367} However, when
the Catholics managed to entice Thaddeus to Roman Catholicism, he was re-ordained and
became the Roman Catholic bishop of Caffa.\textsuperscript{1368} Another person of Armenian descent to

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1363} Loenertz, “Deux eveques dominicains de Caffa,” 255-265.
\textsuperscript{1364} Ponomarev, “Население и территория.”
\textsuperscript{1365} Ripoil and Brémond, \textit{Bullarium ordinis fr. Praedicatorum}, vol. 2 (Rome, 1720), 657-658.
\textsuperscript{1368} Eubel, \textit{Hierarchia catholica mediæ ævi sive summorum pontificum, cardinalium, ecclesiarum antistitum sériés ab anno 1198 usque ad 1431 perducta}, vol. 1 (Munster, 1913), 154.
\end{flushleft}
become a bishop of Caffa in 1377–1382 was a certain John.¹³⁶⁹ The confessional borders between the Greeks and the Armenians were even more blurred. Thus, during a controversy in Tana in 1347/49–1356 between Simeon, the metropolitan of Zikhia and three Orthodox priests (archpriest Michael and priests Nicholas and Theodore), the metropolitan imposed an interdict on the parish(es) of Tana, but the Greeks simply began to turn to the Armenian churches for their liturgical needs.¹³⁷⁰

As with the Latins and Greeks, in the Armenian onomastikon of Caffa, we can compare the data of Massaria Caffae 1381, Massaria Caffae 1423, and Massaria Caffae 1461. In Massaria Caffae 1381 there 368 Armenians (the same applied to the Latin onomasticon of Massaria Caffae 1381 is applicable to the Armenian case, see above):

- 24 times: Hovhannes/Ohannes (Ivanixius),
- 12 times: Amisarchis,
- 10 times: Avak (Ayvac, Ayvat, Avac),
- 9 times: Tavacal (?),
- 8 times: Sarkis (Sarchis),
- 7 times: Asdvadzadour (Asfazador), Carabetus, Mgrditch (Miglidici),
- 5 times: Khatchadour (Caihador), Krikor (Chirchor, Circhos), Tatoul (Tatol),
- 4 times: Emin, Martiros,
- 3 times: Agopxa, Omet, Saahac (Saach), Scandar, Tolec,
- 2 times: Agopus, Arthom (Artom), Avedic, Bagador, Cherchores, Oaam (Oam, Ocham),
- 1 time: Asilbaron, Assany, Ayvaxa, Caihanos, Caiheres, Caihibec, Caihic, Emin-ad-din (Eminadin), Gazarinus, Gricor, Guron/Suron, Ovanex, Parom (Paron) Omet, Saap, Sarchos, Vanixius, Vartam, Vartiros, and others.

In Massaria Caffae 1423, a total of 125 are identifiable as Armenians:

- 20 times: Hovhannes/Ohannes (Ovanixius, Ivanixius, Iuanexius, Vanixius, Ovanes, Ochanes),
- 12 times: Emin (Emin, Eminbei, Emin),
- 8 times: Khatchadour (Caihador, Caichador),

6 times: Avak (Avak, Evacha),
5 times: Krikor (Crichor, Chricor, Chrichor), Mgrditch (Migridichi),
4 times: Akop (Agop, Agopsa),
3 times: Nigoghos (Nicogos), Sarkis (Sarchis, Amir Sarchis), Sahak (Saac),
Asdvadzadour (Asfasador), Karapet (Carabet), Kazar (Cazar, Cazarbei, Gazar),
2 times: Khatchig (Cachic, Chaichik), Kosta (Costa), Mikaiel (Michael, Michali),
Taniel (Tanel), Simon, Tatoul (Tatoli, Tatollus, one of them Tatollus Polat = Tadoul Bullat),
Terbak (Terbac, Terbich),
1 time: Adilbei, Aramton, Asambei, Assabitus, Avedich, Bagador, Begiibe, Conassas
Cozica, Edilbey, Elia, Eminadinus, Georgius, Leonardus, Miram (Milan, Milanus), Norbei,
Norces, Omer, Onos, Sampsa, Savelus, Tatiros, Tateos (Tatos), Toros, Vassili, Zadic, and
others.

Some other names like Vartiros and Martiros are mentioned indirectly, like the name of
the father etc.

In Massaria Caffae 1461, a total of 92 identifiable as Armenians
7 times: Sarkis (Sarchis, Amir Sarchis),
6 times: Akop (Agop, Agopsa),
5 times: Hovhannes/Ohannes (Ovanixius, Ivaxius, Iuanexius, Vanixius, Ovanes, Ochanes),
Karapet (Carabet), Mgrditch (Migridichi), Tatoul (Tatoli, Tatuli),
3 times: Nigoghos (Nicogos), Sahak (Saac),
2 times: Apraham (Abram), Arakop (Aragop), Kazar (Cazar), Kaloust (Colot), Krikor
(Crichor, Chricor, Chrichor), Mardiros (Martiros),
1 time: Acron, Aragan, Artonazus, Arshile (Arzille), Baptista, Bogos, Bozica, Cacor,
Caragan, Cocos, Conagan, Derdor, Eminbei, Esambei, Khatchadour (Caichador), Khatcheres
(Caihares), Lortus, Losichi, Lucegeni, Marchus, Madteos (Matos), Mezic, Montic,
Norces, Olobei, Olosichi, Panos, Samuel, Stilianos, Tatilica, Theodorcha, Tonagan, Tsolag
(Tolic), Vart, Vartabet &c.

We should note that the Armenians were very flexible in borrowing names. Thus, a
name of the Lusignan dynasty of the crusaders’ kings of Cyprus became a personal name: in
1381, there was an Armenian in Caffa called Lusignan Carchanaki, in 1461 yet another

\[1371\] Derived from ‘Lusignan’, the name of the dynasty of the kings of Cyprus, which became an Armenian male
given name.
Lusegen armenus (= Lusignan). The Armenians so made great use of Persian names, and sometimes did not hesitate to borrow Greek ones.

Iurgiani. This mysterious population is mentioned several times in the Massariae Caffae. Ponomarev discusses them in his article on the massaria of 1381–1382, and so far nobody has been able to challenge his point. I will summarize it briefly. If we read the word in an Italianized way as giurgianus or georgiano, the most obvious candidates would be Georgians (as Laura Balletto, and many other scholars understood it). However, Ponomarev goes deeper into the phonetics of the Genoese archival documents, as well as into historical linguistics: if we read it differently [jurgianus], this will bring us to the area of Gorgiana/Gurghania/Jurchenia, which is part of the area of historical Armenia. Then it apparently also has something to do with the widespread Armenian name ‘Gurgen’, of unclear etymology (Armenian Գուրգեն and Georgian გურჯენ, gurgen; possible hypotheses on etymology: 1. Persian گرگ ‘Wolf’ or ‘wolfish’; 2. Hebrew gur + gen ‘son of lion’; 3. Turkic kara gün ‘black day’). The fact that iurgiani were not Georgians is confirmed in the words of a travelogue describing a pilgrimage placed in a Russian chronicle and dated 1389, which makes a clear distinction between Georgians (ивери) and ‘Gurgs’ (гурзи).

Most of the iurgiani in the Massariae Caffae have Armenian names and must have originated from the Greater Armenia. In general, Ponomarev’s argument looks plausible with just one minor caveat: he says that when dealing with sources like massariae these people should not be divided from the Armenians, which is a rather bold; the word ‘Armenian’ would imply that a person was also a part of Armenian Gregorian church or at least Christian, which is not necessarily the case. However, it should be correct that iurgiani were people of Armenian origin, or rather originating from the geographical area of Greater Armenia. The following table on the onomastikon of the iurgiani in Massaria Caffae 1381 is taken from Ponomarev’s study; I added here only translation to English:

1372 MC 1461, 45r, 76v.
1376 “Патриарчная, или Никоновская летопись” [Patriarchal Chronicle]. PSRL 12 (1901). “Сицу же мне случися видеть недостойному и сущим с мною во святем граде Иерусалиме. Есть убо тамо церковь воскресение Христово… тамо есть Адамля глава; а служба тамо Гурзийская, Гурзі служат, а за нею Венецийская служба, Венцы служат… а под Голгофою низу на земле Иверская служба, Ивери служат.”
### Table: Names of the people marked as *iurgianus* in MC 1381

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambec (Ambet) = Muhammad</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amisarchis</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonius</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayvac = Avak</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvasar</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caysar</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherchores</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chidir</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramadin Mercator = Caram-ad-din</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ectiar Carchanaki, Ectiar Grossus</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentille</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgius</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coia Iacharia</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacharia</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibraym</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istano</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanissius Cankaki = Hovhannes</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanissius = Hovhannes</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minas(^{1377})</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombarec</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mombarec Ayvac</td>
<td>Muslim + Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omet filius Martiros</td>
<td>Armenian, Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petros</td>
<td>Greek/Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romus</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabadin = Saba-ad-din</td>
<td>Armenian, Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffadin = Saffi-ad-din</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarchis</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugiadin = Souja-ad-din</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatol</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavacal</td>
<td>Muslim, Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolec(^{1378})</td>
<td>Tatar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolec Facradino = Fakhr-ad-din</td>
<td>Tatar, Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolcotlo (female) = Jol-Kutlug</td>
<td>Tatar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These *iurgiani* are not found in MC 1421 and 1461, but the distribution of their names unequivocally persuades me that although these were people of an Armenian ethnic background, or originating from Greater Armenia, on the level of microgroups we cannot put them all in one category with the members of the Armenian confessional community, as Ponomarev did, since out of thirty-three *iurgiani* at least ten are clearly Muslims, and there is a great degree of uncertainty about many others. So the *iurgiani* should not be amalgamated.

\(^{1377}\) Could also be Greek.

\(^{1378}\) Could be also Tsolag, an Armenian.
with the Armenians, or taken as yet another independent macrogroup alongside the others (Latin, Greek Orthodox, Armenian Gregorian, Muslim, and Jewish), because they do not fit into the criteria of religion according to which I aggregated the macrogroups. The descriptor *iurgianus* encompasses people belonging to different religious communities, and thus part of different macrogroups, but sharing common origins, probably geographical, i.e. from one historical area of Armenia.

The numerous sources of the 1370s–1380s, *iurgiani* disappear in the fifteenth century. Why? They probably merged with the Armenians with whom they shared the same or similar geographical origin and, in many cases, the same or a similar faith. Was it this way or another, we do not find *iurgiani* in the *massariae* 1423 and 1461, and additional research is needed to show whether they are ever mentioned in any of the fifteenth century sources.

**Russians.** Russians were present in Crimea long before the Italians. The “trade route from the Varangians to the Greeks” united the Baltic Sea with the Black Sea, and brought the Scandinavians and Eastern Slavs to the area in question. Apart from trade, piracy, and raids to Constantinople described in the Russian chronicles, Russians had more lasting interests here, and began to settle in the area of which later becomes Genoese Matrega after Prince Igor’s expedition against the Byzantine Empire in 944 and the expedition of Svetoslav Igorevich against the Caucasian tribes in 965–969. The Russian Principality of Tmutarakan, named after its capital city, was first a part of Kievan Rus’ and later an appanage, and existed in the tenth to twelfth centuries on the Taman and Kerch Peninsulas. It probably emerged after the expedition of Vladimir the Great to Constantinople, and was given to his son Mstislav the Brave, who ruled it in 988/1010–1036. In the eleventh century, the Russian princes lost control over Tmutarakan. Russian merchants continued to live there or to visit it; in the thirteenth century, however, the centre of the Russian trading diaspora on the Black Sea shifted to Sougdaia (later Genoese Soldaia). Russian troops came to protect Sougdaia against the Seljuk people. In the thirteenth century, during the Mongol conquest, a part of population of Southern Russia (regions of Dnepr) fled from the destroyed cities to Crimea, chiefly Sougdaia and Chersonesos.\(^{1379}\) The people there were mostly merchants or artisans; at

---

1379 Jacobson, “К изучению позднесредневекового Херсона,” [On the research into late mediaeval Cherson], *Херсонесский сборник* [Chersonese Collection] 5 (1959): 244. See also: Korolev, “К вопросу о славяно-русском населении на Дону в XIII–XVI вв.,” [On the problem of the Slavo-Russian population on the Don in the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries], in *Северное Причерноморье и Северное Поволжье в взаимоотношениях Востока и Запада в XII–XVI веках* [The Northern Black Sea Coast and the Northern
least what we know is that they integrated into the urban rather than rural social environment. The excavations often reveal in Crimea Russian-style bone carving and crosses-reliquaries (encolpion type). There was also an intensive trade (mainly furs) through the Dnepr, Dniester, and Don.

In the thirteenth century, according to the reports of Rubruk, Russian money-changers took part in the trade of the Silk Road, and the Russian merchants domiciled in Soldaia bought silk and spices and sold furs,\(^{1380}\) while the Italian merchants (frayagi in Russian, or surozhanе after the Russian name of Sougdaia-Surozh) also travelled to the Russian areas inland and were even organized in kind of a guild in Moscow.\(^{1381}\) We find Russians cited in the deeds of 1289–1290: indeed one of the first mentions of Russians in the Black Sea context in the Italian documents dates back to this period, a Russian called Johannes (i.e. Ivan), habitator of Caffa, the godfather of Todari (i.e. Theodor), put a Russian slave up for sale.\(^{1382}\) In the course of time, Italians began to penetrate the Russian lands and sometimes even settled there. One Italian, a certain Andrej Fryazin,\(^{1383}\) was even a serviceman of Prince Dmitry Donskoy (1350–1389), having been granted a fief in the Principality of Moscow.\(^{1384}\) The point is that Russians normally pass through in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries on their way to the Black Sea cities like Caffa, Trebizond, and Constantinople was Tana, in the mouth of the River Don; this claim can be supported by the fact that the Russian bishops travelling to Constantinople used the Don road,\(^{1385}\) stopping off in Caffa as well.\(^{1386}\) Thus, compared to Caffa, we know perhaps even more about the Russian population of Tana (at least as far as the precise data of the documents is concerned). The Russian quarter in Caffa had existed since the early fourteenth century.

\(^{1380}\) Brun, Материалы к истории Сугдеи [Materials for the History of Sugdea], (Odessa: 1871), 18.
\(^{1383}\) “Frjazin” is an ethnonym, a Russian word standing for the Roman Catholics speaking the Romanza languages; i.e. mainly the people from the Mediterranean and, in particular, those from Italy.
\(^{1384}\) Tikhomirov, Древняя Москва XII–XV вв.; Средневековая Россия на международных путях. XIV–XV вв. (Ancient Moscow of the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. Medieval Russia on international routes, fourteenth to fifteenth centuries) (Moscow: Moscow Worker, 1992), 82–116.
\(^{1385}\) Karpov, История Трапезундской империи [The history of the Trebizond Empire] (St. Petersburg: Aletheia, 2007), 421.
\(^{1386}\) Путешествие Афанасия Тверитина, in ПСРЛ., vol. 6, Прибавление к Софийской 2-й летописи, 344, 354.
Russians are a problem as regards their identification. The sources describe Russian using one of the following three terms: *rubeus, ruthenus,* and *rossius/russius.* The first problem is that *rubeus/Rubeus* can be either an ethnic name or an Italian family name, and we can only judge on the ethnicity from the given name and the context. The second problem is that we do not really know whether these three words were synonyms, or did they mean different sub-groups of Russians? The folk under the Prince of Moscow were often referred to as *rubei or rutheni* in the diplomatic correspondence. On the other hand, Baron Sigismund von Herberstein drew attention to the fact that the Muscovite prince should not be called *imperator universorum Ruthenorum,* which can mean that the term *rutheni* was not limited to Muscovite Russians. On the other hand, the Grand Dux of Lithuania was often called *dux Rossiae,* which implied that for Westerners his Grand Duchy was Russia *par excellence.* To make things even more complicated, the *Massaria Caffae* of 1381 mentions the elected metropolitan of Moscow Michael (the Michael-Mityaj of Russian historiography) who travelled to Constantinople to ordain seventy Russians, was given a lift on his way back from Constantinople to Caffa by the Genoese captains returning from the Chioggia War, and was referred to as *mitropolita rubeorum* in the sources. To top it all, the same *massaria* refers to as ‘Russian’ not only to people with typical Christian names such as *Antonus rubeus,* but also with names which are clearly Turkic, such as *Iolbei soldatus rubeus.* The sources are not consistent in the terms used. This means that we cannot be sure whether the terms *rubeus, ruthenus,* and *rossius/russius* meant one and the same ethnic reality, i.e. all Russians, or whether they meant different Russian political and ethnic entities. This issue is still very ambiguous and does not allow us to draw any reliable conclusions.

The intermarriage between Russians and Italians in the Black and Azov Sea trading stations has been examined by Prof. S. P. Karpov in his seminal monograph *Latin Romania.* The book examines the mid-fifteenth century in detail, and provides many examples, which I cannot resist the temptation to quote here. Normally, Russians who converted to Roman

1387 Sometimes we have the impression that the Italians scribes distinguished among them: one document drafted by the notary Pietro Pellacan in 1450 mentions *Nicolaus butarius ruthenus and uxor Romani rutheni* (ASV, NT. b. 826, No. 12), in the same deed other people are mentioned as *russii.* ASV, NT. b. 826, No. 12. However, this may be a question of the practice of particular notaries.

1388 Сигизмунд Герберштейн, Записки о Московии (Moscow, 1988), 263–266.

1389 Сигизмунд Герберштейн, Записки о Московии (Moscow, 1988), 263–266.


1390 MC 1381, 16v, 100v.

1391 To confuse the things, some slaves have an ethnic describer ‘Russian’, while bearing a quintessentially Turkic name, such as Khotulub and Tovalat from the deeds drawn in Tana in the early fifteenth century (Prokofieva, “Акты” [The Acts]: 69, 173).
Catholicism and merged with the Italian social environment, retained their initial kinship ties. Maria Grassa was married to a Russian called Feodor, and the money she bequeathed in her will was held by a certain Fetinchia, wife of another Russian Feodor (Fetinchia uxor alterius Fedoris); Maria also had a slave Olita (also a Russian, judging from her name), to whom she bequeathed to her son Andrej; Maria’s executor of the will was called Magdalena, and this lady was married to a judiciary officer Janis, Greek by origin (Ianis plazarius); Perina, a daughter of the late Guglielmo and Marina, who was also half-Slav, was left a silk shirt in the testament. A certain Russian called Cuna (which is in fact a nickname meaning ‘marten’ rather than a baptismal name), brother of Minca, married Catarina Lando, a daughter of the late wall guardian Giovanni, who served as a ballistarius in the Venetian castle of Tana but was unsalaried, as was often the case; he received 800 bezants in 1439, but in 1452 they were still unpaid, although Catarina appointed as her trustee for this case the best notary Niccolò de Varsis, and then a carpenter Giovanni Nigro. Cuna mentioned this unpaid debt in 1450, as the money were promised to him as a part of dowry, and again in 1452, asking his trustee Filippo Diclai or Di Lai to receive it on his behalf. Yet another person is a good example of a Russian integrated into Italian society. Luca Civrano (a Venetian patrician family name) was a Russian (ruthenus sive russicus, habitator eiusdem loci Tane; here ruthenus and russicus are used as synonyms), perhaps a freedman, but a rather wealthy one, being a prosperous artisan and having a mainly Italian social milieu (all executors of his testament, and perhaps his wife). He was probably a convert to Catholicism, since he bequeathed 3 ducats for Latin masses (pro missis sancte Marie et sancti Gregorii), and 50 bezants to the scuola of St Mary and Antony, where his workshop was situated. Nonetheless, he also bequeathed 50 bezants for building and repairing Orthodox church of St. Nicolas, which is understandable in the light of the events of the Ferraro-Florentine council. Luca also owned three slaves employed as servants, a Circassian Iohannes and Russians Orina and her son Chosta, whom he freed according to his will – Iohannes and Chosta had to be freed by default, while Orina had to serve eight years more to Luca’s widow (in fact, her son Chosta also remained serving his former masters). Thus, Luca was Russian by origin, but fully became a part of the society of the Italians.  

The same was apparently true for a Russian Gregory in 1423, and even more so for three Russians mentioned in the Massaria Caffae 1461: Thecla (used here as a

---

1392 See for all these cases in detail: Кarpов, Латинская Романия [Latin Romania], (St. Petersburg: Aletheia, 2000), 191–193.  
1393 MC 1423, 181v.
male name), Costa, gatekeeper in Caffa (placerius Caffe), and another Gregory, who was a banker (bancherius), a tax farmer (emptor commerchii magni, emptor cabelle vini), and an ambassador (ambassador ad dominum ChiJhibei).

Bulgarians. The Bulgarians in the Genoese colonies are mentioned since the fourteenth century, often as servants or slaves. The Caffa Massaria 1381 mentions Bulgarians. In the fifteenth century, Georgius Chalotari, a Greek merchant from Candia living in Tana, hired a fourteen year-old Bulgarian boy as a servant for three years with no salary but board and dress, which was close to the condition of slavery, and in fact could be just that, but in a camouflaged way and with a time limit.

Goths. Goths appeared in Crimea in around 230 AD. By the Middle Ages, the Crimean Goths had been largely culturally assimilated by the Greeks and converted to the Christianity; unlike their Ostrogoth and Visigoth kinsmen, the Crimean Goths were always Orthodox Nicene Christians and never professed Arianism. Although they could not be distinguished from Greeks in terms of material culture and religion, the Crimean Gothic language existed until the fifteenth, and perhaps until the eighteenth century. By the thirteenth century they must have lived mainly in the rural area such as mountains, foothills, and alone the coastline, i.e. the area known as Gothia and perhaps in the region called by Rubruck ‘forty castles’.

---

1394 MC 1461, 188r, 407r end/408v reg.
1395 MC 1461, 39v, 39v bis, 40r, 40v, 42r, 44v, 155v, 303v, 304r, 407r end/408v reg.
1396 MC 1461, 25r, 39r, 39r bis, 40v, 41r, 42r, 42v, 44v, 61r, 68r, 68v, 68v, 70r, 71v, 72v, 91r, 96r, 96v, 97r, 97r bis, 97r tris, 97v, 98r, 98v, 98v bis, 99r, 100v, 101r, 101r bis, 102r, 113r, 113v, 132r, 132v, 164r, 164r bis, 171r, 171r bis, 181v, 188v, 210v, 256v, 266r, 303r, 395r end/420v reg. 406v end/409r reg. 406v end/409r reg. 408r end/407v reg. 410r end/405v reg.
1397 ASG, MC 1381, f. 82r.
1398 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 356.
1401 See the discussion in: Keppen, О древностей Южного берега Крыма и гор Таврических [On the antiquities of the southern coast of the Crimea and the Tauride mountains] (St. Petersburg: 1837). Brun, Материалы к истории Сугдеи [Material for the History of Sugdea] (Odessa, 1871). 15. Vasiliev, The Goths in the Crimea, 167. Balard, La Romanie génoise, 793. Dombrowski, “Средневековые поселения-иисары” Крымского Южнберегерья” [Medieval settlements – the “Isars” of the Crimean southern coast] in Феодальная Таврика [Feudal Tavrica] (Kiev: 1974, 5-56). Firsov, Иисары: Очерки истории средневековых крепостей Южного берега Крыма [Isar: Essays on the history of medieval castles of the Southern coast of Crimea] (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1990), 54. Although Brun thought that ‘forty castles’ of Rubruk must have meant Chufut-Kale (older name, Qırq Yer, which means ‘forty castles’, Rubruk wrote in fact about the castles of the Southern coast of Crimea, the area which further was called the Genoese Captaincy of Gothia. Heyd also believed that ‘forty castles’ were empirical buildings rather than a mere place name. A Dominican Richard, appointed as a bishop of Chersonesos, was also in charge of Gothia according to the papal bull of 1333. Augustin Theiner, ed., Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem
Most probably the Goths were partly merging with the Alans (see below), who can also be found in the late medieval documents.  

The Greek-speaking Orthodox Principality of Theodoro had a certain Gothic component. A large area of the Genoese coastal domains was actually called the Captaincy of Gothia. Goths are mentioned in the Massaria Caffae in the fourteenth century. Ponomarev argued that most people mentioned in the Caffa Massaria as Goths were culturally and linguistically Greeks, but this does not give any reason to neglect the long survival of Crimean Goths and their language. Goths were indeed Greeks – that is they belonged to the Greek community, spoke the Greek language (which does not mean that all of them had forgotten their Germanic mother tongue), and had the same lifestyle as other Greek Orthodox peasants of the Southern Crimea. However, the Goths retained their language and identity throughout the Middle Ages.

Giosafat Barbaro wrote that the Goths that he met in the 1430s spoke their language (gothi parlano in todesco), and his German servant understood them “as if a resident of Friuli heard the Florentine dialect.” In 1423, in Caffa lived a Goth called Yannis. The notary Niccolò di Torriglia, a relative of Antonio di Torriglia, had a Goth concubine called Benedetta, nicknamed Sasia, who was legally free, of good morals and excellent reputation. She bore him several sons and daughters, all of whom died in Caffa, except for the first-born Giovanni. Later, Niccolò had arranged for Benedetta to marry a freedman, Anechino Rechane, vir bone qualitatis, celebrating the wedding in his own home. Goths preserved their language and identity in Crimea until early modern times. As already mentioned, this was certainly the case in the sixteenth century (perhaps until eighteenth). Ogier Ghiselin de Busbecq (1522-1592), a Flemish nobleman and a diplomat on the imperial service sent to the Sublime Porte, wrote a letter dated 1562, where he reported that he met two people in Constantinople – a Greek who knew Crimean Gothic and a Goth who already did not speak it. This letter was published in 1589 and it contains ninety-six words and phrases in Gothic.

1405 I viaggi in Persia, 96.  
1406 MC 1423, 55v.  
that he heard learned. Some other authors such as Torquatus, Kämpfer, and Sestrencewicz - Bohusz confirmed in the following centuries the preserving identity of the Crimean Goths, although their data is less reliable. The Goths merged with the Greeks and Tatars, and were finally assimilated by them.

**Circassians and Zikhs.** The peoples of the Northern Caucasus lived in the Genoese settlements mainly as slaves or freedmen, and very rarely, as small merchants (Adyghe, Shapsugs, Kabarday, Karachays, Abazins, Ubykh people, Abkhaz, Laz people, Mingrelians, etc.). Those most frequently referred to in the sources are the Circassians (*iharchassii*) and Zikhs (*zichi*), i.e. the Adyghe in the broad sense. In the documents they normally have different describers (either *iharchassius* or *zichus*), but since they in fact belong to the same Adyghe group encompassing also Shapsugs, Kabarday, and Ubykhs, here it makes sense to unite all the Adyghe and to treat them as a single unity, irrespective of whether the sources call them Circassians or Zikhs. A Genoese Giorgio Interiano, who lived in Caucasus in the fifteenth century, wrote in his *Vita de’ Zichi chiamati Ciarcassi* that these people are called Zikhs in Latin and Greek, Circassians in Tatar and Turkish, and that they call themselves Adyghe.1410 The entire geographical area around the eastern coast of the Black Sea and the Azov Sea, now Taman, was historically called Zhikha, the main city being Matrega, which was also the see of the Orthodox diocese of Zikhia.

---

1409 The Ubych people no longer exist as a nation, and the last speaker of Ubych, Tevfl Esent, died in 1992; nonetheless, racially Ubychs merged mainly with Adyghe.

The Adyghe mainly appear in the Italian sources as slaves or gangsters. They were probably sold by the parents of poor families. The local nobility, which also supplied Caffa with grain and some other products, could often sell slaves to the Italian or other merchants as well (e.g. in Matrega or Savastopoli). According to both Interiano and Sigismund von Herberstein, Adyghe were Greek Orthodox Christians, and all the attempts of the Latin missionaries to establish a Roman Catholic diocese there failed. In reality, however, Adyghe were and remained Pagans to the present, even though in the eighteenth century most of them were formally Islamised. Therefore it comes as no surprise that the Adyghe slaves arriving to Caffa or Genoa did not have Christian baptismal names. Their names in the sources are often Christian nor Muslim, but often also autochthonous, such as the names of animals, natural phenomena, or human qualities. Among the slaves that arrived to Genoa, girls were more numerous than boys. This is since the local communities or families were more willing to part with their daughters, while the Genoese needed particularly female slaves as house maids and concubines. In the early fourteenth century the Adyghe slaves were numerous, in the mid-fourteenth century their number fell sharply, appearing again in the last quarter of the century and becoming the most numerous ethnic group of slaves in Genoa by the 1400s according to Gioffrè. Zikhs are repeatedly mentioned in the Caffa Massaria for 1374 and 1381–1382. Adyghe slaves, e.g. Indzhibey, a daughter of a Circassian, are still found in Tana in 1430s.

In 1423, we find people from Kabarda – an orguxius Cachimas or Cagimax de Cabardi, specified as grecus (probably people in Kabarda had varying religious beliefs so it was...
important to underline the belonging of this person to the Greek Orthodox Christianity), and another provisionatus and orguxius Dimitrius de Cabardi\(^{1418}\) (here the Greek Orthodox name was self-explanatory). Yet six Adyghe are mentioned in the same 1423 source: a slave Iarchasius,\(^{1419}\) an inn-keeper Iarchasius,\(^{1420}\) yet another slave Iarchassius belonging to a certain Antonio di Sant’Ambrogio,\(^{1421}\) Ichomotus,\(^{1422}\) Sibinus,\(^{1423}\) and an anonymous orguxius Caffe zichus de Zichia.\(^{1424}\) The Adyghe disappear from our sources by 1461 and are no longer cited, first of all, less of them were sold as slaves in the fifteenth century than in the fourteenth century, and, secondly, those living in Caffa had already assimilated and lost their identity, becoming either Latins or Greeks.

**Abkhazians.** Abkhaz people or Abkhazians are indicated as avogasii in the Genoese notarial deeds. They lived in the coastal area around Savastopoli (now Sukhumi), and were sometimes traded to Caffa as slaves, and then to Genoa. According to Pistorino, they accounted for 1.5% of all slaves residing in Genoa and originating from the Black Sea area.\(^{1425}\)

**Georgians.** Balletto argued for the Georgian presence in Caffa.\(^{1426}\) Around thirty Georgians are mentioned in Caffa in 1381–1382; they lived in the citadel rather than in burg [sic] and were mainly tradesmen and craftsmen, e.g. a certain Sabadinus was laborator camocatorum, Sarchis (notably with an Armenian name) – a purse-maker, and Cramadinus and Jharoc were merchants.\(^{1427}\) However, Georgians are not mentioned in the Massaria Caffae for 1386, and Balard explains this fact by their exodus from the Genoese colony as a result of their alliance with the Tatars in the war. However, even afterwards the Genoese maintained stable relations with Georgia, since it was one of the grain suppliers of Caffa,\(^{1428}\)

\(^{1418}\) MC 1423, 13v, 45r, 94v, 56v, 60r, 170r, 245v, 247v, 262r, 268v.
\(^{1419}\) MC 1423, 55v.
\(^{1420}\) MC 1423, 55v, 129r, 131v.
\(^{1421}\) MC 1423, 92v, 127v.
\(^{1422}\) MC 1423, 53r.
\(^{1423}\) MC 1423, 53r.
\(^{1424}\) MC 1423, 43r, 92v, 296r, 313v.
\(^{1426}\) Balletto, *Genova, Mediterraneo, Mar Nero*, (Genova, 1976), 264.
\(^{1427}\) ASG, MC 1381, ff. 98r, 99v, 277r, 463v; also see: G. G. Musso, Gli Orientali, 107-108.
\(^{1428}\) For example, MC 1386, 217v.
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and since it is believed that in the fifteenth century there were still Georgians living in the city.\textsuperscript{1429}

\textbf{Mingrelians.} Today Mingrelians are a subgroup of Georgians, while in the Middle Ages and up to the mid-twentieth century they were more closely related peoples but nevertheless with very distinct identities. In the early times, they rarely faced with the Genoese; only three Mingrelian slaves are known to be in Genoa in the late fourteenth century; in the fifteenth century, there are hardly ever mentioned as slaves in Genoa at all,\textsuperscript{1430} and no Mingrelian slaves were found in Venice either.\textsuperscript{1431} The habits of the Mingrelians were vividly ridiculed by Giosafat Barbaro in his travelogue: he reports how his companion Azolino Squarciafico was treating a Mingrelian woman in Vati, demonstrating her teeth Barbaro, taking her breast, ordering her to look for the insects in his trousers (which she did immediately ‘with utmost diligence’), ordering her husband to buy food and cook for them, etc. ‘The Genoese did in this area whatever he wanted thanks to their mores, without having ever been insulted for that. From all points of view one would see that they (i.e. the Mingrelians) are wild people. The Genoese who are trading in that area introduced the habit of saying “you are a Mingrelian” when they wanted to say “you are a fool”.\textsuperscript{1432}

\textbf{Laz people.} Laz people are group similar to the Georgians and now living in North-Eastern Turkey, near the border with Georgia, on the South-Eastern coast of the Black Sea, and in the mountains to the East from Trebizond.\textsuperscript{1433} Sometimes they were mistakenly mixed with Lesginians, since Marco Polo wrote about a kingdom of Lak in Dagestan, on the shores of Caspian Sea. We can theoretically suggest that the slaves from the shores of the Caspian Sea were transported to the shores of the Black Sea through the whole Caucasus; however, this view is not particularly plausible. The only known Laz slave (\textit{de generatione lachorum}) called Comana was mentioned to be in Genoa in 1302\textsuperscript{1434} and the spelling used here points to

\textsuperscript{1429} Musso, Il tramonto di Caffa genovese, 318, 323.
\textsuperscript{1432} Viaggi alla Tana, § 43.
\textsuperscript{1434} ASG, Not. cart. No. 98, f. 129v.
his being of Laz, rather than Lezginian, origin. Two Laz people are mentioned in the *Caffa Massaria* for 1381–1382.\(^{1435}\)

**Alans.** Alans were initially nomadic Iranian-speaking tribes of Scythian-Sarmatic origin, and their presence in the Black Sea and the Azov Sea region is first mentioned in the first century. They can probably be identified with the Saltovo-Mayaki archaeological culture. Eventually, one part of them settled in Caucasus\(^{1436}\) and formed the modern Ossetian people/nation; another part (*Jász*) settled in Hungary, where they preserved their identity and language, enjoyed special privileges, and lived together in a special region called *Jászság* and gave it its current name Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok; the third part settled around the shores of the Black Sea and the Azov Sea, partly merging with Goths and other local Orthodox population influenced by the Greek Byzantine culture. The documents of Sambuceto mention three Alans domiciled in Caffa and Solkhat, who promised to supply 2000 *modii* of salt to the Genoese, who paid part of price in advance.\(^{1437}\) Later, other two Alans went to the salt mines of Ciprico on behalf of the Genoese.\(^{1438}\) Alans were traded as slaves;\(^{1439}\) four young Alans appear in Genoa in 1310–1326.\(^{1440}\) They probably settled near Chersonesos,\(^{1441}\) although no data really confirms this. They might also have lived in Tana in 1362, as the source mentioned the bath of Alans,\(^{1442}\) however, this could be simply a historical place name that shows their presence in the city in the preceding époque. All in all, after the mid-fourteenth century Alan slaves almost disappear from the sources. One Alan is mentioned in the *Caffa Massaria* for 1381–1382; in the same sources, the deceased husband of a Greek lady Kera Erigni (i.e. Lady Irene) has an Alan name Dashka (*Dascha*).\(^{1443}\)

**Jews and/or Karaïtes.** Jews, although they were not numerous, are problematic for a researcher of Caffa. The ‘Jews’ of a Genoese medieval scribe could have professed either Karaite or Rabbinic Judaism, speaking at the same time Turkic language, and having a

---

1435 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 357.
1440 ASG, Not. ign., Busta 5, fr. 63, f. 62r; cart. No. 8, ff. 54 r, 135r.
1443 MC 1381, 102r. Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 356.
Mongoloid physical appearance. For the scribe, there was no difference between the Jews professing Rabbinic Judaism (which became a mainstream and which is called Judaism par excellence today) and those who followed Karaite Judaism, though this ‘heresy’ was widespread in the Middle Ages, particularly in Crimea, and resulted ultimately in a totally separate religious identity and a separate nation, or rather, a handful of nations speaking different languages and identifying themselves on the basis of their religion. Sometimes we also face some mentions of a Jewish language, notably used not only in daily parlance, but also for the inner company documentation – a certain merchant Leo Callazi, son of the deceased Jew Elijah (Leo Callazi condam Elye zudeus mercator in Tana), was travelling to Constantinople and kept his accounts in Jewish (zedulla banbazina scripta manu Leonis in judaico). However, again we do not know what this meant – some kind of Sephardic Jewish lingua franca, or Genoese/Venetian giudaico, or the Turkic Karaite language? Taking into account the ethnic history of Crimea before, during, and after the Genoese colonization, my intuition is that the Jews residing historically in Crimea were Karaites (unless they migrated from outside), and professed Karaite Judaism, and used the Karaite language, writing in in the Hebrew alphabet (which they used until the twentieth century). At the same time, Rabbinic Jews also came to the peninsula and quite often settled there. While the term ‘Jews’ revokes the idea of mainstream Rabbinic Judaism, the Karaites are far less known, that is why I feel obliged to say a few words about this sect or religion, which came to mean an ethnos.

Not much is known on the origin of Karaite ‘Jews’ in Crimea. In this study they are called Jews, since in the Middle Ages and in our case of Genoese Gazaria the religious identification normally was the chief one, and their religion is of Hebrew origin. Today they have a very distinct, separate identity, and do not consider themselves Jews. Did they descend from the first Jewish Black Sea Diasporas of Antiquity (the myth created by Abraham Firkovich), or from Khazars (whose elite, however, accepted in the eighth century Rabbinic Judaism, and not Karaite one), or from some other Turkic tribe (since the Karaite language is Turkic) that embraced a heretical version of Judaism?

1444 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 356.
The legendary view is that the first Karaites were the followers of a certain David Alroy, who lived in Persia, claimed to be the Messiah, and was sentenced to death in around 1160. However, it is now common knowledge that Karaite Judaism appeared in the early Middle Ages, in the eighth century, in the Near East, in an ethnically Jewish environment. It first appeared in Bagdad, then the Abbasid Caliphate, and its origins are connected with the name of Anan ben David. Karaites (then an exclusively denominational and by no means an ethnic desriber) rejected all Talmudic tradition, sticking to Tanakh. The word ‘Karaites’ (‘the reading ones’) appeared relatively recently; historically the followers called themselves Baale-Mikra, or Bene-Mikra (‘followers’, or ‘sons of Scripture’). Karaites developed a ritual different from the Talmudic ritual and, according to the sources, had their peculiar burial rite, ate only bread and travelled little on the Sabbath.  

The sect reached its peak in the twelfth century, but then began to decline, and finally Rabbinic Talmudic Judaism not only became the mainstream tradition, but in fact pushed Karaite Judaism beyond the cultural and religious borders of the Jewish world. Beyond these borders we then find a nation professing Karaite Judaism and speaking a Turkic language. How did it happen?

Quite probably this ethnos derived from some group of Cumans (and not Khazars, because of the language difference), who settled in Crimea and accepted the Karaite version of Judaism from the local Jews who still professed it, since in the eleventh and twelfth centuries Karaism was still flourishing in the ethnically Jewish environment. This, however, does not mean that there was no Jewish ethnic component in the formation of the modern Karaites, because the original Jews professing Karaism and the Cumans who embraced it probably tended to intermarry more than Rabbinic and Karaite Jews, since the confessional borders mattered more than racial or linguistic ones. Yet as the Karaite heresy in Judaism started to decline, the new converts were a potential continuation of the religious tradition. On the other hand, the Rabbinic Jews also began speaking the Cuman language.


1448 Contrary to the opinion of Czekanowski, see: Czekanowski, “Z zagadniem antropologu Karaimow,” in Mysl Karaimska (Wroclaw, 1947), 15. Linguistically, the closest relatives of Karaite are Crimean Tatar, Kumyk, Karachay-Balkar, Urum, and Krymchak languages.

1449 Khazar origins is purely a legend, since only part of the Khazars (the ruling class) converted to Judaism, and to Rabbinic Judaism, not to Karaic one. Moreover, the Khazar and Karaite languages, both being Turkic, are related, but not closely. Khazar belongs to the Oghur (Volga-Bulgar) group, while Karaite is a Cuman-Kypchak language, a descendant of the language of Cumans, which used to be widespread in the eleventh to twelfth centuries throughout South-Eastern Europe.
The language of normal Rabbinic Crimean Jewish aborigines, Krymchaks,\(^{1450}\) belongs to the same group as Karaic, which leads us to believe that all Jews, irrespective of whether they were Rabbinic or Karaite, simply accepted the *lingua franca* of the steppe at a certain point. However, there are arguments in favour of specifically Turkic, or predominantly origin of Karaites. The very Karaite language is called in Karaite *karaj tili*, but has another name in Hebrew, traditionally used by Karaites – *lashon kedar* (לשון קדר) – the language of the nomads, which has a Turkic pedigree (while e.g. Krymchak language, a dialect of Crimean Tatar, was called Chagatai).

I do not want to say that the Karaites’ ethnic origin was exclusively Turkic, while the Krymchaks’ origin was exclusively Jewish. Both nations appeared as a result of mingling of the Jewish people of two different denominations with those parts of Cumans who settled in Crimea and embraced one of these two versions of Judaism, giving in their turn their widespread language as a chief means of communication. Nonetheless, although Rabbinic Jews perhaps also intermarried with Turkic people and converted some groups of nomads to Orthodox Judaism, it is generally accepted that Karaites have a much greater Turkic component than Krymchaks.\(^{1451}\) Moreover, Karaites in Hebrew testifies to their nomadic pedigree. Thus, we can infer that both Karaite and Rabbinic Jews of Crimea are a mix of Turkic people with the Jews of two different confessions already existing in Crimea by the high Middle Ages, Karaites having more of Turkic origin and Rabbanists (now Krymchaks) less of it. Thus, by the late Middle Ages and early modern times in Crimea there were two groups practising the Hebrew religion, both speaking dialects of Turkic Cuman and using the Hebrew alphabet: the Karaites and the Rabbinic Crimean Jews now known as Krymchaks.

The sources do not distinguish these two groups. A specifically articulated difference between the Krymchak Jews and the Karaites began after Crimea became a part of Russian Empire in the eighteenth century;\(^{1452}\) prior to that point, we know that both Rabbinic and

---

\(^{1450}\) They also have a distinctive ethnic identity as opposed to the Ashkenazi newcomers for instance, but are nevertheless Jews in a proper sense, meaning Rabbinic Jews.


\(^{1452}\) Later on, in Russian Empire, there was a sharp distinction between the Karaites and Rabbinic Jews: the latter were discriminated against and had limited rights, while the former were equal in rights with the
Karaite Jews lived in Crimea, but they neither had separate names ‘Karaites’ and ‘Krymchaks’, which are a recent invention, nor were they really distinguished outside the Jewish environment. They could have been heretics for each other, but for the Latins and Greeks they were not ‘Rabbinic’ or ‘Karaite’, but just Jews. The only possible suggestion is that a person with a universal Jewish or Greek name is more likely to be a Rabbinic Jew from outside Crimea, whereas those bearing the Turkic names are more likely to be Karaites (there were only a few Karaite diasporas outside Crimea, and the Crimean Karaites probably had little contact with them).

It looks as if the greater part of the Jewish population of Crimea was Karaic, but here we can be certain. We have a record of Evliya Çelebi and, although of later times and from a different Crimean city (Mangup, the former capital of the Principality of Theodoro), which gives an idea of who were native Crimean Jews (apart from visiting merchants). According to Çelebi, in the seventeenth century there were seven Jewish quarters comprising 1,000 houses, ‘disgusting and dirty’, and eighty shops. All Mangup Jews were skinners making calves’ and goats’ skins. All the Jews of Mangup and of Karasubazar (now Belogorsk) were Karaites. Çelebi also noticed that Jewish Karaite boys were particularly handsome: because of the excellent air and water on the plateau of Mangup their face colour was marble white and their cheeks were rubicund, eyes – similar to those of a gazelle, and their speech was sweet. Crimean medieval ‘sex-tourists’, looking for adolescent boys (ghilmans), came to Mangup, and Çelebi heard one such ‘boy-hunter’ singing:

Having thrown away my piety, I made a Jewish boy my feed of love.

Having rejoiced, Satan made him even more beautiful.”

---

Christians. The Karaites were considered a separate nation and a separate religion; “The Karaites are considered as people of a religion absolutely different from the Jews, and they (Karaites) enjoy all rights that the Russians have; they therefore cannot be levied to army instead of Jews, and the substitution of Jews with Karaites is illegal.” (Правительственный вестник 24 (1881)). Same was true in the Habsburg Empire (the bulk of Karaites were resettled by Vytautas to Galicia as well as in Trakai in Lithuania around 1392–1397). Notably, during the Nazi occupation of Crimea the Germans also officially recognised in 1939 Karaites as non-Jews, and their ‘racial psychology’ as ‘non-Jewish’, notwithstanding their quintessentially Hebrew religion, and while most Krymchaks were exterminated, there were no extermination of Karaites (notably, three prominent Jewish scholars – Balaban, Kalmanovitch, and Schiper were independently asked by the Nazi authorities whether Karaites could be considered as Jews, and all three replied negatively). Nonetheless, nowadays Karaites have a right of ‘repatriation’ to Israel, based on the fact that their religion is Jewish, although heretical. The Russian Orthodox clergy also regarded Karaites as a separate religion, different from Judaism, see for example, С. Стариков, “О крымских караимах,” Православная жизнь: ежемесячное приложение к журналу «Православная Русь» 5 (1966): 9-10.

Karaites lived in Solkhat in the thirteenth century, or even earlier; later on, their main centres were Caffa, Gezleve (modern Yevpatoria), Mangup, and in the modern times especially Chufut-Kale (meaning ‘Jewish fortress’; in the nineteenth century it was an almost exclusively Karaite city; also known as Sela Yuhudim, סלע יהודים, ‘Rock of the Jews’, or Sela ha-Karaim, סלע הקראים, ‘Rock of the Karaites’). Thus, Karaites must have prevailed over Rabbinic Jews in Crimea in general.

The deeds of Sambuceto mention two Jews in the late thirteenth century, one buying sheepskin from the Italians and acknowledging his debt to them, and another who gives a pledge. In the fourteenth century, many Jews fled to Caffa from Levant, Persia, and Caucasus, and founded in the city a Jewish quartier (called in the Genoese sources giudecca as it was called in Italy). According to archaeological data, there was also a synagogue (or, if it was Karaite, a kenesa), about which I nonetheless did not find any evidence in the written sources. The Jews also started manuscript production in Caffa. Unlike most either nations, the Jews were not involved in any kind of military service or guardianship in Caffa, either because the Latin authorities did not trust them enough, or because the Jews themselves wanted to be exempt from the military service, or both. Jews were not eligible to participate in the Genoese administration on any level; they were, however, often involved in economic affairs, notably supplying and provisioning the Commune as tax farmers (provisionatores). Besides that, as I highlight elsewhere, the Jewish quartier was not a ghetto, since Jews lived owned property in other areas, even in the citadel, while some Christians lived in the giudecca. This bizarre fact can be explained by the scarcity of Jewish population in Caffa (Massaria Caffae 1381–1382 mentions a negligible number of 22 persons; and here we clearly cannot trust Schiltberger, who wrote in the fifteenth century that there were some 4,000 Jewish houses in Caffa). Most of Jews and/or

1454 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 371.
1456 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 3 v, 191v. Balard, La Romanie génoise, 279. Same was true for Tana, where Jews also had their own Giudecca next to the Venetian quarter and separated from it by a ditch. Diplomatarium Veneto-Levantinum, sive Acta et Diplomata res venetas atque levantis illustrantia, ed. R. Predelli (Venice: 1899), Pars 2, 262.
1457 И.Г. Фарфель, Древняя еврейская синагога, найденная в городе Феодосии (Феодосия, 1918). Д.А. Хвольсон, Восемнадцать еврейских надгробных надписей из Крыма (Saint Petersburg, 1866), 140.
1459 Musso, Note d’Archivio sulla “Massaria” di Caffa, 62-98.
1460 Musso, Il tramonto di Caffa genovese, 329-330.
1462 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 386.
Karaites were involved in trade and artisanship, especially in leather production. In 1381 the Massaria Caffae mentions around thirty Jews, and some names look more Greek or Armenian (e.g. Michali or Iohanes Cacanachi), while others are more Turkic (e.g. Tactacha son of Tartachi, Sacarbec, Rosbey), with one Catalan Jew called Leo. This makes one to think that some Jews with regular Jewish names were merchants of the Black Sea or even Mediterranean scale, coming from Constantinople, the Greek cities of Southern Black Sea, or Italy and Catalonia, while the bearers of the Turkic names professing Judaism should have been the above-mentioned Turkic Karaites. The Statute of 1449 prescribed to protect Jews from different abuses. The Jewish community was probably less numerous than the other Oriental ones, but also more exclusive and closed to the outside world. However, it looks as if the Jews could play as brokers between Russia and the Mediterranean: Duran Duelt researched an interesting case of two Jews ‘from Russia’, Jehuda e Izatar (jueus mercaders del Realme de Ròssia), who were given a letters patent by the Queen in Barcelona. Surprisingly, it happened after the massacre of Jews in Barcelona in

1463 Balard, Genes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 371.
1464 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 260r, 295r, 3801, 403r, 463v.
1465 ASG, MC 1374, ff. 16v, 32r, 38v; MC 1381, ff. 260r, 403r, 410v, 458 bisr, 165r, 229v.
1466 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 8 r, 128r.
1467 Indeed trade is one profession, and the main one, among few professions specified as far as the Jews are concerned. ASG, MC 1381, ff. 4r, 410v, 464v.
1469 The documenti is stored in: ACA, Cancelleria, reg. 3113, f. 107v. It was published in: Daniel Duran i Duelt, “Els catalans i els mallorquins a la mar Negra i a la Tartària,” in Els catalans a la Mediterrània oriental a l’Edat mitjana: Jornades Científiques de l’Institut d’Estudis Catalans, 11 (Barcelona: Institut d’Estudis Catalans, 2003), 219-220. 1433 octubre 20, Barcelona. La reina Maria ordena a tots els seus oficials que no distorbin Jehuda i Izatar, jueus del regne de Rússia, que, desitjant retornar a les seves terres, han arribat a Barcelona a la recerca d’algunar embarcació que els serveixi per a tal fi. ACA, Cancelleria, reg. 3113, f. 107v. Maria, per gràcia de Déu, Reyna d’Aragó, etc. Lochinent, etc. Als nobles amats e feels nostres tots e sengles capitans, patrons, alguatxers e altres oficials e persones de qualsevol naus, galeres e altres qualsevol fustes e navilis, axí de la armada del dit senyor Rey com altres qualsevol, e encara a tots e sengles officials e sotsmesos del dit senyor Rey e nostres de ça i dellà mar on se vol constituy-its e dels dits officials lochinent. Salut e deleció. A vosaltres e a cascú de vós notificam com Jehuda e Izatar, jueus mercaders del Real me de Ròssia, per fortuna e tempestat de vent e de mar han perdudes totes I urs mercaderies e volents retornar a I ur terra, són pervenguents en aquest regne e, per consegüent, en aquesta ciutat de Barchinona per cercar e trobar fusta ab la qual puexn possar e retornar en la dita I ur terra; per çò, a pregàries del Rey de Navarra, nostre car frare, qui de aço nos ha scrit e los ha fet cert saulcondaty-t, e a suplicació de alguns domestichs e familiars nostres, vos manam de certa scència e expressament sots obtemenent de la gràcia e mercè del dit senyor e nostra e pena de mil florins d’or dels béns dels contrafahents als coffres del dit senyor aplicadors que los dits Jehuda e Izatar, jueus dissus dits, ab tots I urs béns, robes, diners e altres qualsevol coses que en si aportaran per totes vostres juredicçions, potestats e senyories lexets anar, passar, entrar e retornar francament e segura e los pertractés favorablement e benigna. E no consintats ni permetats que sien maltractats ni los sia feta injúriaa ni
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August 1391, when all the Jewish population of the city was either exterminated, or had to convert to Christianity, and this was followed by a royal ban for the Jews to settle there. What was so special about them? A separate research is required to answer this question; however, it is very likely that these Jews were in fact either from Caffa, or were travelling through Caffa on their way to somewhere else. Yet another example of the Jews on the diplomatic service is a Crimean Jew Kozja Kokos, who was an envoy of the Crimean Khan Meñli I Geray to the Grand Prince of Moscow Ivan III Vasilyevich; notably, part of the correspondence was written in Hebrew.

For Jewish onomasticon of Caffa, we can compare the data of the Massaria Caffae 1381, Massaria Caffae 1423, and Massaria Caffae 1461. In Massaria Caffae 1381 a total of nineteen persons are Jews (same comment as was before applied to the Latin onomasticon of Massaria Caffae 1381 is applicable to the Armenian one, see above):

5 Ellias (Elias),
3 Alaon/Araon/Araon,
2 Issac,
1 David, Eliachim, Salamon &c.

In Massaria Caffae 1423, only 8 can be identified as Jews. Coachabei, Elia, Yusuf, Saba, Sabbata, Simon, Somocha, Coichocus (= Coia Cocos?), &c.

In Massaria Caffae 1461, only 7 identifiable as Jews. Cocos, Elia Passa, Elia Yhiliati, Iambei, an others.

Summing up the section on Jews, we should underline that both Rabbinic Jews and Karaites constituted a very small group in the overall population of Caffa and were not very visible. Apparently, they were a very seclusive and exclusive community, and its members rarely stepped outside it to make business contacts or other deals involving trust, preferring to rely on their coreligionists within the community. Nonetheless, the role of this community was relatively important in Caffa and, above all, was yet one more link of the city both with the Mediterranean and with the Central/Eastern Europe thanks to the interconnection of the Jewish communities.

dan algú en persona ni béns I urs, abans los endrecets e los provehiscats tota vegada que n serets requests de segur passatge e saulconduy-t, certifficant vos que al dit seyor e a nós per los dits sguards serà plasent e agradable. Dada en Barchinona, sots nostre sagell secret, a XX dies de octubre de l’any de la nativitat de nostre Senyor MCCCCXXXIII. La Reyna. Domina Regina presente Cancellario mandavit mihi, Petro de Colle, alias Lobet. Probata.

1470 A.Ф. Малиновский, “Историческое и дипломатическое собрание дел, произошедших между Российскими Великими Князьями и бывшими в Крыме татарскими царями с 1462 по 1533 г.,” ZOOID 5 (1863): 275.
**Syrians.** The people called *sorianus* or *surianus* in the sources, i.e. ‘Syrians’,\(^{1471}\) belong to a separate group in this analysis. However, we face a tricky issue. There are some Syrians mentioned as domiciled in Caffa in the late thirteenth century:\(^{1472}\) Michael and Tedari owned two houses, one of which was shared with the bishop of Soldaia, Hassan owned a *funduq* (*caravanserai*), there are also people called Amarrico de Gibeleto and Ansaldo.\(^{1473}\) Nonetheless, their describer ‘Syrians’ is rather deceptive and does not necessarily mean a separate Jacobite Syrian or Maronite identity, but rather a mere geographical provenance from Syria: in fact, Amarrico and Ansaldo are clearly Latins, either the Italian traders or refugees from the Crusader states, Hassan is certainly a Muslim and probably an Arabic-speaking one, and out of the first two names Michael is more or less universal, while Theodor (*Tedari* as written by scribe) is more characteristic for the Greeks, or, more correctly, the Greek Orthodox people, which were and still are present in Syria.

The Syrians that appear in the documents in the fourteenth century are people of modest social standing such as shopkeepers, owners of taverns and public bathhouse; one Syrian owned a *funduq*, another one was a ship-owner,\(^{1474}\) and in 1375 one Syrian merchant was mentioned.\(^{1475}\) In *Massaria Caffae* 1381–1382 there are several *suriani* called Abram, Andreas, Ayvac, Elia, Ibraym, Issac, Manzurr, Nauros, Rostalla, thus mainly with the Oriental Muslim names; in fact there are more, since all people designated ‘de Gibelet’ come from this area in Syria. Gibeleto in Syria, which was hosting a Genoese trading station, equals ancient Byblos, in Arabic Jubayl, and this famous place clearly supplied Caffa an influx of newcomers. In the same *Massaria Caffae* 1381-1382 there are fourteen people from Gibeleto called Abram, Araon, Agopssa, Cosma, Dominicus, Francischus, Georgius, Johannes, Isaac, Iudas, Manolli, Solimam, Salamon, and Varsamon.\(^{1476}\) Some ‘Syrians’ are mentioned in 1386: Francesco de Gibeleto was an interpreter, Antonio was a butcher, Giorgio belonged to a mendicant order, Callojane was an *orguxius* and a head of a ‘hundred’, David de Gibeleto was a merchant obliged to pay the Tana *commerchium*, Solimano went to Bulgaria in order to buy 498 *modii* of grain on behalf of the Commune.\(^{1477}\) As one can see out

---

1475 ASG, Notaio Niccolò de Bellignano, ff. 11 r.-13 r., f. 113v., 115 r.-118v.
1476 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 359.
1477 ASG, MC 1386, f. 206r, 416v, 453v, 508r, 515r.
of this list, Francesco de Gibelet, Antonio, and Giorgio were Latins from Syria, the name David sounds ambiguous and could belong to a person of virtually any ethnic origin, Callojane (Καλογιάννης) was a Greek Orthodox, and Solimano (i.e. Süleyman) – a Muslim. What Caffa received from Gibeleto in the fourteenth century was therefore a mix of religions and identities, and these people were described as ‘Syrians’ just because of the geographical provenance that they shared.

The situation changes, however, in the fifteenth century. In 1423, there are eight persons from Gibeleto: Antonio, Costantino, Domenico, Gabriele, Giorgio, Edipo, Giuliano, and Lodisio. In 1461, there were five men from Gibeleto: Tommaso, Battista, Lorenzo, socius of Caffa, and Giuliano. As we can see, those from Gibeleto are not defined as suriani, and indeed they all have Latin names, thus being neither Syrian, nor Oriental at all, but just Latins, and perhaps even Genoese inhabitants of the trading station of Byblos, who migrated to Caffa. Contrary to that, one Syrian is mentioned in 1461; he is doubtlessly a Muslim, Mansur surianus, but indeed his mention does not bear any reference to Gibeleto.

What we can infer is that the ‘Syrians’ of Caffa were as mixed and diverse in terms of religion and language, as the population of Syria itself used to be. Sometimes it was argued that the ‘Syrians’ of Caffa is a religious describer of a consistent group formed of Oriental Orthodox Christians like Jacobite Syrian Christians or Nestorians (or e.g. Syriac-speaking Maronites). Indeed, for unexperienced travellers like John Schiltberger it may seem that the suriani were yet another group of Christians of Caffa alongside the Catholics, Orthodox, and Armenians. Indeed, we cannot be certain, but one can hardly imagine a person called Dominicus or Francischus among the medieval adherents of the Jacobite Syrian or Nestorians

---

1478 MC 1423, 192v.
1479 MC 1423, 129r, 134v.
1480 MC 1423, 276v.
1481 MC 1423, 53v, 75r.
1482 MC 1423, 13r, 45v, 60r, 92v, 369v, 373v.
1483 MC 1423, 33v.
1484 MC 1423, 17v, 33v, 64r, 77r, 77v, 78r, 79r, 80r, 81r, 85v, 93v, 126r, 133v, 147v, 150v, 153v.
1485 MC 1423, 39v, 40v, 40v bis, 42r, 44v, 46v, 97v, 303v, 304v, 407r end/408v reg.
1486 MC 1423, 175r, 284r, 287v, 407v end/408r reg, 410r end/405v reg.
1487 MC 1423, 175r, 284r, 287v, 407v end/408r reg, 410r end/405v reg.
1488 MC 1423, 175r, 284r, 287v.
1489 MC 1461, 309r end/406v reg.
1490 MC 1461, 110r, 406v end/409r reg.
1491 MC 1461, 133r, 406v end/409r reg.
Churches. Maronites, who were in full communion with Rome, are more plausible candidates, since they used Arabic system of names, spoke Syriac rather than European languages and had a distinctively non-Latin liturgical system. However, this is no more than a hypothesis. The only thing we do know with any certainty is that these were people coming to Caffa from Syria, and mainly from one particular place, that is Gibelet.

What should be stressed here is the evolution and transformation of the Syrian migration to Caffa. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the Syrians in Caffa are numerous, with different religious affiliations, and come from the same place, namely Gibelet. In the first half of the fifteenth century, the migration from Gibelet to Caffa is still very visible, but by that time those migrants were exclusively or almost exclusively Latins from the Orient, those Latins whose emergence was made possible by the creation of the Crusader states. In the strict sense, these people could not be called Syrians, and the scribes of the massariae indeed did not call them so, just saying ‘de Gibelet’. After 1453, even these Latin people from Gibeleto almost disappear because of the closure of the straits; the only exception, the above-mentioned Mansur, is Syrian, but not from Gibeleto. Thus we arrive at the following conclusion: our sources reflect the deep structural changes that occurred in Levantine migration during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. An intensive migration from Gibeleto in Lebanon to Caffa was typical for the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and included people of all kinds of religion and ethnic background – Franks, Oriental Christians (Nestorians, Jacobites, Melkites, Maronites etc.), Muslims, etc. In the first half of the fifteenth century, the migration from Gibeleto to Caffa retained its importance, but the Syrians disappeared from the scene: this migration became totally or almost totally Frankish. This migration of Latins from the Orient, namely from Gibeleto, also ceased after 1453, and in the last decades of the Genoese ownership of Caffa we find practically no Latins from Gibeleto or Syrians in general.

**Arabs.** Some authors mention the presence of Arabs in Caffa, and there were some, but since they are undistinguishable in practice from other Muslims, they will be treated as saraceni. However, some sources give additional information. In 1443 the Sultan of Egypt arrested and jailed the Genoese merchants, who were treated badly and in 1466 their heirs

---

reported that two of them had died. This was a revenge for a certain conflict that happened previously in Caffa between the Genoese and the Egyptians and which broke the conditions of the earlier treaty between Genoa and the Sultan. Two embassies were sent to the Sultan, one from Famagusta and another from Caffa. Thus, even if we do not have any direct evidence of the Arabic presence in Caffa, we can hypothesise that the Egyptian merchants frequented the city.

**Turks.** A *turcus* or *turchus* of the Italian sources are not always a synonym of the ‘Ottoman’. Normally, they must mean an Oghuz Turk notwithstanding their political affiliation and as opposed for instance to the Turkic group of Kypchaks, to whom the Cumans and Tatars belong. Without additional evidence we cannot automatically treat a person with a Turkic name as a Turk, because we do not know whether he retained his Turkic identity (if such thing existed) having converted to Christianity. Furthermore, if a person bears a Muslim name we cannot automatically say that he was a Turk (he could also be Arabic, Persian, or a Slav converted to Islam). Thus, a descriptor *turcus* constitutes a reason for including a person in this group itself (especially when combined with a Muslim name).

**Saracens.** In the lexicon of the Italian scribes, *saracenus* equalled Muslim. Balard discusses the identity of the Saracens, convincingly proving that they were Muslims and not Cumans (allegedly from ‘sarı’, Turk. ‘yellow’). Their ethnicity is generally almost indistinguishable, unless they bear Turkic names. When they have universal Muslim ones such as Abdullah (*Avedol*), Ahmet (*Acmet*), Ali, Ibrahim (*Ibracim*), Ismail, Khalil (*Calili*), Muhammad (*Macomet*), Mustafa (*Mostafa*), Omar, or Yusuf (*Iusup*) we cannot distinguish whether the person in question is an Arab, Turk, Persian, Tatar, or something else. Muslim

---

1494 Bliznyuk, Die Genuesen auf Zypern, No. 79.
1495 On the one hand, a Greek, Slav, or Albanian converted to Islam and associated in his political allegiance with the Ottomans is an Ottoman, though not a Turk. On the other hand, members of Turkic tribes living on the lands not yet conquered by the Ottomans were Turks, but not Ottoman.
1497 The need for a specific descriptor *saracenus* (which is not the same as ‘a Tatar’ or ‘a Turk’) is an indirect witness that Tatars whom the Genoese lived with in the cities normally were not Muslims (otherwise they would have been comfortably described by an ethnic identifier equalling a religious one, as was the case for Armenians or Jews).
community existed in Caffa perhaps since its very beginning. We find Muslims in the deeds of 1289–1290. Moreover, in 1290, we find sources mentioning a ‘house of the Muslims’ (domus Mossorimanorum) in Caffa, which probably meant a mosque. Ibn Battuta, whose accounts describe the city as of the 1330s, also mentions a mosque in Caffa. A Saracen Coaia Macometus de Boberli gave to the massarii of Caffa pro rebus inghentibus (sic) necessariis 92 sommo, 1,200 ducats, and 130 golden danghae. The statute of Caffa testifies that the Muslim population of the city was large (…multos saracenos colere hanc urbem). According to the statute, the Genoese curia of Caffa must have had one scribe capable of writing in litterarum saracenarum (Tatar or Arabic). Most of the Saracens must have been Tatar, Cuman, or Uyghur speakers, while Arabic was used mainly in the religious context. Thus, those who were Tatars (for good reasons the majority of the Saracens, albeit many Tatars alternatively professed Christianity) will be dealt with here under the subheading ‘Tatars’.

The male Muslim onomastikon of Caffa looks as follows. In Massaria Caffae 1381 total of 76 Tatars (since the table in the Ponomarev’s article does not distinguish names by ethnic group and gives the gross numbers of use for each name in the whole population, I have included a selective list including the names that most probably belonged to Muslims and missing some ambiguous names that are relatively, although not predominantly frequent, but hard to identify with any single ethnic group):

6 times: Amir,
5 times: Ectiar,
4 times: Morati,
3 times: Agi, Aminadin,
2 times: Ambet, Asilbec, Asilbei, Cradamin, Ibraym, Saffadin, Taiadin,
1 time: (Agimacomet/Agimamet), Alibec, Alibei, Amirmacomet, Amirsar, (Avedol/Avedollus), Ayşe (Ayse), Carvadel, Chidir (Chidil, Cheder), Issadin, Mansurrus (Manzurrus), Mombarec, Noradinus, Ramadan, Sabadin, Saraffadin, Sayt, Sic Assam, Solimam (Soliman), Sugiadin, and others.

1500 Brătianu, Actes des notaires, No. 332.
1501 Ibn Batoutah, 357.
1502 ASG, Peire Massaria 1391, f. 70; Notaio Giovanni Balbi, No. 482.
1503 Statutum Caphe (1449), 609, 679.
1504 Mosheim, Historia tartarorum ecclesiastica (Helmstadt, 1741), 148.
1505 See below, the Ponomarev’s method of cathegorization is not completely identical to mine.
In *Massaria Caffae* 1423, a total of 55 identifiable as belonging to the Muslim community of Caffa; *onomastikon* is very diverse.

3 times: Sa’id, Kutul, Bulat,
2 times: Hassan, Amir / Amir Bey, Edilbey,

In *Massaria Caffae* 1461, a total of 44 identifiable as Muslims;
3 times: Mustafa,
2 times: Ali,

Finally, we should note that the Muslim population of Caffa, was smaller compared to the Latin, Greek, or Armenian populations, but was still a visible part of urban life. In the fifteenth century its structure underwent a transformation: besides local Turkic people professing Islam and often still having a nomadic background, there appeared a substantial quantity of the merchants and, particularly, slave traders coming from the urban centres of Asia Minor. This was an important factor that defined the portrait of Genoese Caffa in the wake of its Ottoman conquest.

‘*Khazars.*’ This ‘ethnic group,’ sometimes, albeit rarely, mentioned in the sources, probably has nothing to do with the early medieval Khazars. The word ‘Gazaria’ had several meanings – it could be one of the names of the Tatar state, and also the name of the Genoese possessions on the Black Sea coasts. Several people bearing the name Cazarinus or Cazarus are Armenians, since in Armenian ‘Cazar’ is the same as the name ‘Lazarus’, and sometimes
in is put explicitly e.g. *Cazar armenus*, nonetheless, romantic imagination of certain authors turned these people to be the remnants of the Khazar Khaganate.

**Cumans, also known as Kypchaks or Polovcy.** This was a Turkic nomadic people/nation that moved to the Black Sea steppe from Trans-Volga region in the eleventh century, having partly replaced, and partly subjugated the Oghuz Turkic tribes known as Pechenegs. Cumans crossed the Dnepr and reached the Danube, becoming therefore the masters of all steppes from the Danube until Irtys, and these territories then received the name *Desht-i Qipchaq* in the Turkic languages, Cumania in the Latin and Greek ones, and the Steppe of Polovcy in the Russian ones. Some Eastern sources testify that a mainly Greek city of Soldaia was one of the places with a considerable Cuman population, living there side by side with Armenians, Jews, Alans, Arabs, and Persians. After 1238, the Mongol-Tatars defeated and subjugated almost all Cumans, some of whom fled to Hungary; nonetheless, as the local Cumans together with other Turkic people largely outnumbered the Mongol newcomers, the process of assimilation began. The Cuman language remained a *lingua franca* in all *Desht-i Qipchaq*, which is reflected in European travelogues and other sources, as being prevalent in the steppe to the extent that it was in use throughout northern Asia up to the borders of the Gobi. The *Codex Cumanicus*, which is a manual of the Cuman language meant to help the Latin monks in their mission, initially refers to the Turkic entry
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1507 The Russian word ‘Polovcy’ probably originates from the word *половъ* meaning ‘yellow’, ‘straw colour’. One version is that this name is due to the blond ‘straw’ colour of their hair, not really typical for most of the Turkic tribes. Another version is that it derives from Sary-Kypchak, meaning ‘yellow Kypchaks’. One more option is that it could derive from the word *половъ*, literally ‘half’, since the Russians living on the right bank of Dnepr said about the nomads from the steppe that they were from the left bank – *оного полу*, i.e. ‘from another side’. See: Скржинская, “Половцы. Опыт исторического истолкования этникона,” in Русь, Италия и Византия в Средневековье (St. Petersburg: Алетейя, 2000), 36-90. The last version is doubtful, since the Cumans are known as *plavci* in Old Czech and *plauci* in Old Polish, and both names correlate according to the rules of the Slavic liquid metathesis and pleophony with *половъ*, but not with *половъ*.
1508 See in: Vasary, Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries.
comanicum, but in the second part, referring to the same language, it calls it Tatar (tatar til), which meant that even when the codex being written the border between the Cumans and the Turkic people who came with the Mongols was blurred. Describing the region of the River Don, an unknown Franciscan friar wrote in the fourteenth century:

Afterwards I embarked on the Sea of Sara in a ship of Coman Christians... I reached the Cape of Gotia which is between the Mare Mayor and the Sea of Letana (Azov Sea). The Goths occupied this cape when they went forth to besiege Alexandre. The cape borders on two very extensive provinces, the land of the King David and the province of Avogasia, and Tana. Thence I entered the Sea of Tana by a strait between the Capes of Gotia and Tus, where there is a city called Materga. There are three kingdoms bordering on this Sea of Letana, which are subject to Uxleto. These are Comania whose people are Christians, Comanes; Tana, a country of Turcos and Tartaros, and Canardi. They are divided by a great river called Tanay, from which the city takes its name. The flags of these kingdoms are the same as that their over-lord Uxleto (Sebastopolis). I departed from the Sea of Letana and proceeded along the shores of the eastern side of the Mare Mayor for a very long distance, passing by Aruasaxia, and Pesonta in the empire of Uxleto, and arrived in the kingdom of Sant Estropoli which is inhabited by Comanes Christians. Here there are many people who have Jewish descent, but all perform the works of Christians in the sacrifices, more after the Greek than the Latin Church. The King has for his flag-gules a hand argent.1511

In the thirteenth and partly fourteenth centuries, it partly makes sense to distinguish the Mongol-Tatar conquerors, who were Oirats, from the vast majority of the Cumans, who belonged to the Turkic Kypchak group. The data of the archaeological excavations reveals that the differences in the burial rite of the Cumans and the one of the Tatars were preserved until the fourteenth century, although only by the higher strata of the elites. Later on, however, reading in the sources ‘Cuman’ we should treat it as ‘Tatar’, not in the modern sense, but in a sense in which the sources of that époque called the Turkic people of the steppe Tatars, since the Cumans played major role in the genesis of such nations as the Tatars, Bashkirs, Karaims, Karachay-Balkars, Krymchaks, Kumyks, Crimean Tatars, Urum, Kazakhs, Karakalpaks, Nogai, and Kyrgyz. According to certain travelogues (beginning with

---

1511 Book of the knowledge of all the kingdoms, lands and lordships that are in the world, ed. Sir Robert Clements, KCB (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1912), 51, 56.
Carpini and Rubruck), some tribes to the North of from the Caucasus and in the immediate proximity to it still were known as Cumans even in the fifteenth century and, unlike most of the nomadic Tatars, professed Orthodox Christianity rather than Islam. Although the Cuman language was called this even in the fifteenth century, after the mid-fourteenth century, the word ‘Cuman’ disappears in the notarial deeds and the last known mention of the Cumans in the Italian archival sources dates to 1381. This means that in the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the word ‘Cuman’ slowly went out of use, as the multitude of the steppe Turkic Kypchaks, mainly descendants of the Cumans and having assimilated the Mongol-Tatar minority, were more and more widely known as Tatars, a describer based on their subjection to the Tatar khanates than on their initial ethnic origin.

Among the slaves on the Black Sea, in the first two decades of the fourteenth century the Cumans shared the first place in the list with the Russians. In Genoa, however, the Cuman slaves only appear in the mid-fourteenth century – there are six men with Latin Christian baptismal names, and twenty-eight women, some with Latin Christian names, and some – with the Pagan ones (Arcona, Megola, Cali, Caligia, etc.). Last time a Cuman female slave with a baptismal name Catalina is mentioned in 1354; she was freed by her master Giofredo Zaccaria. After that, the mentions of Cuman slaves become scarce and disappear by the fifteenth century (probably because these people were now identified as Tatars), and the rare cases of Cumans outside the context of the slave trade appear only occasionally, as those mentioned above from Massaria Caffae 1381–1382, although in fact not everybody styled ‘Comanus’ there is in fact a Kypchak, since the word began to be used as a personal name or a nickname/family name. In 1423, one person, evidently Greek Orthodox, Vassili de Comania grecus, is mentioned in the Massaria Caffae.

The word saraceni or sarraceni is problematic and has been discussed by Balard. He proposed two possible options: that they were either Cumans, or people whom the Latin

1513 Book of the knowledge of all the kingdoms, lands and lordships that are in the world, ed. Sir Robert Clements, KCB (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1912), 51, 56.
1514 A scriba litterarum sarracenarum Sarafadinus (Cerefeddin) was quoted in a document dated 1422: ASG, MC, 1422, f. 256v. Balard, “Infideles ou comans,” 11. He might well have been a scribe with some knowledge of the Tatar language, and the Tatar language could be conventionally called lingua sarracenarum, litterararum sarracenarum as it has an old Uyghur alphabet.
1515 None of them are found in Gioffrè, Il mercato. Verlinden, Le recrutement des esclaves à Venise.
1516 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 292v, 293v, 276v.
1517 MC 1423, 189v.
authors of the sources would call infidels, i.e. the Muslims (Pagans from the Caucasus were normally categorized by an ethnic or geographical describer and were not considered Saracens). Although Balard suggests that *sarraceni* could mean the Cumans, a more accurate analysis of the use of the term *sarraceni* in the Genoese documents as opposed to the Latins, Greeks, Armenians, and Jews, made it possible to conclude that this term was a designation for the infidels in general, which in that period meant mainly Muslim and Pagan Tatars and Turks, and also Cumans, inasmuch as they persisted as a separate ethnic group without being converted to Christianity (which was the case for the Cumans living to the north from Caucasus according to the European narrative sources). Balard convincingly proved based on a long onomastikon (where the *saraceni* names were almost exclusively of Arab, Turkic, and Tatar origin), that the *saraceni* were a name for Muslims in the Genoese documents. The broad diversity of geographical provenance of the *sarraceni* discovered by Balard (Asia Minor, Kypchak, Thrace, Crimea, Matrega, even Syria) is a strong argument in favour of seeing this word exactly as a religious and not ethnic identifier. At the same time, not all Tatars, Turks, or Cumans were *saraceni* for a Latin scribe, e.g. those who were Christians, either Catholic or Orthodox.

**Tatars and Mongols.** After the Mongol-Tatar conquest, a new ethnic group appeared in Europe. There is ambiguity in how the terms ‘Mongol’ and ‘Tatar’ are used. The word Tatars first appears in the Chinese sources and meant a tribe or tribes living north of the Great Wall of China. Perhaps, they inhabited areas around the Lake Baikal, and were probably mainly Mongol-speaking, although the Chinese sources count among the Tatars both some of Mongol-speaking nomadic tribes (including the ancestors of modern Buryats) and some non-Mongol peoples/nations such as Turkic Tuvans and Tungusic Evenks. As it was a tribal confederation, the language and race were of secondary importance, and political affiliation came first. In the mid-twelfth century, Tatars became one of the strongest tribal confederations in the Eastern steppes. Since then, the word ‘Tatar’ in Chinese and in the
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1518 Deriving from the word sary meaning yellow or fair – for their color of hair, skin, and eyes; notably a Russian name for Cumans, polovtsy, also can refer to their hair color, see above.
1519 Balard, “Infideles ou comans,” 10. Despite a correct idea about the identity of the sarraceni as infidels, Balard probably was mistaken identifying them with all Tatars en gross (Ibid., 11), since, as it is shown elsewhere, a large part of ethnic Tatars, including not only slaves, but also a big bulk of freemen, were in fact rather Christians, than Muslims. It was a case for the cities, but maybe in many cases for the hinterland (casalia) as well.
1520 Balard, “Infideles ou comans,” all pages.
Central Asian sources often mean all nomads of the Eastern Asia steppes, and not only those of Mongol origin and language. At the same time, the Mongol sources see Tatars as a distinct political unit, and only one among the tribes in the steppe. This tribe disappeared physically: Genghis Khan had wars with Tatars and, having defeated them in 1202, he exterminated all the men and women who were taller than the wheel axle of a cart. Those Tatars died out, but their name survived. The point was that in Chinese or Central Asians languages the word ‘Tatar’ was already used in the broader sense, and thanks to this mistaken use all the people led by Genghis Khan were therefore perceived as Tatars, no matter whether they were Mongols, or some other people (Turkic, Tungusic, Finno-Ugric, etc.).

By the time when they came to Europe, the Mongols probably already constituted a minority in Genghis Khan’s army, the majority being various Turkic tribes from the steppe that joined him voluntarily or after being defeated and subjugated. The Cumans were one of the last examples of this incorporation – they were defeated by the Mongol-Tatars, Desht-i Qipchaq (Cumania in the European sources) and became the Golden Horde, but the people who lived there (Mongols, Cumans, other Turkic and non-Turkic tribes) became known to the Europeans as Tatars rather than Mongols. Kypchak language, the language of the defeated Cumans, remained lingua franca in all Desht-i Qipchaq, as the majority of its population was Turkic-speaking; moreover, it influenced the formation of the Tatar language of the Golden Horde. Thus, in the thirteenth century European lexicon the word ‘Tatars’, possibly transmitted from Asia to Europe by the Armenian go-betweens, became chiefly a political term, meaning the nomadic and predominantly Turkic-speaking population of the newly-established Golden Horde.

However, we find that the authors of the Italian notarial sources distinguished between the Mongol and Tatar slaves, not forgetting the Cumans mentioned above. Mongol slaves cost more, which means that they were less available, which is understandable, since Mongols were the conquerors, the masters of the Golden Horde, and mainly the core of its political and military elite. One of the reasons for the Tohtu’s attack on Caffa in 1308 was the enslavement of his subjects, mainly Tatars in broad sense of the term, but probably also a

1522 Later on, in the Russian Empire, basically all those speaking Kypchak Turkic languages (which means almost all Turkic people) were called Tatars. Today the name is used much less.
1523 Jean de Plan Carpin, Histoire des Mongols, 139.
1524 Or initially nomadic and then settled down.
few members of the Mongol elite. Verlinden thought that the slave traders distinguished much more Europeoid Tatars from the Asiatic-looking Mongols racially and somatically based on anthropological parameters, and suggested that the Mongol slaves of the Italian deeds could be Kalmyks. The first point is dubious, or at least can be accepted at best as a hypothesis – the Tatars and any Turkic people could be and still are of very diverse anthropological types, from quintessential Mongoloids to blond and blue-eye Europeoids. The second point is completely incorrect since although Kalmyks are indeed the most western of the Mongol-speaking nations (they now live in the Northern Caspian region and are not only the most western Mongols, but also the only nation in Europe that professes Buddhism), they appeared in the area of contemporary settlement only in the seventeenth century, having migrated from Dzungaria to Europe.

What did a notary mean in a deed when he described one person as a Mongol, and another as a Tatar? This could theoretically be an identification based on the racial and anthropological features. However, the most logical solution seems to be different, that is, language and the social status. Mongols were Mongolophone, while most of the population of the Golden Horde was Turcophone, and could be described as Tatars. The second factor determined the fact that Mongol slaves cost more: they were more likely to be before the enslavement members of higher social stratas. At the same time, we cannot be sure that all Western sources are consistently uniform: a difference between Mongols and the Turkic people of the steppe could be obvious for a notary dealing daily with the slave trade, aware of the racial difference between them, and perhaps knowing some ‘Cuman’ language, but not so obvious for a European chronicler or even the author of a travelogue. Nonetheless, the criteria of the language and social status/price seem to be the best factor to distinguish between Mongols and Tatars meaning Turkic inhabitants of steppe.

Prior to the mid-fourteenth century we find eight Mongol slaves in Genoa, but after 1350 there are no more Mongol slaves mentioned in the Genoese documentation. In the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, the Tatar identity was still in the process of formation, and the Turkic people that came with Genghis Khan were merging with Cumans.
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1526 B. Spuler, Die Goldene Horde, 84.
1529 ASG, Not. cart. No. 137, ff. 49v, 49v-50r; No. 235, f. 189 r. One of them is said to be de partibus Mogolii, which means that he was from the geographical Mongolia.
the old population of this area. These Turkic-speakers formed the majority of the population of the Golden Horde and assimilated the Mongol minority, mainly the elite of the state. That is why for the early époque the differentiation of Mongols on the one hand and Cumans on the other from the Tatars of the Golden Horde still makes sense. By the late fourteenth century, however, any mention of Mongols and Cumans disappears from the Italian documents, whilst the Tatars remain. This means that the formation of the Tatar ethnic group in the Golden Horde must have taken place by the 1350s–1400s. Balard conceived of the absence of the Mongols in the Italian archival documents after the mid-fourteenth century as a result of the crisis and instability on the trade routes of the Golden Horde. This is one possible explanation. However, perhaps, there is another major reason. In the second half of the fourteenth century the Mongol elites were assimilated by their subjects, the Turkic population of the Golden Horde, and were then called Tatars rather than Mongols. Thus, having said some words about Mongols and before that also a few about Cumans, I will also speak about Tatars – the Turkic-speaking population of the Golden Horde, and the colonies of Genoese Gazarı.

Tatars formed a visible, although initially not very large part of the population of Caffa. *Mutatis mutandis*, we can say that these were proto-Crimean Tatars, and thus probably already had he rudiments of the sub-ethnic groups known afterwards, namely the steppe Tatars (çöllüler, noğaylar), the mountain Tatars (tatlar), and the coastal Tatars (yalıboylular). In the fourteenth century, the Tatar population of Caffa grew, but the Latins, Greeks, and Armenians all outnumbered the Tatars. By 1380s, Tatars became slightly more numerous in Caffa than in the early part of the century (sixty-one people in the *Massaria Caffae* 1386), even though part of the Tatar population must have left Caffa at that point due to the Genoese-Tatar war of 1386–1387, and their property was confiscated by the Genoese as they were considered traitors. Nonetheless, in Caffa, unlike in Soldaia, Tatars did not constitute a large group.
The Tatars of the Genoese territories called *cancluchi*, meaning the subjects of the Khan, had a double subjection: on the one hand, within the Genoese territories they were under the jurisdiction of the Genoese consul, on the other hand, they were subjects of the Khan of the Golden Horde, who was represented in Crimea by the ruler of Solkhat, who in his turn sent his representative to the Genoese territories. This officer was called a *tudun* in Tatar or *titanus canluchorum* in Latin but did not act as a sort of viceroy. As the Genoese strengthened their power over their territories in the second half of the fourteenth century, the *tudun*’s function was reduced to a role similar to that of a consul in a foreign country in charge of the well-being of his compatriots (‘reduced’ only if it was previously something more than that, which does not seem to have been the case). Interestingly, both officers serving as a *tudun* in the fourteenth century were probably not Tatars: from at least 1374 and in the early 1380s this post was held by Cachador, and in 1386 there was already a new *tudun* called Pandaseni, Cachador being an Armenian given name *Khachatur* and Pandaseni – a Greek family name Πανταζής. Taken into account that this post implied by default brokerage and middlemanship, it is no surprise that the intermediary between the Genoese administration the local population, and the Tatar authorities was a person from the local population, but not a Muslim Tatar. Caffa Tatars were subject to a special 5% tax called *tolta* in Tatar or *commerchium canluchorum* in Latin and in the 1380s one-seventh of it had to be sent to the ruler of Solkhat. Tatars did not generally serve in the Genoese administration, or if they did at some point, it was much rarer than for Greeks or Armenians in the Italian service. The Tatar freemen mentioned in the documents as settled in Caffa were mainly brokers or artisans: butchers, smiths, etc.
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Horde in 1246–1247, did not find a single town or hamlet on his way, and while Rubruck, who travelled there in 1253–1255, reported the intensive city-building. After the conversion of Berke Khan to Islam, it became even more necessary to build cities with mosques, madrasah, caravanserais, etc., which was made possible thanks to mobilization of the artisans captured during the wars of conquest. After Berke the khans rejected Islam (Möngke Temür, Tode Möngke, Talabuga, and Toqta), as well as Berke’s urban development strategy; however, the following khans (Özbeg, Tini Beg, and Jani Beg) made steps in the same direction. Özbeg (1313–1341) embraced Islam and went on with the city-building, having found Sarai and moved capital to it from old city with the same name. During the fourteenth century, all area of Volga and Don became a heterogeneous zone of settlement with big cities, smaller towns, and agricultural areas. The urban life in the Golden Horde began to decline after the dynastic wars in the 1360s and onwards and in fact ended after the cities were devastated by Tamerlane in 1395–1396. В.Л. Егоров, Историческая география Золотой Орды в XIII – XIV вв. Глава 3. Города Золотой Орды и некоторые вопросы экономической географии государства.

1532 Nystazopoulou, Η εν τη Ταυρικη Χερσονήσω πόλις Σουγδαία (Athens, 1965), 68-69.
1533 ASG, MC 1374, f. 36v. ASG, MC 1381, f. 275r. C. Desimoni, Trattato dei Genovesi, 161-165.
1534 MC 1386, f. 204 r
1535 ASG, MC 1381, ff. 165v, 190v; MC 1386, ff. 152v, 217 r-v, 311r, 389r.
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The religious affiliation of Tatars is a problematic issue. It is often thought that Tatar by default equals Muslim. The nomadic Tartars formally professed Islam since the times of Özbeg Khan (1313–1341), but many of them tried to stick to Paganism. Giosafat Barbaro retells a story of how he saw Pagan sacrifices (boiled millet covered with a wooden bowl and called hibuth peres) to the gods still exercised by the Tatars in the 1430s. He learned that there were many Pagans and that also tried to hide the fact. Moreover, although we saw from the discussion about Saracens, many of the fourteenth and fifteenth century Tatars living in Gazarria were indeed Muslims, but this was not the case initially. The first Mongol attack on Crimea took place in 1223, and since then, Tatars began settling on the peninsula. Some of them were converted by the Catholic missions, which the popes began to send to the Mongol-Tatars as soon as the invaders appeared on the European historical scene. However, the local Orthodox were often ahead: “It was just… between 1260 and 1350, when the notes on Orthodox Qumans crop up in the Sudaq Synaxarion, that the Catholic missions, especially the Franciscan missionary activities gained ground in the towns of the Crimea.”

The cultural influence of the local Orthodox population on a part of nomadic newcomers who settled in the Crimean cities led to the massive conversion of Turkic people to the Greek form of Christianity. This continued throughout the period of Mongol domination at least until the time of Özbeg Khan (the establishment of a Russian episcopal see in Sarai, capital of the Golden Horde and the activity of the Russian Church under the Tatar dominion have also been thoroughly studied in scholarly literature). It may be that a large number of the sedentary Tatars, especially those living in the cities, professed Greek Orthodoxy.

The sources of the thirteenth century demonstrate that the Turkic population of Soldaia (i.e. Tatars and Cumans) was mainly Greek Orthodox. The main document here is the Synaxarion of Sugdea, one of the first relevant sources containing notes referring to Christian Tatars and testifying to the mass conversion of Turkic people in Crimea to Orthodox Christianity. Its margins contain notes on historical and family events of the local population written in 1186–1419. Many of the people mentioned there have Turkic names; at

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{1536} I viaggi in Persia, 73.
\bibitem{1538} Vasary, Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries.
\bibitem{1539} Archimandrite Antonin, “Заметки XII–XV века, относящиеся к Крымскому г. Судее (Судаку), приписанные на греческом Синаксаре” [Notes on the twelfth to fifteenth century relating to the Crimean city of Sugdea (Sudak), attributed to the Greek Synaxarion],” ZOOID 5 (1863): 595-628. See more on the Orthodox Tatars in Crimea: Vasary, Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries.
\end{thebibliography}
that point conversion to Catholicism (commonly when a person was sold as slave) occurred alongside the adoption and exclusive use of a Latin baptismal name, while in Greek Orthodox tradition the Tatars influenced by Greeks and converted to Orthodoxy could either be baptized with their Pagan names, or, like Russians, could receive a baptismal name for sacramental purposes, but use socially another, originally Pagan name\(^{1541}\) (this was the case for the Russians, e.g. Prince Vladimir, who baptized Russia, was himself baptized with a name Vasily, and this practice of having a ‘baptismal’ and a ‘social’ name continued well until the seventeenth century).\(^{1542}\) In some cases, the Turkic name was used only as a sobriquet, since each newly converted Christian had to adopt a canonical Christian name.\(^{1543}\) Gyula Moravcsik was convinced that the bearers of all non-Greek names must have been Christian Tatars. Thus, we find in the Synaxarion of Sugdea a vast number of Christian Turkic people, as well as some additional data in the *Codex Cumanicus*. Istvan Vasary compiled an extensive *onomastikon* based on the Synaxarion of Sugdea and that is what he writes:

The names of the persons mentioned in the notes are for the most part of Greek origin. But, in addition to the Greek names and sobriquets there are some 70 names in the notes, which are evidently of non-Greek origin. Out of these names, some 30 are of Turkic origin, and a further 10 names can also be derived from Turkic with a varying degree of probability. The remaining names require further investigation; they may be of Iranian (Alan?) and Armenian (?) origin. Be that as it may, the main conclusion for our purposes is that the greater part of the non-Greek names can be explained from Turkic. The Turkic names of the synaxarion of Sudaq are as follows: Aba, Abidqa, Abqa, Alaii, Aladuq, Alp-ata, Aqsamas, Arap, Bagalin, Baraq, Bavdi, Caqa, Cobaq, Arsimdn, It-mangii, Qaruqan, Qutlu, Qutlu-bey, Qutlug, Malak, Mugal, Oraqti, Salih, Sari’-sapar, Songur/Sunqur, Sultan, Tatqara, Toq-temir, Turkman, Yamgnrdi. All these names can well be explained from Turkic. The Turkic names of the synaxarion of Sugdea are as follows: Aba, Abidqa, Abqa, Alaii, Aladuq, Alp-ata, Aqsamas, Arap, Bagalin, Baraq, Bavdi, Caqa, Cobaq, Arsimdn, It-mangii, Qaruqan, Qutlu, Qutlu-bey, Qutlug, Malak, Mugal, Oraqti, Salih, Sari’-sapar, Songur/Sunqur, Sultan, Tatqara, Toq-temir, Turkman, Yamgnrdi. All these names can well be explained from Turkic. Some of them were attested already in the pre-Mongol period. Three names can be derived from ethnonyms (Arap, Mugal, Turkman), the ethnonym Mugal could not come into being prior to the 13th century. Three names, Bagalin, Aladi, and Abqa ultimately go back to Mongol names (Mong. Bayalun, Aladi, Abaka), but the first appears here in Turkic phonetic garb, and the other two names may also be explained as Turkic names of Mongolian origin. Consequently these names could also enter into Turkic in the 13th century. Three names (Malak, Salih, Sultan) came from Turkic words having their origins in Arabic.\(^{1544}\)

---

1541 Thus, Prince Vladimir Sviatoslavich I of Kiev was baptised as Basil; however, socially he used his previous name; this was practiced by the Russian elite at least until the seventeenth century.
1543 Vasary, Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries
1544 Vasary, Orthodox Christian Qumans and Tatars of the Crimea in the 13th-14th centuries.
These people may very well have been Turkic, but not Tatar, e.g. Cumans or some other Turkic people living in Crimea, because the Orthodox community seems to oppose those then called ‘Tatars’ for them, i.e. the Mongol conquerors and the Turkic people who had sided with the Mongols. Thus, a note dated March 28, 1278 reads that “… Salih and Sunqur and all the others were killed by the Tatars.” This supports the argument that these Crimean Turkic people were Cumans, or e.g. the descendants Khazars or Pechenegs. However, if we take the word Tatar in the political and cultural sense it has a different meaning: ‘Salih, Sunqur, and all the others’ were Orthodox Turkic people who settled in Soldaia and probably changed their identity, being closer to their co-believers, the Orthodox Greeks, and their killers were their former compatriots who continued to follow a nomadic lifestyle in the steppes. However, there are examples of Orthodox Tatars in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth century. As late as in 1501, in the Papal curia the Armenians and Tatars were treated as Greek Orthodox. Moreover, about half the Greeks, whom Suvorov relocated from Crimea to Novorossiya, actually spoke Tatar rather than Greek, thus having Greek Orthodox identity and a full or partial Turkic ethnic and linguistic background.

The Tatars of Caffa lived under the protection of a Khan’s representative called a tudun (titanus canluchorum), but inside Caffa he did not have much power (pace Spuler), even though some sources call him the signore di Caffa. The Tatar community in Caffa was not particularly large: Massaria Caffae 1381–1382 mentions just 98 people, that is 4.5% of total. Normally Tatars were deprived of access to the administration of Caffa, and

---

1545 Thus, Yolmelikh a Candelis was an Orthodox and the wife of a Greek merchant Mihali Mitrioti; since she is mentioned in the deeds of Donato a Mano (1413–1419), Nicolas de Varsis (1430s), Benedetto de Smeritis (1430s), and Pietro Pellakan (1440s–1450s), she must have lived in Tana around forty years at least. Her family name reveals that she was from a trading family; scandelium stands for urban scales for heavy loads; see: Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 427. She bequeathed money to several Greeks including a priest Papa Tatuli in her testament. She writes about her sister Natchaton or Marnatchaton and her husband Karauzukh: in quibus manibus commendo animam meam (ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 21rv), which clearly means that these two Tatars were also Orthodox Christians. The Tatar slaves converted to Catholicism in slavery, as well as freedmen, are also present in the Italian colonies (ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 8, 23r. ASV, CI. Cart. 231. 8v). 1546 “… quod diocesis Vilensis latissimos fines habet, et tam in ea, quam in illius confinibus habitant Tartari et Armeni et aliis sub ritibus Grecorum et aliis diversis sectis, eciam extra obedientiam Romani Pontificis degentes, et in pluribus a fide catholica dissentientes” (here applied to the Liuthanian realms). Theiner, Augustin. Vetera monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae gentiumque finitimarum historiam illustrantia maximam partem nondum edita ex tabulariis Vaticanis deprompta. Theiner. Vol. 2. 293.


1550 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 386.
most of them were exempt by default from military service and guardianship, in much the same way as Jews and dissimilar to Christians. In particular, the Muslims were even explicitly forbidden to keep weapons in their homes (chapter 95 of Statutum Caffae 1449: *Quod aliquis saracenus tenere non possit in eius domo arma*), since they were defined in the same legal provision as worst enemies of the Christian faith (*sunt fidei christiane inimicissimi*). Nothing similar was ever applied to the Greeks, Armenians, or Jews; and clearly it did not apply to the Christian Tatars, who belonged by virtue of their baptism to one of the Christian communities. Some Tatars, we are not sure of which religion, were hired as Cossacks (*cazachi*), which on the language of medieval Caffa meant mounted mercenary armed forces of the city. The *Caffae Massariae* contain special entries on salaries for the Cossacks (*salaria cazachorum*). Thus, in a certain sense the relations between the Genoese and the Tatars can be called a partnership.

**Macrogroups: applying statistics to the demography of Caffa**

Switching from the description and qualitative analysis of the microgroups to the largely quantitative analysis of macrogroups we come up against the inevitable difficulties with categorization and the aggregation of individuals into groups corresponding to their identities. “Identities have always been multiple and malleable, subject to minor tweaking or radical change as individuals and communities have adjusted their self-conceptions to the circumstances of their existence.” Many people would negotiate multiple identities in such an entangled society as Caffa. Moreover, the nature of the sources only allows us rather limited ways to distinguish a person’s ethno-religious identity.

First, we should note that identity in a broader sense, meaning broader than geographic provenance of ethnic background, discussed above in the section dealing with microgroups, was defined in Caffa largely by religious affiliation. People’s identities were certainly more complex than this and this is discussed in the previous section. Yet it was religions which defined which of the five communities a person belonged to – Latin Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Armenian Gregorian, Jewish, or Muslim. These five identities will therefore constitute our macrogroups.

---

1552 Statutum Caphe (1449), 679-680.
1555 Bentley, “Global History and Historicizing Globalization,” 78.
The method used here to identify people’s affiliation was developed by Ponomarev and applied to the Massaria Caffae 1381.\textsuperscript{1556} Here I made certain modifications which do not relate to identification, but to categorization.

1) First, we can see the direct mention of the person’s identity by a scribe – \textit{grecus, armenus, iudeus,} and \textit{saracen us}. This nevertheless rare but it does give us the first point of certainty. Religious identity was something real and important for the chancery.

2) Kinship connections are the next element that \textit{must} work with the children and parents of a given person whose identity we already know and which \textit{can} work for their partners as well.

3) The specification of position occupied by a person can clarify his identity. According to Genoese legislation, consuls, \textit{vicarii, massarii,} captains, members of commission, barbers, etc. are Genoese citizens and therefore certainly Latins. The same is true for the Catholic clergy and mendicants, as well as to the clergy of the Orientals.

4) The names of the place of origin and/or the family names, not always discernible from each other also help us. In most cases these are Genoese, Ligurian, or otherwise Italian place names/family names. This criterion does not however work with individuals with clearly Oriental given names, who are servants of a Latin master whose family name extends to them – these people would be classified based on their given names.

5) A vast amount of both Latin and Oriental names are quintessentially idiosyncratic for a single macrogroup. Thus, Francesco is by definition Latin, Theophylaktos is Greek, Asdvadzadour is Armenian, Chayyim is Jewish, and Mustafa is Muslim. Some names are used by several groups, which is another problem. For instance without other evidence we have no grounds to categorize a person called Georgius, because this name was common for at least Latins,\textsuperscript{1557} Greeks, and Armenians. However, different cultures have their preferences in the frequency with which they use names. In theory, a Latin could have a name such as Theodorus, Constantinus, or Manuel, but in the absence of other evidence we should suggest that with most probability people with such names are Greek. Moreover, we can distinguish people with names which have different forms in different macrogroups: e.g. Latin \textit{Iohanes} (Giovanni) and Greek \textit{Iane} (Yannis), Latin \textit{Michael} (Michele) and Greek \textit{Michalli} (Michail) and the like.

7) the same criteria, but with a match between the names and the families.

\textsuperscript{1556} See: Ponomarev, “Население и территория.”
\textsuperscript{1557} Moreover, it is widespread in Genoa as the name of the city’s holy patron, St. George.
6. 8) Then comes the orthography of second names: the possessive suffix ‘-ita’ is typical for Greeks, ‘-aki’ and ‘-ihi’ for Armenians; then, certain combinations of letters are impossible in a Greek, or Armenian, or Turkic onomasticon, so we can judge by exclusion.

9) Contacts. Ponomarev suggested that, for instance, the servants of the Genoese came from Italy, because being a servant requires daily contact and therefore a knowledge of the language. According to Ponomarev the same applies in business and personal relations. This does not seem to be the case in my sources, but it does not change much, because by this point I have already categorized most of the population mentioned in the massariae studied.

10) In uncertain cases the presence of an ambiguous surname (e.g. deriving from a nickname) means that a person is Latin rather than Oriental, since most of Orientals did not yet have surnames.

Before making a comparison of Ponomarev’s 1381 data and my data from 1423 and 1461, I have to make a methodological remark. My method of categorization was inspired by the one used by Ponomarev, but slightly differs in two aspects. First, Ponomarev’s ‘Armenians’ included Catholic Armenians, Syrians, and iurgiani, while I consider the first ones as Latins, and the other two as a mix, which could fit into the Armenian group sometimes or even most of the time, but not by automatically by default. Second, the Ponomarev’s ‘Tatars’ are a group encompassing all Muslims plus all those with Turkic names who cannot be placed in any other category. On the other hand, I use a category of Muslims. The reasoning behind the first case was the following: Ponomarev argued that ‘ermineus catolicus’ is an ethnic Armenian, disregarding that he was a member of the Latin community. In my study, I attributed such people to the Armenian microgroup, but treated them as Latins on the level of macrogroups, since they were part of the Latin community and ecclesiastic environment. Ponomarev also included Syrians in the Armenian group based on the assumption that ‘they [the Syrians] were not numerous and there were Cilician Armenians among them, and they were united by their affiliation to the Oriental Churches.’ This reasoning seemed weak to me. These people belonged to different confessional groups in 1381, whereas in 1423 and 1461 the people from Gibeletto were Latins and not even classified as Syrians, and a handful of those labelled suriani are clearly Muslims. Last, I have no iurgiani in 1423 and 1461, but those found by Ponomarev in 1381 could be, and probably were, an ethnic group akin to Armenians, and therefore it makes sense to treat them as a single microgroup (see above). One the other hand, they were not confessionally

1558 See: Ponomarev, ‘Население и территория’.
homogeneous: among the *iurgiani* there were people with Latin, Armenian, Muslim, and universal names. I would not therefore categorise them as part of the Armenian macrogroup by default. Nonetheless, since these three groups (Catholic Armenians, Syrians, and *iurgiani*) are very small and therefore statistically insignificant, with a certain degree of observational error we can therefore safely compare Ponomarev’s figures with our own. The same is true for Tatars: Ponomarev’s ‘Tatars’ include not only all Muslims, but also a handful of people with Turkic names, whose religion is unknown and who could therefore be not only Muslim, but Pagan or Greek Orthodox. At the same time, since we are speaking about a few people out of several hundred, this difference in methodological approaches to categorisation will not make any significant statistical difference.

Following this identification, attribution, and categorization I obtained the following results. In 1423, out of 1,408 persons mentioned in the *massaria* there are 869 Latins, 288 Greeks, 125 Armenian, 8 Jews, and 55 Muslims (63 ‘unknowns’). In 1461, out of 1,025 persons mentioned in the *massaria* there are 673 Latins, 133 Greeks, 92 Armenian, 7 Jews, and 44 Muslims (76 ‘unknowns’). If we compare these results with those of Ponomarev (*Massaria Caffaei* 1381 with a total of 1,909, of which 876 Latins, 570 Greeks, 368 Armenians together with the Catholic Armenians, Syrians, and *iurgiani*, 76 Tatars with no religion, 19 Jews), we obtain the following distribution:

![Religious composition of people mentioned in MC 1381](chart.png)
As we know from different sources, the population of Caffa decreasing over the fifteenth century. What are the dynamics of depopulation? Based on the data of those people mentioned in the *Massariae Caffae* for 1381, 1423, and 1461, we obtain the following dynamics:
As we can see from the diagrams, the dynamics in the structural changes in the population were considerable. In the late fourteenth century, Latins accounted for less than half of the population reflected in the *massariae*; in 1423 they have a share of 62%, and increase to 66% by 1461. Contrasted to the overall dynamics of the depopulation of the city, a dramatic increase of the share of Latins in it is a clear testimony of a constant influx of European migrants arriving to Caffa even after 1453. The Greek population decreased from 30% in 1381 to 20% in 1423 and to 13% in 1461. Nonetheless, the Greeks remained the second most
numerous macrogroup, which was contrary to the opinions of many academics never superseded by the Armenians. The decrease of the Armenian share was sharper: from 19% in 1381 to 9% in both 1423 and 1461. The Jews and the Muslims had a stable share of 1% and 4% respectively throughout the whole period.

What we should note here is that contrary to most of earlier scholarship the Latin population of Caffa only slightly declined in absolute figures and grew in relative to the others. Discussing the colonial oppression in Caffa, some Soviet historians and Balard stated that this was an oppression of Oriental majority by the Latin minority. Balard believed that the Latins, mainly of Ligurian origin, made up no more than one fifth of the population of Caffa, adding that: ‘La domination numérique des Orientaux est donc écrasante’.\textsuperscript{1559} The \textit{Massariae Caffae}, however, show the contrary: not only do the overall figures for the number of Latins reveal that they were the absolute majority (46% in 1381, 62% in 1423, and 66% in 1461), but the same is confirmed by the application of the quantitative methods (see below).

Contrary to the opinion of many prominent scholars the Armenians occupied not the first, or even second, but only third place in the ranking of ethnic groups of Caffa with regards to the population. The myth of a predominance of Armenians in Caffa is commonly explained by the letter from the consul and the \textit{massarii} of Caffa, writing to the protectors of the Bank of St. George that “this country is populated principally by the Armenians, who are of great fidelity in our regard and are also good merchants, who bring the city great profits”.\textsuperscript{1560} Yet another administrative document of the \textit{Officium Monete} says that the Armenians account for two-thirds of the population of Caffa.\textsuperscript{1561} The statistical sources show that these estimations were very far from reality. However it makes sense that the Latins in the absence of strict statistics had the impression that the Armenians were the most important Oriental group in Caffa. As Ponomarev shows in his study of \textit{Massaria Caffae} 1381, and as I will show in the following chapter, Armenians had the highest indices of prestige, social activity, and intensiveness of contacts with the Latin colonizers among the local population. At the same time according to Ponomarev Greeks had the lowest indices of prestige among all ethnic groups in Caffa in 1381.\textsuperscript{1562} I did not estimate the prestige of ethnic groups in 1423 and 1461 in the same way and with the same methodology as Ponomarev, preferring a linear regression in STATA software explaining levels of social activity (see the following chapter).

\textsuperscript{1559} Balard, “Les Orientaux à Caffa au XV\textsuperscript{e} siècle,” 223–225.
\textsuperscript{1560} Vigna, Codice diplomatico, 6/1, 365.
\textsuperscript{1561} Vigna, Codice diplomatico, 7/2, 345.
\textsuperscript{1562} Ponomarev, “Население и территория.”
However, even the social activity of the Greeks estimated in this way is not particularly impressive, unlike the one of the Armenians. To sum up: Greeks were more numerous, whereas the Armenians were wealthier, of higher social standing, and more socially active.

The fact that the Armenians did not amount to anything like the mythological ‘two-thirds’ is confirmed by a source quoted by Balard: Massaria Caffae 1455 reports that when the authorities of Caffa had to pay tribute of 3,000 ducats to the Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II Fatih and 300 sommi to the Khan of Crimea Hacı Giray, they imposed a special tax on all the groups in the city: the Latins had to pay 113,62 aspres, the Armenians 75,746 aspres, and the Greeks 31,070 aspres. This shows that, on the one hand, even the administration of Caffa was aware that the Armenians did not amount to anything like ‘two-thirds’, not only being second to the Latins, but also being second by a wide margin. On the other hand, the fact that the Armenians here rank second before the Greeks means that they were more wealthy and important, which indeed seems to have been the case from the sources studied. Nonetheless, the Armenians have a more modest share in the population of Caffa than the Greeks in 1381, 1423, and 1461. The numeric preponderance of the Armenians over Latins and Greeks is nothing than a myth: in raw numbers Armenians constituted only less than 19% of the population of Caffa in 1381, 9% in 1423, and 9% in 1461.

Furthermore, we should note one interesting fact. On the one hand, Caffa was depopulating in general terms from 1381 to 1423 (from 1909 to 1408 in mentioned persons, see below for the total reconstructed adult male population) and from 1423 to 1461 (from 1408 to 1025 in mentioned persons, see below for the total reconstructed adult male population). On the other hand, the Latin population decreased from 1381 to 1423 insignificantly (from 876 to 869), whereas in the same period it grew tremendously in its relative share, i.e. in percentage relation against the quickly shrinking groups of Orientals. In percentage terms, the decrease of the share of local people in the population of Caffa was very sharp: Greeks from 30% in 1381 to 20% in 1423 and to 13% in 1461; Armenians from less than 19% in 1381 to 9% in 1423 and 1461 (Muslims and Jews remained at the same level throughout the period, 4% and 1% respectively). Even if we go beyond the numbers, just a visual impression of anybody reading the Massariae of Caffa of the fifteenth century and comparing them to the fourteenth century will show that the Oriental population is decreasing, or at least is less and less reflected in the sources. The quantitative figures

---

confirm this intuition, showing that Orientals reduce, Latins only slightly decrease in absolute numbers, but grow dramatically in relative percentage towards other groups; among them presumably many lived permanently in Caffa; not only those born in Caffa, but also newcomers from the realms of Latin Christendom.

After this general presentation of the population of Caffa in its ethnic dimension we should ask, how large was this total population? Can we ascertain the data shown above and representing not the whole population, hypothesising the total number of inhabitants of Caffa, as well as of the separate macrogroups? Until recent decades there were only some speculative opinions and unrealistic guesses in this respect. Schiltberger, who travelled to Caffa in the early fifteenth century, counted 6,000 houses within the citadel walls, 11,000 inside the main walls, and 4,000 in the outskirts, that is 21,000 houses in total, while a potential consul of Caffa Giacomo Giustinian wrote in a letter from Chios dated July 10, 1475 that the population of the city equalled 75,000 persons, the same figure as given by other sources. Some Ottoman chronicles also assure that the population of Caffa equalled around 70,000 people. This figure is rooted in historiography even up to the twentieth century. We should, however, leave aside the fantasies of Schiltberger and similar travelogues, and we cannot be sure that the figures provided by Giustinian are relevant. Such an amount of people is simply unrealistic for any medieval city. In 1467 Antonio Torriglia wrote that there were about 4,000 inhabitants, and the Ottoman registers of the early sixteenth century mention 3,000 houses; nonetheless, with these slightly more than 3,000 houses Ottoman Caffa was the fifth largest city in the Ottoman Empire after Constantinople (16326), Adrianople (6351), Bursa (6351), Ankara (4061), and Thessaloniki (4863). The Ottoman estimations of 1516 and 1542 show that there were 3017 and 3043 households respectively. Villain-Gandossi estimated the population of Caffa as 30,000 people based

1564 Balard, “Les formes militaires,” 68. И. Шильтбергер, Путешествие по Европе, Азии и Африке с 1394 по 1427 год (Baku, 1984), 45-57.
1565 Vigna, Codice diplomatico, 7/2, 248. Malowist, Kaffa w drugiej połowie XV-ego wiki (Warsaw, 1939).
1566 Della Decima e delle altre gravezze imposte dal comune di Firenze, vol. 2 (Lisbon/Lucca, 1765).
on later Ottoman sources;\textsuperscript{1571} Gabriela Airaldi offered the figure of 9,000 people, with no more than 2,000 Genoese.\textsuperscript{1572} Freidenberg suggested judging from the number of parishes and reached a similar conclusion.\textsuperscript{1573} Balard and some other reputable scholars believed that Caffa must have been home for about 10,000 persons.\textsuperscript{1574} Similar figures were provided by Karpov.\textsuperscript{1575}

If we summarize the statistical data extracted from \textit{Massariae} for the period 1423-1461, the results are as follows:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|ccc|cc|cc|}
\hline
Ethnicity & Number of times & Mean & Std. Deviation & Minimum & Maximum & Sum \\
         & mentioned       &       &              &          &          &      \\
\hline
Armenian & 125 & 8.8 & 2.14 & 1,859 & 1 & 13 \\
Greek & 290 & 20.4 & 2.81 & 2,628 & 1 & 21 \\
Jew & 8 & .6 & 2.38 & 1,408 & 1 & 5 \\
Latin & 881 & 61.9 & 4.67 & 6,888 & 1 & 93 \\
Muslim & 55 & 3.9 & 3.38 & 3,308 & 1 & 14 \\
UNKNOWN & 65 & 4.6 & 2.55 & 2,450 & 1 & 12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Statistics MC 1423}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|ccc|cc|cc|}
\hline
Ethnic origin & Number of times & Mean & Std. Deviation & Minimum & Maximum & Sum \\
          & mentioned       &       &              &          &          &      \\
\hline
Armenian & 92 & 8.9 & 3.13 & 2,726 & 1 & 14 \\
Greek & 133 & 12.9 & 3.67 & 4,703 & 1 & 49 \\
Jew & 7 & .7 & 2.86 & 1,952 & 1 & 6 \\
Latin & 693 & 67.2 & 7.86 & 11,337 & 1 & 136 \\
Muslim & 44 & 4.3 & 2.00 & 1,965 & 1 & 11 \\
UNKNOWN & 62 & 6.0 & 2.71 & 2,831 & 1 & 13 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Statistics MC 1461}
\end{table}

I used the figures from \textit{Massaria Caffae} 1423 and 1461 for the diagrams and for the above analysis. Nonetheless, we should consider that the \textit{massariae} are just samples, and that they are not representative. To calculate the whole population of Caffa, we have to extrapolate applying statistical methods. In fact, we have to count how many people are \textit{not} mentioned in

\textsuperscript{1571} Villain-Gandossi, \textit{La Méditerranée aux XIIe-XVIe siècles: Relations maritimes, diplomatiques et commerciales} (London: Variorum Reprints, 1983), 34.
\textsuperscript{1572} Airaldi, \textit{Studi e documenti}, No. 12.
\textsuperscript{1573} Фрейденберг, “Дорогами столетий, или об одном распространенном заблуждении,” \textit{Победа. Феодосия} № 208 (29 October 1988).
\textsuperscript{1575} Карпов, “Что и как праздновали в Каффе в XV в.,” \textit{Srednie veka} 56 (1993): 226.
the *massariae* out of the pool of those who could have been mentioned there, i.e. to calculate the total population of *adult free males in Caffa*. Then we can hypothesise about the whole population based on what we know about the family structure of medieval Europe and the average number of slaves in a city known from other sources.

The first reliable statistical data in the respect of the demography of Caffa was made available after Ponomarev applied his method of ‘counting those, who are not mentioned’ in his research on the *Massaria Caffae* of 1381. His pivotal article provides a general picture of the population of the city in this period, and also provides a solid methodological basis for the demographic calculations of the general population based on a non-representative sample. He inferred that the overall population must have been around 7,000 and not more than 9,000.\footnote{Ponomarev, “Население и территория.” These methods were approbated by Ponomarev in a number of studies: Пономарев, “Численность купечества и объем торговли генуэзской колонии в Пере в 1281 г. (по данным картулярия Габриэле де Предоно),” in XVIII Международный конгресс византинистов (Moscow, 1991), 913-914. Idem, “Чего нет, того не сосчитать?” in Математические модели исторических процессов (Moscow, 1996), 224-245. Idem, “Считая сосчитанное: Проверка корректности нового статистического закона распределения качественных признаков результатами президентских выборов,” in Круг идей: Традиции и тенденции исторической информатики, ed. Л. И. Бородкин, И. Ф. Юшин (Moscow, 1997), 297-309. Idem, “Денежный рынок Трапезундской империи в XIII-XV вв.,” Причерноморье в средние века 3 (1998): 201-239. 1577 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 352. 1578 Lopez, Storia delle colonie genovesi nel Mediterraneo, 95. Balard, *La Românie genoise*, 245.} According to Ponomarev, the difference in volume between *Massaria Caffae* 1374 and *Massaria Caffae* 1381 makes us think that the population grew rapidly precisely in this period,\footnote{Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 352.} which is understandable, given that it is exactly the time of formation of the Genoese colonial empire. A large part of its population apparently consisted of migrants from Liguria and Italy, in search of fortune.\footnote{Lopez, Storia delle colonie genovesi nel Mediterraneo, 95. Balard, *La Românie genoise*, 245.}

The methodological novelty introduced in the studies of the demography of Caffa and, arguably, to the entire field of medieval demography by Ponomarev is based on an assumption that knowing the number of people mentioned in the sources and the number of times they are mentioned allows us to extrapolate these probabilities to those who are not mentioned. The *massariae Caffae* are a statistical source, which mentions names of the inhabitants of the city. The sample, albeit being non-representative, is here as limited as the general population of the city was. It very rarely and indirectly mentions the person’s father left in Genoa or the Crimean khan, but this does not change the statistical picture; at the same time, almost all those who are mentioned in the ledger are the adult free male city-dwellers. Each *massaria* covers a limited time span or financial year. Finally, each traces a certain type of people’s activity – their contacts with the treasury of the administration. The *Massariae* of...
Caffa therefore fit into all the three classical Aristotelian rules for drama: unity of action, unity of time, and unity of place.

People are mentioned in the Massariae of Caffa with certain regularity. Each person in the database is a unit with a numeric characteristic – the number of times they are mentioned. Some people are mentioned dozens of times, whereas other adult male free city-dwellers who in theory could be mentioned in the document might not be mentioned at all or are mentioned zero times. Clearly, since most people in the massariae are only mentioned once, twice, or three times, there must be some or many people, who are mentioned zero times. At the same time, had our source been unlimited (including limitlessness in time) with a limited circle of people who have theoretical chances to be mentioned there, and these are, once again, not all the city-dwellers, but only free adult males, all these people sooner or later would have been mentioned in this source. Thus, we can put a question: if there are people mentioned more frequently and less frequently, that is, e.g., there are two people mentioned ten times, five people mentioned three times, ten people mentioned twice, fifteen people mentioned once – how many people are mentioned zero times?

The mathematic model used in Ponomarev’s studies used the Monte Carlo method with the random number generator simulating the process of mentioning the names in Massaria or any other observations. Using this number generator, he generated random samples based on an assumption that there was certain regularity universal for all of them. For each sample, a plot was constructed: the x axis reflected the ranks (i.e. ‘mentioned 0, 1, 2, 3 times’), whereas y axis reflected the observations (in our case – cumulated sum of mentioned people corresponded to the particular rank). After a long work consisting of around 200 random generations of different samples, he hypothesised certain universal pattern of true distribution and justified the dependency that according to him explains at best the regularities of different kinds. This formula reads as:

\[ \ln y = \ln (a(b - x)^c) \]

where \( \ln y \) refers to the logarithm of the cumulated sum of mentioned people corresponded to the particular rank, \( x \) refers to the logarithm of rank of mentions of persons +1 (since lowest rank equals zero, and logarithm from zero equals minus infinity), and \( a, b, \) and \( c \) are parameters determining curvature, steepness and other non-linear properties of the function.

For the current study, I apply the functional dependency suggested by Ponomarev. This method was many times approbated on various samples and can be safely applied here.

\[1579 \text{The one or two women mentioned in our source are statistically insignificant.}\]
Applying this dependency, we will be able to extrapolate it on the size of general population, approximate the missing people in the source, and calculate therefore the total adult free male population of Caffa for a given year based on a non-representative sample. Using the methodology proposed by Ponomarev I compute approximations of the first and second orders.\textsuperscript{1580} Average error here would be less than 10%, which is an extremely accurate for such field as medieval demography. On the preparatory stage to the application of the above-mentioned model, we have to summarize the total frequency of mentions of all people in \textit{Massaria Caffae 1423} and \textit{Massaria Caffae 1461}. We obtain the following values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1580} The methodology of approximations of the first and second orders is described in: Ponomarev, “Денежный рынок Трапезундской империи в XIII-XV вв.”, \textit{Причерноморье в средние века} 3 (1998): 205–206.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MC 1461 Number of times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using this mathematic model Ponomarev obtained for *Massaria Caffae* 1381 a number of unmentioned for the whole document – 218 persons. Applying this model to our data we obtain 242 unmentioned people in *Massaria Caffae* 1423 and 103 unmentioned people in *Massaria Caffae* 1461. Summing those mentioned and those calculated ‘mentioned zero time’ we get the following final figures for the whole of the adult free male population of Caffa: 1381: 2127; 1423: 1650; 1461: 1128

The data obtained in general terms repeats the same regularity of decrease, which was visible already from the sample:
We can verify the results obtained for the whole population counting by separate ethnic group and then summing them. Clearly, the results differ, but the difference is not huge. Here is the data on the frequencies of the actual number of times people mentioned in 1423 and 1461.

### Dynamics of the population of Caffa: total

![Dynamics of the population of Caffa: total](image)

### Number of times mentioned MC 1423

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50,4</td>
<td>50,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23,2</td>
<td>73,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14,4</td>
<td>88,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>92,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>94,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>96,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>97,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>98,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>99,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Greek     |           |   |         |              |
| Valid     | 1         | 119| 41,0    | 41,0         |
|           | 2         | 72 | 24,8    | 65,9         |
|           | 3         | 27 | 9,3     | 75,2         |
|           | 4         | 18 | 6,2     | 81,4         |
|           | 5         | 12 | 4,1     | 85,5         |
|           | 6         | 11 | 3,8     | 89,3         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jew</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th></th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of times mentioned MC 1461

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| UNKNOWN       |           |     |         |              |
|               | 1         | 29  | 44.6    | 44.6         |
|               | 2         | 18  | 27.7    | 72.3         |
|               | 3         | 7   | 10.8    | 83.1         |
|               | 4         | 1   | 1.5     | 84.6         |
|               | 5         | 1   | 1.5     | 86.2         |
|               | 6         | 4   | 6.2     | 92.3         |
|               | 7         | 1   | 1.5     | 93.8         |
|               | 8         | 1   | 1.5     | 95.4         |
|               | 9         | 1   | 1.5     | 96.9         |
|               | 11        | 1   | 1.5     | 98.5         |
|               | 12        | 1   | 1.5     | 100.0        |
| Total         | 65        |     | 100.0   | 100.0        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Jew</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNKNOWN Valid**

|        | 1     | 36     | 58.1   | 693  | 100.0 100.0 |  
|        | 2     | 9      | 14.5   | 25   | 72.6 73.2 74.8 |  
|        | 1     | 1.6    | 1.6    | 27   | 82.3 82.3 82.3 |  
|        | 2     | 3.2    | 3.2    | 28   | 77.4 78.0 78.6 |  
|        | 3     | 4.8    | 4.8    | 29   | 88.7 89.3 90.0 |  
|        | 1     | 1.6    | 1.6    | 30   | 95.2 95.8 96.4 |  
|        | 1     | 1.6    | 1.6    | 31   | 98.4 98.8 99.4 |  
|        | 1     | 1.6    | 1.6    | 32   | 100.0 100.0 100.0 |  

Total | 62 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
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The application of the adjustment mechanism for the analytical relationship to the data in software MatLab R2014 allowed me to extrapolate and produced the following results:

In 1423 unmentioned (i.e. ‘mentioned zero times’) counted by macrogroup: Latins 119; Greeks 189; Armenians 95; Muslims 17; Jews 2; Unknown 34. 
In 1461 unmentioned (i.e. ‘mentioned zero times’) counted by macrogroup: Latins 57; Greeks 22; Armenians 34; Muslims 45; Jews 2; Unknown 33.

We can therefore calculate the sum total of all adult free males including those mentioned zero times after counting by ethnic group is for 1423 and 1461:

1381: 933 Latins, 687 Greeks, 415 Armenians, 98 Tatars, 22 Jews -> Total 2155.
1423: 988 Latins, 477 Greeks, 220 Armenian, 72 Muslims, 10 Jews, and 97 ‘unknown’ -> Total 1864.

To estimate the difference and verify the method let us compare the total values obtained applying the method to the entire sample and to each of the ethnic groups separately to sum up the results:

1381: 2127–2155;
1423: 1650–1864;
1461: 1128–1218.

As we can see, the figures are not identical, but very close. This suggests that the method used here is reliable and applicable to studies in medieval demography. Now we can compose new diagrams with new values demonstrating the reconstructed total free adult male population of Caffa:
Religious composition of people mentioned in MC 1381 (counted total)

- Latins: 43%
- Greeks: 32%
- Armenians (together with iurgiani and Syrians): 19%
- Jews: 1%
- Tatars (mainly Muslim): 5%

Religious composition of people mentioned in MC 1423 (counted total)

- Latins: 53%
- Greeks: 26%
- Armenians: 12%
- Jews: 0%
- Muslims: 4%
- Unknown: 5%
As we can see, in general terms the reconstructed values show more or less the same dynamics of population as the initial ones of the sample: a sharp increase of the share of Latins and a gradual shrinking share of Orientals. This means that although our sample is not representative, different macrogroups, whether Latins or Orientals, are underrepresented to a similar extent; in other words the *Massaria* does not mention 99% of the Latin population and only 2% of the Orientals. The main difference is that in 1423 the Greeks actually had a greater share than what is reflected in *Massaria Caffae* 1423: 26% instead of 20% of the initial sample data. This confirms my point that I will develop further: albeit being numerically second largest group after Latins, the Greeks (unlike, for example, Armenians or Muslims) were a ‘non-prestigious group’ and mainly occupied the lower strata of social life. *Massaria Caffae* 1423 reflects this with particular strength, clearly demonstrating how Greeks were systematically underrepresented in the social life of the city compared to other macrogroups.

We must now adjust the graphs of population decrease with the new values:
The graphs showing population decrease again give us a picture similar to the initial sample with an amendment to underrepresentation of Greeks in *Massaria Caffae* 1423, and therefore less dramatic decrease of this macrogroup than it was shown on the initial graph. Another interesting thing is the positive dynamic of Muslim population by 1461 – largely thanks to the presence of Muslim merchants from Asia Minor. As for the more general outcomes,
contrary to some historiographic opinions, Latins were not a minority, but an absolute majority in Caffa, followed by the Greeks, Armenians, Muslims, and finally the Jews. The dynamics we see from the values obtained indicate that the share of Latins in the local population was increasing, albeit in absolute numbers the overall Latin population kept increasing in the first half of the fifteenth century and only slightly declined after 1453. In case of the Greeks, Armenians, and Jews we can safely speak of depopulation; at the same time the Muslim population not only did not decrease, but even increased slightly. However, if we triangulate our quantitative data with qualitative analysis we see that they are mainly newcomers to Caffa (merchants from Asia Minor).

Finally, if we hypothesise about the total population and assume, following Ponomarev, that, first, the female population was roughly equal to the male one, second, that children accounted for about 30% of the population, and, third, that the number of slaves was similar to the one in 1386 (known from treasury records), we obtain for 1423 and 1461 values similar to the ones suggested by him for 1381, i.e. between 7,000 and 9,000 people. This does not look very impressive compared to contemporary European urbanism; nonetheless, in that period Caffa was the largest and most populated city of Crimea and of Christian Eastern Europe.

Contacts between Latins and Orientals and religion in Caffa

Caffa was a trade-oriented society with different ethnicities and religions, making it a very tolerant city by the contemporary standards of Catholic Europe, perhaps even outstandingly tolerant. First of all, the idea of territorial segregation was alien to Caffa and none of the quartiers of the city can be categorized as a ghetto. It was a generally accepted convention that the dominating Genoese lived in the citadel, whilst the others normally lived in the burgs in separate quartiers. However, it is easy to find Orientals living in citadel and even sharing houses with the Italians, and also Genoese living in quarters normally inhabited by Orientals, not even excluding giudecca or Jewish quartier. Latins and Orientals constantly collaborated in commercial affairs and the communities were well integrated among them. The

---

1581 Balard, Veinstein, “Continuité ou changement d’une paysage urbain?” 84.
1582 Balard, Veinstein, “Continuité ou changement d’une paysage urbain?” 82-83.
1583 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 386.
1585 Many studies deal with this, among the general works see: Balard, La Romanie Génoise. Pistarino, I Gin dell’Oltremare.
Orientals were the junior partners of Italians in trade as stressed by Karpov.\textsuperscript{1586} In the documents originating from Caffa and other Black Sea colonies, the Orientals are quite well involved in navigation, as well as freight and renting vessels from the Latins,\textsuperscript{1587} as well as in provisioning the city.\textsuperscript{1588} Moreover, the Greeks and the Armenians were mobilized for military service, guardianship, and defence of the city, which means that they were to some extent recognized as equals by the Genoese.

The normative documents of Caffa contained certain provisions and privileges for the Oriental communities. For example, its 1449 Statute provides that the consul of Caffa should guarantee that the city’s Catholic bishop will not intervene in the internal religious affairs of the other communities (chapter \textit{De molestiis per dominum episcopum Caphe illatis grecis, ermenis, iudeis et aliis scismaticis removendis}).\textsuperscript{1589} Some of the local literati were incorporated into the civilian administrative institutions of the Genoese settlements. In many cases they converted to Roman Catholicism to facilitate their chances of promotion; however, there are no doubts that a considerable part of them collaborated with the Latins in one way or another without giving up their religious and cultural identity. In addition, it was often more productive to sit between two stools and take advantage of double identities. Finally, mixed marriages were frequently practiced, including mixed marriages with the members of local elites, and this seems to be characteristic to the Genoese colonialism particularly, to be adopted later in the Hispanic colonial models.\textsuperscript{1590}

The legal and, particularly, notarial culture of the Latin West strongly influenced the local people, and the European legal practices became widespread among the Orientals. Being involved in commercial relations with the Genoese, they actively employed all the tools that the medieval Europe could offer them. Obviously, they began drawing up notarial deeds (Greeks in Soldaia had their own notaries)\textsuperscript{1591} and adopted the practice of calling procurators both in business and in inheritance relations – and cooperating in this way both inside their own Oriental environment\textsuperscript{1592} and calling procurators from or being procurators

\textsuperscript{1586} Besides this point of Karpov, Balard also considered the Orientals to dominate certain areas of economy and trade. Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise}, vol. 1, 334.
\textsuperscript{1588} ASG, MC 1374, ft. 79v, 80v, 85r; MC 1381, f. 319r; MC 1386, ff. 125v, 217v, 369 r, 206 r, 414 v.
\textsuperscript{1589} Statutum Caphe (1449), 630-631.
\textsuperscript{1590} The most notable case being the one of Guizolfi, see in this thesis.
\textsuperscript{1591} ASG, MC 1381, f. 192v.
\textsuperscript{1592} Brătianu, \textit{Actes des notaires}, 252, 312. Airaldi, \textit{Studi e documenti} Nos. 9, 44, 46.
for the Latins. However, when Ponomarev tried to analyse the density, intensiveness, frequency, and directions of various types of inter-ethnic contacts, he found that the Genoese were indeed the brokers standing in the centre of interactions among all the other ethnic groups, which underlines the key role of colonizers. In particular, if we exclude a very small and secluded Jewish community, we find that most of Greeks and Tatars dealt with the Genoese as often or even more often than with their compatriots (perhaps because dealing with the Italians was profitable), Armenians were doing well in different directions of contacts (and in the following century their importance in the city grew). At the same time Greeks probably belonging to the lower strata of urban society, were those contacted most rarely. According to Ponomarev in the range of social activity the Latins were in the first place, followed by the Greeks, Armenians, Tatars, and Jews, who were less socially active.

How did the multicultural society of Caffa affect the religious situation in the city, especially taking into account that, on the one hand, the key factor for identity was religion and, that on the other the Genoese brought with them not only a developed system of trade, but also Roman Catholic missionaries?

Lajos Tardy claimed that the population of Caffa was mostly Catholic, which is not necessarily certain, but which is quite close to the truth. The Roman Catholics dominated in Caffa from the very beginning just because of the nature of the city – a colony and a trade outpost of the Republic of St. George. Organizing the ecclesiastic life was all the time an immediate concern of the colonists in Levant, Latin Romania, and Gazaria. In the thirteenth century, in the early stage of the history of Caffa, Franciscan and Dominican friars greatly contributed to organizing their religious life, because Caffa was considered a bulwark of Catholic mission in the Golden Horde from its beginning till its fall. It eventually began

1594 ASG, Notaio Niccolò de Bellignano 1375, ff. 14v-15v, 19v-20r, 24v-26r, 110r-111v.
1595 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 400–401.
1596 Though it looks like this claim is a bit far too strong, especially applied to the earlier period of the emergence of the colony.
with the missions of Giovanni Plano Carpini and Guillaume de Rubruck, and we have clear
evidence that the Franciscans sent to the Golden Horde were somewhat familiar with the
Crimea as early as in the mid-thirteenth century. Notably, many of them originated from
Eastern Europe – Hungary or Poland. Just to give two brief examples: in 1287 friar
Włodysław wrote a report on the area and in 1288 the Georgians killed a Hungarian
Franciscan called Stephanus Ungarus. The *fratres minores*, who came some twenty years
earlier than the *predicatores*, obtained permission to go on a mission from Khans Mengu-
Timur and Özbeg and established the vicariates of Tartaria with the custodies in Sarai and
Gazaria (the latter with an obvious centre in Caffa). Initially Caffa formed part of a huge
missionary diocese of Khanbaliq (now Beijing). A Franciscan from Catalonia called Jerome
was ordained a bishop in 1311 and sent to the Mongol realms as a vicar to Giovanni da
Montecorvino (1247–1328), first Archbishop of Khanbaliq. However, instead of reaching
China he stayed in the Golden Horde. In 1318, when Pope John XXIII founded a Catholic
diocese in Caffa, Jerome was appointed as its bishop, and hereafter most bishops of Caffa –
which implied mission – were the members of mendicant orders.

The new bishopric included the lands from Varna in Bulgaria in the West to Sarai in the
Golden Horde in the East, and from the Black Sea in the South to the Russian realms in the
North. The ecclesiastic head of Caffa never became an archbishop, in spite of all the
efforts of the Republic of St. George; yet he remained the most important Roman Catholic
hierarch in the area, he received a salary and enjoyed the full support of the Genoese
authorities of Caffa. The new dioceses in Soldaia and Cembalo and a short-living
archbishopric in Vosporo did not undermine the positions of the bishop of Caffa, who was
indeed the bishop of the whole Tataria. The eastern limit of the bishopric was River Volga;
besides that, the bishop ruled over the Christian refugees from the Ilkhanate to Iran and Asia
Minor. Besides that, the bishops of Caffa, being the hierarchs ruling the frontier, the contact
zone between Christianity and Islam were all the time on the forefront of the crusade
movement against the Muslims, and later on – against the Ottomans. It was therefore

349.  

1598 Michel and Wright, “Willelmi de Rubruck Itinerarium,” *Reçueil de voyages et de mémoires publie par la
société de géographie* 4 (1839): 215.
1601 Besides the Franciscans and the Dominicans, Caffa had communities of the Knights Hospitaller and perhaps
even the Beguines.

(Vatican, 1952), No. 8.
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sometimes the case that the tithes from Europe were sent to Caffa and spent on building the fortifications. As those facing the Muslim threat, the defenders of Caffa also obtained an indulgence from the Holy See. By the late fourteenth century, Caffa was a centre of Catholic mission. The city had more than twenty Catholic churches including the cathedral of St. Agnes and the Franciscan and Dominican convents. In 1430 the city was elevated to be a centre of *provincia Orientalis Ordinis fratum minorum* and the residence of the Vicar General of the Order.

The relations among different churches seem to be as much complicated as the relations among different ethnic communities. On the one hand, collaboration with the Italians was a way to boost economic profit and obtain a greater degree of participation in the colonial administration or at least indirect influence on it. On the other hand, we cannot skip the contradiction between the will of all the Oriental communities to retain their identity and the missionary ambitions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Although the Genoese and Venetians were more tolerant in religious matters than the French crusaders, they, too, tried to replace the upper echelons of the Greek clergy with Latin priests. Moreover, there were Roman Catholic missionaries in every Italian settlement, and their relations with the Greek clergy and Tatar administration were hostile at best.\footnote{Karpov, “The Black Sea region before and after the IV crusade,” 289.}\footnote{Things were even more complicated for the Armenians, who had their hierarchy appointed by the Armenian Gregorian Catholicos, but nevertheless the future bishop in question had to be approved by the consul.}\footnote{The Catholics often applied cunning strategies, allowing their clergy to look more like Eastern one – having beards, not shaving tonsure, celebrating mass in Turkic instead of Latin, and not necessarily in the church, but also on the fresh air (the latter being aimed at those Turkic people who were still nomads).} Besides direct proselytism, the Catholics were always trying to push the Greeks and the Armenians towards union with the papacy,\footnote{Acta Urbani P.P. V (1362-1370), ed. Tautu, in Codice dei Canoni delle Chiese Orientali, vol. 11, (Vatican, 1964), 12-130.} and even when they did not succeed – they had space to intervene in family affairs and inheritance affairs of local people via the administration of the Genoese consul, especially in the cases of mixed marriages.

Being more active, but also more restricted in the centre in Caffa, where some rights for Oriental communities were guaranteed to a certain extent from the very beginning, the Catholic missionaries seem to have acted more freely in other cities and in the hinterland. Some Latin monasteries and missions outside Caffa, perhaps in Cherson, Kyrk-Or, Solkhat, and Sarai, also appeared as early as in the late thirteenth century. By 1320, the Franciscans already had eighteen monasteries in the region of Tartaria Aquilonari, and, among them, one
in Cherson. Administratively, these monasteries were ruled by the Custodia Gazariae. There was a Genoese trading station in Cherson, which had probably existed until the very last days of the city, so it is not surprising that the commercial activity of the Italians was paralleled by the rise of a Catholic mission.

Though there is evidence that there was a bishop in Cherson (as well as in Vosporo and Cembalo) as early as in 1303–1304, formally the Latin bishopric in Cherson (Chersona diocesis in Gothia) was instituted by John XXII in 1333. The Bogdanova’s claim that the existence of the Franciscan missionaries in the episcopal rank in Crimea meant that the dioceses had already existed in the early fourteenth century is exaggerated. Both bishops – Francesco and Richard the Englishman – could have been ordained as bishops in partibus infidelium, which did not mean that the cities where they resided were automatically created episcopal sees. Thus, the traditional date of 1333 is more secure. In April 1333, these two Franciscans came to pope seeking institutionalization of the ecclesiastic life in Crimea. Their request was treated, and the bishoprics of Vosporo and Cherson were created, allowing the establishment of the cathedrals as well. The document about Cherson is published under the heading “In terra Gothiae locus Cersona vocatus civitas et sedes episcopalis constituitur”, nom. CDLVII. Notably, the document expresses doubts on the ancient origin of Cherson. However, while for the makers of the charter it was ‘dubious’ that the city had ancient origin, for a present scholar it must seem that they were not really sincere in their expressions. Denying the ancient history of Cherson was undoubtedly a rhetorical tool for legitimization of a proselyte policy on the historical and canonical territory of the Orthodox Church. Below the papal disposition says that it gives back to Cherson a status of the city and orders to build

1608 The Genoese documents regarding Pera mention Francesco, bishop of Vosporo, and Richard the Englishman, bishop of Cherson, thirty [sic] years before they were formally appointed to these sees by the pope. Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis, in Historiae Patriae Monumenta. 1857, col. 437 (158), 445 (160).
1611 See also: Heyd, Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1886), 211.
1612 Richard, La Papaute, 231 - 232.
1613 Locus existat vocatus Cersona, qui fuisse dicitur civitas ab antiquo, quamquam super hoc dubia credalitas habeatur, esseque prohibetur populosus, aptus, accommodus ac rerum temporaliubertate fecundus, speique devote verismiltudo promittat... Theiner, Vetera, vol. 1, 348.
a church in the name of St. Clement, pope of Rome. These words have a dual meaning. On the one hand, the officials of the papal Curia were well aware that Cherson had existed in antiquity and that the spread of Christianity was historically connected with the name of Pope Clement, who was exiled and martyred in Cherson. On the other hand, denying the status of city for a place where there was no Latin bishop and presenting the creation of a Latin diocese in a place where there was a Greek Orthodox diocese paralleled by “granting the status of city” as a legal consequence of the presence of a ‘true’ bishop there... The rhetoric of this text in general is such as if before the Latin mission there had not been any Christian Church in Crimea whatsoever. The bishop appointed to Cherson, Richard the Englishman, received direct instructions to convert Greeks to Roman Catholicism. Thus the documents of the papal curia demonstrate the justification of their proselyte actions, denying the ecclesiastic reality of the Orthodox Church and the history of the region.

A similar charter was headed to a newly-created diocese of Vosporo. The document was entitled “Erectio ecclesiae metropolitanae Vosporensis, cui ecclesiae Cersonensis, Sevastopolensis etc. suffragannea subjunguntur”, nom. CDLVIII. Francesco de Camerino was appointed the head of the diocese of Vosporo and a Dominican Richard the Englishman was appointed a bishop of Cherson. Both Francesco and Richard worked long ago as missionaries in Crimea, having converted the prince of Alans Milleno (Milleno Alanorum principe). They were also known for their proselyte works. In 1334 Richard even engaged in a dispute about the proceeding of the Holy Spirit with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Later on, on 30 September 1335 he took part in the Council of Avignon. He came back afterwards to Crimea and appeared in Avignon again in 1338. Thus, Catholics (Genoese,
Venetians, and local converts) were obviously numerous in Cherson. Notably, Cherson was subject to the *metropolia Vosporensis* and not the other way around (or, for instance, to Caffa, Soldaia, or other more populated places). Vosporo had to be a metropolis, but a short-term one. We should note that all these new chairs were filled with the mendicants previously working in the area, thus acknowledging their previous considerable proselyte activity and success, as well as their religious zeal and strong rhetoric against infidels and schismatics.

Through the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the secular authorities of Caffa supported the same framework – supporting the Catholic mission inasmuch as they could and trying to promote to the diocese chairs the members of mendicant orders, who previously had a long-lasting experience of proselytising in Crimea. In fact this was an obligatory requirement. For example, a Franciscan friar Corrado was elected a bishop in 1359. Both mendicant orders were continually strengthening their positions in Caffa, building hospitals, hospices, and orphanages (some of them were arranged by laymen on social grounds, such as All Saints Hospital built in 1424 by the local Genoese, alongside the chapel that accompanied it; notably the founding charter betrayed its proselyte nature, since it was meant for all faithful Catholics, and also by all pagans and heretics who expressed their desire to become good Catholics). It is also possible that the Catholic mission went far beyond Gazaria. Some people in the Golden Horde must have been converted to Roman Catholicism, and we have an additional testimony by Ibn Battuta who mentioned that in Crimea the Cumans converted to Christianity (we do not know whether to Roman Catholicism or Greek Orthodoxy, to which Cumans were very much inclined and indeed many of them had already embraced it in the twelfth century). However even outside these Cumans, some Greeks,
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1624 The church in Vosporo had not yet been founded “*ut in dicta metropoli sub vocabulo beati Michaelis Archangeli fundari et construi debeat ecclesia cathedralis*” Theiner, *Vetera*, vol. 1, 348. However... “*ordinamus, quod ecclesie cathedrales, que subsequuntur, videlicet Cersonensis, Trapesondensis, Sevastopolensis, Caphensis et Peyrensisi, dummodo alicui alteri ecclesie metropolico iure non subsint, suffraganee sint Vosporensis ecclesie memorate*” Theiner, *Vetera*, vol. 1, 348.

1625 “...perduxit, quod in terra Gazarie, que in Tartarorum vastitate consistit, multi scysmaticorum et infidelium nationum indigenarum fratrum Predicatorum et Minorum ordinum partes illas peragrantium” Theiner, *Vetera*, vol. 1, 348.

1626 *Terra Gothiae diffusa et populosa, que consistit in partibus orientis, antiquis temporibus lex viguit celebritur christiana, sed ex crescente malicia temporis cessavit proh dolor ibidem observancia dicte legis, ipsiusque terre incole in infidelitatis cece tenebris deviantes sese diversorum errorum nexibus involvent, effecti scismatici communiter et parenter*. Theiner, *Vetera*, vol. 1, 347.


Tatars, Mongols, and Armenians were apparently professing Catholicism in the fourteenth century.

In the late thirteenth century, Caffa had at least six Roman Catholic churches (St Maria, St John, St Peter of Venice, St Francis, St Maria de Coronato, St Domenic). In the course of the fourteenth century, at least five more churches were built (St Agnes’ cathedral, St Magdalena, St Michael, St Kosmas and Damian, St Nicolas). However, apart from these eleven or so churches, the most intensive period of church-building was in the fifteenth century. By 1449, the Caffiotes added to the previously existing ones another eleven or so churches (the consul’s castle church, St James, St Fabian, St Lazarus, St Antony, St John, St Claire, St Lorenzo, St Catherine, St Peter and Paul, and Holy Cross). At the same time, the Genoese did not put considerable pressure on the Oriental communities in Caffa. The relations between the Genoese administration of Caffa and the Greek Orthodox Church were regulated by a number of provisions drawn up in the city’s legislation: the consul had to respect the rights of the local churches, both Greek and Armenian, and even had to honour the Greek churches with the gifts on the Epiphany and at Easter.

In the fifteenth century the number of times that Caffa is mentioned in papal documents increased, reflecting the concern about the growing Ottoman threat, as well as the activity of the Roman Catholic mission there. Caffa, rather than any other local diocese such as Trebizond, Vosporo, or Cherson, made a substantial contribution towards proselytising and converting the local population – in other cities the Catholic mission had presumably very little success and left no particular evidence. In 1459 Pope Pius II appointed a Dominican Geronimo a bishop of Caffa instead of the deceased Iacobus (“Hieronymus ex ordine Praedicatorum ecclesiae Caphensi in episcopum praeficitur”). The letter of appointment was issued on February 1459, and was followed by another letter dated June, where the Pope allowed Geronimo to be ordained by any two or three canonical catholic bishops in communion with Rome. Another document followed. It was issued in Mantua on August 1459, “Civitati Caphae indulgentia omnibus euntibus ad suam defensionem a Calixto III concessa usque ad annum prorogatur”, and was of typical thing of crusading origin. Because of the threat from the Turks and the Tatars the indulgence would be given to anyone helping to defend Caffa either with action or with money. The charter mentioned “Loisio de Flisco Archidiacono ecclesie Ianuensis, Iohannus de Gattis Prior Prioratus sancti Theodori extra
muros Iauenses”, who were in charge of collecting money.¹⁶²⁹ Thus, the Pope admonished to fight the Ottomans.¹⁶³⁰

During the Ottoman conquest news reached Rome of new losses of Latin Christendom reflected in the papal documents such as the news that the Turks “Monocastum et Licomostum occuparunt”.¹⁶³¹ Probably the more an Ottoman threat seemed likely, the less optimistic Rome was about the results of its mission, notwithstanding the attempts of the clergy. Moreover, apart from the Ottoman threat, many local people stuck to Greek Orthodoxy. Thus, in 1501, Armenians and Tatars were conceived by the Papal curia of the naturally Greek Orthodox people,¹⁶³² which means a general failure of the Latin missionary strategy in Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, the papal curia preserved a memory of the previous missions and still considered continuing similar attempts even in the sixteenth century.¹⁶³³

As for the organization of the Orthodox Church in the region, Crimea had a see or *scilicet* called Gothia, initially an eparchy under the metropolis of Doros,¹⁶³⁴ later an archbishopric,¹⁶³⁵ and by the time we are dealing with – a metropolis without suffragans.¹⁶³⁶ Another Orthodox eparchy, and a more significant one than Gothia, was the eparchy of Zikhia. In early Byzantium, it was known as an eparchy of the archbishoprics of Cherson, Bosporos, and Nikopsis (and occasionally of Sougdaia).¹⁶³⁷ Its neighbouring diocese to the South was called Abazgia,¹⁶³⁸ and it had an archiepiscopal see in Sebastopolis,¹⁶³⁹ modern


¹⁶³⁰ Theiner, *Veterea*, vol. 2, 161 – 163. Notably, in most papal documents there are two variants of spelling of the name of Caffa – normal “Caffa” and a hypercorrection “Capha.”


¹⁶³³ Theiner, *Veterea*, vol. 2, 1501 year. “Oratio Erasmi Vitellii praepositi Vilnensis, Illustrissimi principis domini Alexandri magni dacis Lithuaniae secretarui, et oratoris ad Alexandrum VI pontificem maximum ad praestandam obedientiam missi, Romae habita anno MDI die Mercurii ultima mensis Martii, et pontificis responsum” is narrating about the Turkish conquest. Theiner, *Veterea*, vol. 2, 277-280. See also year 1563: *Excerpta ex epistolis episcopi Camerinensis ad cardinalem Moronum de rebus Polonicis durante sua legatione in Polonia scriptis ab 20. April. 1561 usque ad 19. Iunii 1563*. The sources also read: “Questo vescovato e’ presso la Palude Meotide, e per dir meglio nella Taurica Chersonessa, ha 200, fiorini d’entrata, ma egli e’ stimato assai, se bene va poco per essere Senatore di questo Stato”. Theiner, 2, 663.


¹⁶³⁶ Darrouzes, *Notitiae episcopatum*, 181, 17/86, 18/86, 19/93, 20/46, 21/70. The chronicles mention in 1402 – 1403 a metropolitan of Gothia James (*Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*, ed. P. Schreiner (Vienna 1975), 114 (chronicle 12, NN 13, 14)).

¹⁶³⁷ Darrouzes, *Notitiae episcopatum*, 1/62.63.64, 2/66, 3/82.83.84, 4/63.64.65, 5/67.68.69.

Sukhumi, now the capital of Abkhazia (the Genoese had a small trading station there). At least as early as in the tenth century, Zikhia was an archbishopric with a centre in Tamatarcha, i.e. Genoese Matrega. From the thirteenth century onwards it was known as a metropolis without suffragans. Both Cherson and Bosphorus, initially being the archbishoprics of Zikhia, became metropolises also without known suffragans (probably from the twelfth to the thirteenth century). Apparently, in the period in question the area beyond the Azov Sea was canonically ruled by the see of Zikhia, the territory neighbouring on Cherson was subject to its see, while the modern area of the Kerch Peninsula was ruled by the see of Bosphorus, and the territory of the Principality of Theodoro correlated to Gothia.

The territory of Genoese Gazaria (that is, mostly the Southern coast of Crimea) was a territory of the archbishopric of Sougdia, which had existed since early Byzantine times and which was once a see of Zikhia. Later on, it became a metropolis, being united with Phoulloi (previously an archbishopric). Caffa was initially a part of this archbishopric of Sougdia-Phoulloi; however, in the period in question it is already mentioned as an independent metropolis, having some monasteries and independent church rule.

However, beyond jurisdictional ecclesiastic history, how did the religious affairs influence the life of the population of Genoese cities and its hinterland? Strikingly enough, we do not find any considerable traces of the Catholic mission in the coastal countryside of


1641 Darrouzes, Notitiae episcopatum, 80, 84, 118, 125, 126, 8/120, 11.139.140.141, 15/171. Although Tamatarcha (Matarca, Matracha) is listed as a separate archbishopric in various places, it looks like this name of the city was often used interchangeably with the name of the region (Zikhia). Another tricky point is that the archbishopric often appears under different names - Matarca (53, 121, 128, 130, 133, 134, 160, 169, 172, 173, 12/136, 16/122) and Tamatarkha (31, 57, 80, 82, 84, 86, 125, 8/120, 11/139, 12/136).


1644 Darrouzes, Notitiae episcopatum. As archbishopric: 126, 1/63, 2/67, 3/83, 4/64, 5/68, 7/90, 8/105, 11/125, 12/122, 14/107, 15/152, 16/112; as metropolis without suffragans: 181, 17/97, 18/97, 19/108.

1645 Darrouzes, Notitiae episcopatum, 23, 31, 72, 73, 80, 81, 126, 138, 7/98, 8/114, 11/133, 12/129, 14/114, 15/160, 16/118.

1646 Darrouzes, Notitiae episcopatum, 127 n. 2, 133, 134, 17/99, 18/99, 19/111, 20/46; also referred to as Sougdouphoulloi 12/(129.130), 15/163.


1648 Darrouzes, Notitiae episcopatum, 21/71.

Gothia. Most, if not all of the archaeological remains of the churches do not reveal anything to do with Catholicism and are quintessentially Greek. Even in Soldaia there is a visible growth of Greek Orthodox churches, which can reflect the demographic growth, but in any case bears few or no evidence of Latinization. Unlike the big urban centres such as Caffa and Soldaia, in the whole Southern Crimea, according to Firsov, there is even no single Latin epigraphic monument. Besides that, again according to Firsov, the presence of the Latins in general is not reflected in Crimean toponymics (with one exception, which is a place named Katsiveli, in Italian Castello Vecchio), which means that in the rural area of Gothia there was no or almost no Catholic mission, or it was superficial, or unsuccessful. It was opposite in Caffa, where the mingling of people left room for conversion. This conversion, however, went in different directions. There was certainly a number of Orientals who converted to Roman Catholicism directly, or became part of the established Oriental Unionist Greek or Armenian churches after the Council of Florence. Conversion of Muslims was intensive, e.g. there is the case of Ismael nunc d-s Michael. Same must have been the case of an Egyptian by origin Giovani from Alexandria, scribe specialising in ‘Uyghur’ language (scriptor litterarum u gasescharum, scriba litterarum u gasescharum), who continued to use his Muslim name Saraf-ad-din alongside his Christian one (Iohanes de Alexandria aliax vocatus Sarafadinus). The conversion of Greek and Armenians can also be traced in the following way: since the recent Oriental converts to Roman Catholicism were becoming part of the Latin community and received a describer (or rather a last name) ‘Catolicus’, we can partly see the figures and the dynamics of Latinization. In 1423 there are eleven people with the last name ‘Catolicus’: habitator Caffe Giovanni, olim turchus, Bartholomeo son of Aguchi, Albapagi, Alessio, tailor Andrea, Climicha, Domenico.

1653 MC 1387, 134v.
1654 MC 1423, 45r, 56v, 133v, 209r, 248r, 262r, 268v. Also mentioned by Balard in “Infideles ou comans,” 11.
1655 MC 1423, 81v, 113r.
1656 MC 1423, 28r, 41r.
1657 MC 1423, 49v.
1658 MC 1423, 41r.
1659 MC 1423, 16v, 132r.
Giorgio, Martino Sonichi, socius burgi Soldaye Niccolò Novello, and custos nocturnus Caffe Simone. In 1461, there are just four: prouisionatus Caffe Anestaxius, orguxius Ie[***]ep, orguxius Giacomo, and Tommaso. Since we are dealing here with a kind of a delayed effect, we can hypothesise that in the decades running up to the 1420s the proselytising activity of the Roman Catholic Church among the Orientals was more intensive, and became less influential in the decades prior to 1460s. However, conversion also went in the opposite direction: mingling with the local population, primarily marrying local Oriental women or entering in partnership with them, some Westerners adopted their faith. In Caffa, this was certainly the case for those who married Greek women and embraced Greek Orthodoxy, which is reflected in the documents of the ecclesiastic authorities, outraged by these cases of conversion. The same could also apply to Armenians and with Muslims, since we know of examples of Genoese converting to Islam in other areas of Latin Romania, e.g. Cyprus, where a certain Genoese called sier Usier de Lort (i.e. di l’Orto) converted to Islam and adopted the name Nasr-ad-Din.

**Mixed marriages and other forms of domestic partnership**

Marriage and family relations in Caffa are of a particular interest from many points of view and provide rich material for scholars in such branches as Cultural History, Anthropology, Gender Studies, Social History, and Colonial Studies. They bear the mark of Genoese colonialism in the Black Sea region. Family and gender were often analysed in relation to the business and commercial character of the Genoese presence in the area, economy being treated in a basically Marxist way as the basis, while the level of family relations etc. was considered part of the superstructure. However, we can see this entangled world in a more complex way, considering its multinational character, interethnic interaction, and the shaping of a new peculiar and quite idiosyncratic cultural and social environment based on a synthesis.

---

1660 MC 1423, 231v.
1661 MC 1423, 41v, 66v.
1662 MC 1423, 49v.
1663 MC 1423, 55v, 129r, 162r.
1664 MC 1423, 379r, 385v.
1665 MC 1423, 43r, 55r, 248r, 340v, 352v.
1666 MC 1461, 39v, 39v bis, 44v, 211r, 213r, 408r end/407v reg.
1667 MC 1461, 239v.
1668 MC 1461, 175r, 307r, 310v, 312r, 406v end/409r reg.
1669 MC 1461, 300v.
of Latin and Oriental features and exceeding a narrow unilateral interpretation of a connection between the economy and other spheres of human life. The Latin society of Caffa was often being seen as an expatriate society. In such cases the scholars took a prospective embracing the Genoese society and the one of Caffa as its continuation. This approach is productive as far as personal networks are concerned, but ignores the interaction between the Latins and the Orientals, which can be seen in the most visible way in the sphere of interethnic marriages.

We know that in Italy sometimes up to a half the population deviated from the family structure. In the Genoese colonies, the family in a traditional sense was perhaps even less diffuse among the Latin colonists; however, there were many other types of organised personal life. Having a woman was a sign of social status and was highly advisable even for a travelling merchant (Pegolotti). Obviously, most of the Italian newcomers to the Black Sea were young single men. Testaments are an excellent source of information. Italians wrote wills quite often and throughout the history of the overseas colonies. In around half the Venetian notarial deeds drawn up in Tana in 1430s, there is a formula *interrogatus a notario infrascripto de postremis respondi non habere uxorem*. Thus, although being only a part of the society composed also of elderly Latins and Latin families living in the colony already for the generations, the newcomers were normally young bachelors, presumably regarding their stay in colony as a temporary one and willing to make money to return to the metropolis and to settle there. They did not always return, but this was their expectation. So, a young Genoese full of the ‘spirit of capitalism’, but without ‘Protestant ethics’ and without too much of moral restrictions came to Caffa as an officer, soldier, sailor, notary, independent merchant, or a junior representative of his family firm (in fact it does not make much difference whether he was a professional merchant or not, since he would in any case become involved in trade). Without the family, such bachelors (and often even married people who left their families in the metropolis) chose concubines from local women. This could be done in a number of ways. First, a master could use a girl whom he bought as a slave or hired as a servant as his concubine (as I showed above, these two cases in fact differed only from the legal point of view). Furthermore, he could after a certain time free his slave, thus giving her Roman citizenship, and sometimes, although rarely, acknowledge any children. Most often,

1671 See, for example, Daine Owen Hughes, *Urban Growth and Family Structure in Medieval Genoa*, 4–5.
however, he would free her and her children without claiming to be their father, otherwise legally adopted his illegitimate biological issue.\textsuperscript{1672}

This was not, however, the most interesting social phenomenon in the field of family life in Caffa. Another way of managing the household and having a partner was a temporary marriage legally framed by contract.\textsuperscript{1673} The Italian settlers could draw up a contract with a local woman, normally from a Christian nation (thus, almost all known cases are temporary marriages with Greeks or Hellenized Tatars or Russians, who are not always distinguishable from the Greeks). Normally, a contract was drawn up for a specified period, which could be a provisional period of stay of a Latin individual in the colony. The local woman was called \textit{cuma},\textsuperscript{1674} and this word is a \textit{terminus technicus} of the Latin sources for the designation for a temporary wife. \textit{Cuma} was responsible for all things a normal wife would have been expected to do – running the household, cooking, cleaning, washing, and also being a concubine to an Italian. The reward was board and housing, plus some additional money. Temporary wives were treated better than other servants and, unlike most of the latter, they received a salary. \textit{Cuma} did not have rights that a normal wife would have under Roman and Genoese law; however, she obviously had more rights than a slave or a common servant. This also pertained to the issue of such temporary marriages, who were not considered illegitimate: according to the terms of most contracts, the male issue would be acknowledged by father and taken to the metropolis, while the female issue would normally remain with the mother (although this might vary). Surprisingly, such women were not always single: in certain cases they were married and leased by their husbands to an Italian for a temporary marriage.

Children of mixed marriages in Latin Romania, and hence in the Greek-speaking areas of Crimea, were known as \textit{gasmouloi} or \textit{basmouloi}, and according to Jacoby were probably bilingual.\textsuperscript{1675} Bilingualism must have been the norm in the society of Genoese Gazaria,

\textsuperscript{1672} ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 44v.
\textsuperscript{1674} \textit{Cuma} is a Russian word (кума) meaning a godparent in relation to the parents of a child, and vice versa – the parents of a child in relation to the godparent. Broadly, it could also mean any type of non-blood connection.
perhaps more than anywhere else in the Mediterranean. Orientals who had to deal with the Genoese and other Latins directly probably spoke some Genoese vernacular or another type of Romance *lingua franca*, and many Latins could speak some Greek, Armenian, or Tatar.

The Catholic clergy condemned mixed marriages between the Italians and the local women, but the bishops of Caffa blessed such marriages on the condition that the women promised to convert into Roman Catholicism. Pope John XXII instructed the Genoese authorities to punish the women who did not carry out this promise, and was deeply worried by the issue that the Italians themselves might convert to Orthodoxy, living in the Orthodox environment with Orthodox wives.\(^{1676}\)

Karpov has carried out detailed research into mixed marriages between Roman Catholic Italians and Orthodox Russians. These cases are well attested for Tana, and the descendants seem to be well integrated into the Latin social environment.\(^{1677}\) Mixed marriages between different groups of Christians (Catholic, Orthodox, and Armenian) are known and well documented, although there is no evidence of marriages between Christians and non-Christians (Muslims or Jews). It is probable that such alliances did not occur at all, or were few in number.

A case documented in 1367 raises tantalizing questions of identity. A Greek woman married to the Catalan Pere Estanyol in Thebes and who had converted to Catholicism returned to Orthodoxy after her husband’s death fourteen years later, became a nun, and fled to Thessalonica.\(^{1678}\) This sort of case may often have occurred in Genoese Gazaria, changing one’s faith on marriage and only for this family reason, and then returning back to the original religion.

---


\(^{1676}\) Eubel, *Epitome sive suinrna bullarium*, vol. 6 (Rome: Quaracchi, 1905), No. 303.


\(^{1678}\) Jacoby, “Foreigners and the Urban Economy in Thessalonike, ca. 1150–ca. 1450,” 86.
Family and familial clan in Caffa

The Genoese society was an oligarchy, but an oligarchy of clans rather than individuals. The clan structures called *alberghi* were the basis of the connections of primary importance. We can hardly trace any ‘rise of importance of a nuclear family’; what the sources show us is rather preservation than dissolution of larger family structures. The Genoese tended to stick to their lineages. Far from loosening family bonds, urban association strengthened them. As the city’s aristocracy rose to dominate Genoa’s trade in the first half of the twelfth century, lineage ties became more clearly defined, more firmly patrilineal, and more frequently invoked, and the bonds of the domestic group, the joint patriarchal family, were reinforced.\(^{1679}\)

The role of a lineage based on the male issue was the predominant form of connection between the relatives in Genoa and Caffa, prior and by far more important than the nuclear family. In the case of the husband’s death, his widow had to choose. She could take care of his children as a legal guardian often staying with her husband’s relatives or at least being legally patronized by them. Otherwise, she could receive her dowry and remarry, but in that case she lost her power and guardianship over her children from the first marriage, which would normally pass to her dead husband’s next of kin.\(^{1680}\) Besides a weak legal link between the mother and her children, we can add the fact of the importance of the relation between uncles and nephews in the Genoese clan. Nephews often acted as either junior partners, or representatives of their uncles’ firms. Sometimes we have the feeling that the uncle–nephew relationships were more important than those between father and son. The same is true for the particularly strong fraternal ties. Thus, familial solidarity was reinforced by commercial activity.\(^{1681}\)

Nonetheless, the role of a woman in Italian society of that period was relatively significant. Women in the Genoese colonies were subject to the same rules, regulations, and traditions that existed in the metropolis. Genoese women had certain civil rights and were subject to law. For instance a woman could be a *fideicommissar* and execute a testament, or even be appointed as a procurator, which would have been unthinkable in Roman law in

---

Women’s rights were, however, obviously not equal to those of men. Women were not responsible for civil matters, and could not act without the consent of a patronizing male guarantor such as a father, husband, relative or neighbour. For instance, a woman could initiate a lawsuit, but only if she had the permission of her guarantor. The same restriction applied in business, where women could act independently in all kinds of entrepreneurial activity, but only after being authorized via a notarial document by their guarantors. The measure of woman’s rights largely depended on her age. Those under fifteen (for males the age of majority was seventeen) had to be represented by parents or legal guardians acting on their behalf in all legal and juridical cases. Girls who reached age of majority but were still under the age of twenty-five were subjects of law and could act in legal cases with the consent of a male guarantor (a husband, father, two relatives or neighbours). If a widow remarried she lost her power and guardianship over her children from the first marriage, which normally would pass to the next relative. The woman preserved her right on her dowry, as well as on her inherited property, and the husband would need his wife’s permission to dispose of it. At the same time, a wife would need a notarial permission from her husband to dispose of his property in his absence. In property-related issues, a woman (married or widowed) could own property on her own right, but again provided that there was a permission of her husband or closest relative. Thus, in general, the rights of a woman were moderately broad for the époque in question.

The women’s role in social life and business activity in Genoa was quite important. On the one hand, women were involved in the commercial affairs themselves, both conducting trade and investing in others’ enterprises, acting either on their own right, or on

---

1684 We however rarely find cases when a woman acts as a plaintiff – it is normally exactly that man responsible for her who could have given consent to her participation in a lawsuit to represent legally her interests in the court. Sometimes, however, we find local women acting as plaintiffs in the Genoese courts, occasionally against their husbands, like Iolmelich, an inhabitant of Tana.
1686 Not to mention that a widow, for instance, would need the permission of the legal guardian of her children to dispose the property of her deceased husband and her children’s inheritance, which is still true today in Italy.
1687 Balard, La Romanie génoise, 439.
behalf of their absent husbands or her minors; on the other hand, even when a husband disposed of his wife’s property, e.g. dowry, it was often not only a contribution to the family household, but also an important share in family entrepreneurship, and a considerable factor of social relations. Dowry comprised money, property, clothes, utensils, etc., money, however, being of a particular importance, and being paid either in cash, or in cambium, by obligations, or other monetary tools. Normally, a dowry was paid to the bridegroom by the lady’s father, his future father-in-law, or in his absence by one of the closest relatives, but in fact apart from a father, brothers, or uncles, the dowry could be paid by a neighbour, a legal guardian, a former master in case of a freedwoman, or by the bride herself. The size of the dowry varied from about 100 several thousand aspri and reflected to a certain extent the social position of a woman (in the thirteenth century we find that the largest dowry of 3000 aspri was paid by a Russian bride). After the husband died, his widow could receive her dowry back into personal possession in order to secure her subsistence; there is no evidence of a single case of divorce among the Latins, which is understandable in the Late Middle Ages, and a single case of a divorce mentioned in the overall documents refers to the Greeks, which is evidence that in Greek society at that point women were more emancipated than in Western European.

A woman’s wealth was not limited to the dowry, which was in her husband’s hands as long as they remained married. Women often owned or rented real estate, either entirely, or as a part of shared property; this can be seen from the deeds confirming the transfer of houses, which are sold by women as single proprietors on their own right or by both co-proprietors. Women also appear in the sources as slave owners, again either alone or in

1689 Having received her dowry from her family, a woman was not entitled for a part of inheritance, apt from cases when she had no brothers, see: Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, Pars 3, col. 893.
1690 Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, Pars Prima, col. 857.
1692 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-mer, No. 385. For the fourteenth century, the largest known dowry is however almost three times bigger – 8,000 aspri, see: Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 42.
1693 Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, Pars Prima, col. 864. See examples in fourteenth-century Caffa: Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 28, 42, 54. Airaldi, Studi e documenti su Genova e Oltremare, Collana storica di fonti e studi diretta da Geo Pistarino 1 (Genoa: Istituto di paleografia e storia medievale, 1974), No. 17. We know a case when a wife died before her husband, with children from a previous marriage; her dowager had to pay the dowry back to the legal guardians of her daughters by her first marriage. Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 13. For the legal basis of it see: Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, part 1, col. 858.
1694 A certain Greek Michali divorced his wife Maria and obtained from her 250 aspri. Airaldi, Studi e documenti, No. 45.
share with somebody, and the sources shows that they often bought and sold slaves.\textsuperscript{1696} There is evidence of partnerships between spouses in entrepreneurial affairs, running business together, buying and selling goods together. In certain cases women acted in business affairs on their own, but most often – representing their husbands in different commercial and financial transaction, which is understandable, since in the Genoese legal practice woman was a subject of law, although she needed a permission of her husband or other guarantor to act independently.\textsuperscript{1697}

How was the inheritance system organized in Caffa? The best way to study it would be to go into the notarial testaments. There are some documents preserved from the thirteenth\textsuperscript{1698} and fourteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{1699} Some fragmentary notes on inheritance can also be found in other documents, especially the paperwork connected to the legal process framing it.\textsuperscript{1700} The deeds of the thirteenth century, however, contain good inventories which allow us to draw conclusions regarding property, but provide us with little information on the process and legal procedure connected to the inheritance. In the later period, however, there are cases with several deeds referring to one procedure, which makes conclusions more reliable. The Genoese, male and female, old and young, often made several wills or testaments during their lifetime, and the Genoese legal system regulated how these were drawn up.\textsuperscript{1701} Testaments follow a standard formula with minimal variations with a rhetorical praefatio followed by the disposition of the property of the testator (money, slaves, property, real estate, ships, shares in enterprises, debts, obligations, etc.), most of which was given to the legal heirs and others to whom the testator wanted to bequeath something, alongside the dispositions for repaying debts and receiving money due by obligations, and with donations to churches, monasteries, or hospitals in Caffa and elsewhere, donations made to serve a certain number of masses, alms, and other charitable donations. At the disposition of the testament the testator named the fideicommissari (executors of the testament), who had to implement the will. The heirs, in their turn, could follow the inheritance procedure themselves; however, taken into account the distance, time, and dispersion of property that was omnipresent in the society of merchants, they often nominated one or several procurators, either men or women (commonly relatives, friends, or business partners, although in each case it was decided on

\textsuperscript{1697} Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, No. 628, 675, 727, 773, 831, 859.
\textsuperscript{1699} Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 15, 19, 32, 39, 53, 56, 63, 72, 78-79.
\textsuperscript{1700} For further information see: Airaldi, \textit{Studi e documenti}, Nos. 22-24.
\textsuperscript{1701} \textit{Leges Genuensis}, \textit{Statutorum civilium, Pars Prima}, col. 849-852, 880-882.
the basis of the situation). Heirs or their procurators requested the authorities of Caffa to announce the inheritance publicly, to compose an inventory of the possessions of the deceased, to document it together with the notaries of the Curia of Caffa, and received it only in case if nobody in the city claimed any objections or declared to have an interest or a share in the inheritance – this was done in order to make sure that all the debts of the deceased were paid to his creditors, and if the inheritance did not comprise a needed sum of money, his possessions had to be sold on the auction in order to cover the debts. There are many examples of how the heirs, procurators, or curators managed the affairs of the deceased and distributed their possession, paying their debts, covering them by selling property (first goods, then personal movables and slaves, and finally, if it did not suffice, the real estate owned singularly or in shares), and extracting the due net inheritance, either in parts, or entirely. This net inheritance was further distributed among the heirs.

Normally, since the inheritance process had to secure the transmission of property and subsistence of any children, the main heirs were by default the legitimate children of the testator (when a testator had a son or sons, they would be heirs by default, while daughters received their share in family property only as a dowry). If children were under the age of majority, a legal guardian was appointed by the testament (generally the closest relative, i.e. parents of surviving spouse), and a special disposition was made if the heir dies before the age of majority (if he or she was a minor) or without his or hers legitimate heirs. Apart from the children, the heirs could be brothers and sisters of the testator, and in certain cases some other relatives, or even people with whom the testator had no kinship links. Spouses were not heirs to each other, or at least there are no known examples of this. The husband had to return dowry and could leave some money to his wife after his death, but she was never his

1702 See for examples: Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 4, 53, 71, 79. Airaldi, Studi e documenti, Nos. 9-15, 27. The procurators have to be distinguished from legal guardians of people or curators of property, see: Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, Pars 3, col. 873-875, 895, 897-903. Airaldi, Studi e documenti, Nos. 17, 34.


1704 Notai genovesi in Oltremare, Nos. 24, 25, 29, 42, 46, 51, 54, 57, 61, 63, 80.


1706 Sometimes, as we can see from the case in the Venetian Tana, the inheritance process could be conditioned by the behavior of the potential heir. Bartlomeo de Serigo (a family name or a profession connected to the silk trade?) claimed in his testament that his wife should receive her dowry back immediately following his death, being at the same time the legal guardian of their underage son (ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 44v). However, he stressed twice that his son Federico would receive it upon reaching the age of majority only if he behaved well and obeyed his mother, which meant that the testator had doubts about him. Thus, an obstinate sibling could have been disinherited in case of misbehavior. Other provisions or conditions were often imposed on the heirs, and meanwhile the property had to be governed by a fideicommissar.

1707 Such as the mother in the case of Rollando de Robino. Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-mer, No. 704.
main heir by default, although she was frequently the legal guardian of their underage children by default, staying with them, not extracting her dowry, and using the sum for subsistence left by her deceased husband. The normal order of inheritance preference was therefore: sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, parents, other relatives, nd non-relatives (illegitimate children from slaves and concubines normally came last). The attitude towards the widow was clear: she was excluded from the order of inheritance unless she remained as a legal guardian with her underage children in her deceased husband’s family; otherwise, she could extract her dowry, leave her children, and remarry. This reveals the fact that in Genoa and in Caffa lineage absolutely prevailed over the idea of a nuclear family.

We should note that the Orientals (especially Greeks, Russians, and Armenians) in Genoese Gazaria all used the same legal tools as the Latins – the notarial testaments, institutes of fideicommissari, procurators, and curators, and seemed to be a part of the same inheritance system as the Genoese Caffiotes. This can be seen not only as a result of their stay under the Genoese jurisdiction and operating within the same social and economic frameworks as the Italians, but also as a sign of a cultural exchange and mutual influence in a multi-ethnic colonial society.

1708 Leges Genuensis, Statutorum civilium, Pars 3, col. 895. However, in certain cases a provision is made that the wife remains the legal guardian of children only if she remains with them or with the family of the testator – clearly in order not to let her remarry and to avoid any property going outside the clan. See: Brătianu, Actes des notaires, No. 228. Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-mer, No. 882. Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 19.
1709 Apart from this a slave concubine was often freed together with her illegitimate children, given Roman citizenship and a certain amount of money to marry as a dowry.
CHAPTER 6. PRESTIGE, STRATIFICATION, AND SOCIAL GROUPS IN THE SOCIETY OF CAFFA

The society of Caffa to some extent resembled that of the metropolis, mainly in its economy, law, and social order. Nonetheless, it had many significant differences and its own peculiar and distinctive features. The first of these was the essentially business character society; if not of all of Caffa society, then at least for its Latin part. Obviously, Westerners came to the colonies to make money; even if some of them settled down overseas and practiced some non-business-related profession, the spirit of gaining profit was omnipresent. It was true for Genoa, where ‘all citizens were merchants’, but was doubly true for the New Genoa, whose main raison d’être was commerce. Another distinctive feature was the cosmopolitan and multinational character of the city. There were various diasporas and minorities in Venice, Genoa, Barcelona, Constantinople, but in Caffa there were no minorities, because the city lacked any monolith cultural identity. It was a Genoese colony, but the Latins were not an absolute majority even in the cities, living in a piebald cultural environment. Yet another specific feature was the surrounding of the Genoese colonies and the constant need to trade-off with the Tatar authorities and to oppose the Princes of Theodoro. In social terms the Black Sea trade brought intensive social changes. Many people of different social positions from Italy travelled eastward in search of adventure, enchanted by a mirage of easy fortune. What they faced was a different social reality, which they had to deal with, and to change it and to change themselves. This makes Genuensis civitas in extremo Europae an interesting example of interaction of the Western European and Oriental urban cultures and logics of development. This society should therefore be studied in detail. I will analyse the society of Caffa from the perspective of its stratification and social groups, but I will also touch upon such categories as professional groups in the urban environment, the distribution of wealth and property, forms of property and relation connected to it, institutions, coercion and revolts, social networks, migration, social practices, horizontal and vertical social mobility and strategies to attain it, connections to families, parishes, towns, interconnectivity, different kinds of relations (familial, parental, marital, potestarian, brokerage, patron-client relations, etc.), sociability, norms of social comportment, issues of gender and age, marriage; to make a long list short – the structures of society and the individual’s behaviour within these social structures.

First I will focus on the formal things starting with the social stratification of Caffa society. Because of the limitations of our sources, information is clearly disproportional with more data on Latins, less data on Orientals. However, this is not the only caveat. The sources contain people with certain social identifiers; moreover, we can learn something about them based on the distribution of wealth and property. As in the case with ethnicity, social or professional describers had a lot to do with the identification and self-identification of a particular person. The describer mentioned in the sources provides us with some data on how people themselves and the author of the sources perceive the place of these people in Caffa society. Hence, there will be a good deal of subjectivity. Can we nevertheless identify the existence of certain social groups, whose members possess a set of characteristics defining their belonging to this group, based on certain relevant formal criteria and parameters? And if such groups can be defined, did the members of different groups constitute some social environment, and how can this environment be defined? Which principles were in the basis of the society of Caffa, what did the social stratification look like, what principles were social groups based on and defined, which were the essential features determining belonging to a certain group, in which relations did these groups stand to each other, was there any social dynamics and what did it look like? Can we reconstruct and describe social groups and structures, social hierarchy, and the basic principles of the society based on the available sources?

It is not easy to answer, which factors determine the social identification and self-identification of a person, and this can often vary from one case to another. Moreover, just as in the case of given and family names, ethnic and religious describers, and other kinship identifiers, the social describers were used in the sources to identify a person, and not to make the historian’s life easier. Ideally, the scribe would have had a chart with different columns such as social standing, profession, family ties, religious affiliation, and he would have meticulously filled in all the columns for every person he met in his practice. This, however, was not the case, either for notarial deeds, or for accounts books, or letters, or any other of the multitude of sources. If a nickname or a rare profession were enough to define a person’s identity, the scribe did not feel obliged to write down all other parameters of this man or woman. That is why the describers such as nobilis, civis, burgensis, ser, mercator, egregius, sartor could be used in social reality, but in the sources they are situational; the scribe used as many or few of identifiers as to describe a person satisfactorily, so as those who would consult the documents in future would have known what he meant. Thus, every
statistical account based on these sources would be imperfect. Imperfect, however, does not mean impossible. First, we can often learn something a person’s identity indirectly (e.g. some nobleman are not described as nobilis, but held an office reserved for the nobility). Second, although some or even most of the people in the community are not mentioned in the sources, we can sometimes reconstruct the possible quantity of the absent people based on the quantity and frequency of those who are mentioned. Third, using the sources we can define those people who were more active in the social practice, and this may or may not correlate with their social standing (and if it did, we can claim that the elite was most socially active). Other markers of social activity are noble or other prestigious describers, prestigious professions, citizenship or status of permanent residency, frequency of being mentioned in the sources, commercial activity, and wealth (money, real estate). First of all, I will discuss different levels of relations between an individual and the Commune coined in the legal categories – nobiles, cives, burgenses, and habitatores.

The population of Caffa in legal categories: nobiles, cives, burgenses, and habitatores

Nobiles. The sources of all three centuries of existence of Caffa clearly show that power and wealth there was all the time in the hands of the Genoese aristocracy. They held the most important positions in the social and political life of the city’s Commune. The oligarchy of noblemen was perhaps more stable in Caffa than in Genoa itself.

The Genoese nobility was more an urban patrician than of feudal origin. Noblemen were initially both landowners and entrepreneurs engaged in trade more than any other social strata; at the same time, administration and military commandment was also in the hands of the patricians. Thus, both private property and political power was concentrated in the hands of the noble elite. In the sources, noblemen can be indicated based on a describer nobilis (also dominus, ser), or the position reserved to nobility, or a patrician family name. While the first two means are secure, the latter does not always work, since freedmen often took the family name of their former masters, in the same way as servants or other dependants.

1711 Indeed the Republic never had feudal system, aside of a feudalization of several families who received feuds in Latin Romania (mainly Aegean and Ionian archipelagos) and, preserving the family connections with Superba, possibly made its republican system more oligarchic than it was in the very beginning. Same was true for Venice, perhaps even to a bigger extent, see: Dennis, “Problemi storici concernenti i rapporti tra Venezia e i suoi domini diretti e le signorie feudali nelle isole greche,” in Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo XV, vol. 1 (Florence, 1973), 225–232. Neither did Genoa ever have any feudal law system, since its legal practice and institutes were always essentially belonging to the Roman legal system.
The Genoese nobility ran the administration of Gazaria. The Genoese administration in Caffa retained its predominantly aristocratic character even when the metropolis was temporarily ruled by the popolo. The sources from Caffa contain references to the old noble families in Genoa both in administration and beyond: Camilla, Cigala, Doria, Fieschi, Grillo, Grimaldi, Guizolfi, Lercari, Lomellini, De Marini, Spinola, Squarciifico, Vivaldi, etc. ran the city; at the same time the patrician families originating from the popolo such as Adurno, Cabella, Giudice, Oliva, Rezza, Sauli, Zougli, etc. were also present in the ruling elite, although arguably to a lesser extent. We find the same pattern in trade, where the nobles held leading positions. The stability of the patrician oligarchy was a characteristic feature throughout the history of the Genoese Black Sea colonies. Even in the times when in Genoa the Guelfs took over, Genoa preserved the Ghibelline rule. However, noblemen sometimes considered the positions in the colonies as a burden rather than as a fortune. Thus, for instance, Battista Imperiale, an offspring of a noble lineage, had to accept a consulate of Cembalo, which he considered beneath his dignity and social status (quod non erat officium pro suo honore, neque pro suo statu); he was obliged to do so by poverty (ad inopiam) and the need to support his family.1712

Nobles engaged in trade on the Black Sea from the start, as they did in the administration of the Genoese colonies there. Thus, as early as the thirteenth century, the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto contain noble family names such as Negro (mentioned twenty times), Mallone (fifteen times), Doria (thirteen times), Salvago (twelve times), Cigala (eleven times), Cibo (ten times), and surnames such as Gattilusio, Grillo, Grimaldi, Lercari, Lomellino, Pallavicino, Spinola, Squarciifico, Usodimare, etc. Many commanding positions in the garrison of Caffa and other colonies were also held by the nobility.

I already mentioned one methodological issue with identifying noblemen in the sources. While a noble cognomen can be misleading, a title (nobilis, dominus, etc.) is a clear marker of one’s nobility, as much as a post reserved to nobility. In actual fact (and indeed unfortunately), in most cases these two come together, that is, some kind of a title is normally applied to post-holders in the Massariae Caffae, while the majority of the noblemen who did not hold positions in the administration or in the garrison are without titles.

The Massaria Caffae 1423 refers to the following title-holders (most of them also current or previous post-holders, which makes me think that in most cases even if a certain

nobleman was entitled to be called *dominus* or *nobilis vir*, the scribe omitted this, unless used together with the name of the post):

*Spectabilis dominus*: Girolamo Giustiniani, *massarius* and syndic of Caffa,\(^{1713}\) Giorgio Adorno, *provisionatus Caffe*,\(^{1714}\) Giacomo Adorno, former consul.\(^{1715}\)

*Nobilis et egregius vir/nobilis et egregius dominus*: Pietro di Fieschi, Count of Lavagna, *massarius* and syndic of Caffa.\(^{1716}\)

*Nobilis vir/nobilis dominus*: Frederico Spinola, at different times consul of Caffa, *massarius* and syndic of Caffa, sent to serve as a captain to Cembalo on a *galeota*, tax farmer (*emptor introitus multii/martilii Caffe*).\(^{1717}\) Borbone Centurione, *consul, castellanus et massarius Samastri*,\(^{1718}\) Tommasino Italiani, *consul, castellanus, capitaneus et massarius ciuitatis Soldaye*.\(^{1719}\)

*Egregius vir/egregius dominus*: above-mentioned Girolamo Giustiniani *massarius* and syndic of Caffa,\(^{1720}\) Bartolomeo de Zoagli, *consul, castellanus et massarius Samastri*,\(^{1721}\) Bonavei de Monleone, previous *consul, castellanus, capitaneus, massarius et scriba Cimbali*,\(^{1722}\) Pellegrino de Mulazana, new *consul, castellanus, capitaneus, massarius et scriba Cimbali*,\(^{1723}\) Oberto de Benesia, *consul, castellanus, capitaneus et massarius ciuitatis Soldaye*.\(^{1724}\)

*Dominus*: Battista de Campofregoso, *olim consul Samastri*,\(^{1725}\) Battista de Franchi *olim consul Caffe*,\(^{1726}\) Antonio Marruffo, *olim consul Caffe*,\(^{1727}\) Gabriele de Nicomisso,\(^{1728}\)

\(^{1713}\) MC 1423, 1r, 6v, 13v, 14v, 32v, 33v, 44r, 44v, 52r, 52v, 53r, 54v, 58r, 59r, 62v, 75r, 79r, 84r, 103v, 107r, 120v, 125v, 130v, 133r, 133v, 133v bis, 136r, 145r, 146r, 149r, 150v, 152v, 170r, 191r, 192v, 195r, 195r, 216r, 231v, 233r, 244r, 244v, 245v, 253r, 257r, 260r, 275r, 279r.
\(^{1714}\) MC 1423, 152v, 263v, 269r.
\(^{1715}\) MC 1423, 6v, 43r, 52r, 214v.
\(^{1716}\) MC 1423, 1r, 14v, 15v, 32v, 33v, 45r, 52r, 53v, 58r, 59r, 62v, 64r, 93v, 122v, 125v, 129v, 130r, 133v, 146r, 146v, 150v, 152v, 159r, 195r, 197r, 206v, 209v, 217v, 241v, 245v, 253r, 274v, 276v, 277v.
\(^{1717}\) MC 1423, 1r, 16r, 44r, 52r, 55r, 55v, 58r, 59r, 68v, 82r, 90v, 91v, 93r, 94r, 122v, 123v, 126v, 127r, 146r, 152r, 160r, 194v, 206v, 226r, 231v, 231v bis, 253r, 243v, 244v, 264v, 271v.
\(^{1718}\) MC 1423, 33v, 45v, 91r, 105r, 128v, 152v, 245r, 415r, 416v.
\(^{1719}\) MC 1423, 13r, 13v, 45v, 60r, 56v, 105r, 122r, 126v, 149r, 209v, 245r, 354v, 357v.
\(^{1720}\) MC 1423, 1r, 6v, 14v, 13v, 14v, 32v, 33v, 44r, 44v, 52r, 52v, 53r, 54v, 58r, 59r, 62v, 75r, 79r, 84r, 103v, 107r, 120v, 125v, 130v, 133r, 133v, 133v bis, 136r, 145r, 146r, 149r, 150v, 152v, 170r, 191r, 192v, 195r, 195r, 216r, 231v, 233r, 244r, 241r, 244v, 245v, 253r, 257r, 260r, 275r, 279r.
\(^{1721}\) MC 1423, 105r, 128v, 133v, 135v, 149r, 415v, 416v.
\(^{1722}\) MC 1423, 8r, 33v, 45v, 54v, 59r, 62r, 92v, 93r, 105r, 123v, 130r, 149r, 159v, 196v, 245r, 395r, 397v.
\(^{1723}\) MC 1423, 13v, 17v, 123v, 123v, 126r, 191r, 194r, 197v, 198r, 395v, 397v.
\(^{1724}\) MC 1423, 355r, 357v.
\(^{1725}\) MC 1423, 27v, 41r.
\(^{1726}\) MC 1423, 27v, 41r.
\(^{1727}\) MC 1423, 2r, 7r, 41r, 54v.
\(^{1728}\) MC 1423, 59r.
Melchiorre de Vultabio *sindicus comunis Ianue in Caffa, iudex peritus*,
Iorbey de Licona, *orguxius in Soldaia*,
Prospero de Ovada Bouello, *legum doctor*,
Giovanni de Sassorosso (*Petra Rubea, superministralis Caffe*),
Lodovico Vico, *magister, ordinis Sancti Francisci*;
Lodovico de Sancto Petro, *magister, episcopus Soldaye, ordinis fratrum minorum*.

Massaria Caffae 1423 refers to the following title-holders:

*Magnificus dominus*: Raffaele de Monte Rubeo, in different times *consul Caffe* and *prouisor et massarius*;

*Reverendus dominus*: bishop of Caffa;

*Egregius dominus*: Badasale Doria, *prouisor et massarius*;

*vicarius, olim scriba massarie*;

*Gianbartolomeo de Collis, vicarius, syndic of Caffa*;

*Alberto Bulla* *olim vicarius*.

---

1729 MC 1423, 133v, 172r, 206v, 244v, 245r, 253r. 
1730 MC 1423, 55r, 133r, 133v, 248v, 371r, 373v, 448r. 
1731 MC 1423, 42v, 189r. 
1732 MC 1423, 17v, 29v, 63r, 63v, 64r, 93v, 125r, 133r, 133v, 134r, 136r, 152v, 162v, 208r, 208v, 256v, 260r. 
1733 MC 1423, 81r. 
1734 MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 121v, 361v, 367v. 
1735 MC 1461, 43v, 45v, 46v, 6v, 6, 7, 7, 95v, 97v, 101v, 148r, 172v, 173, 173r, 173r bis, 180v, 201r, 204v, 206r, 206r bis, 239v, 311r, 407v end/408r reg, 408r end/407v reg, 408r end/407v reg bis. 
1736 MC 1461, 39v, 43r, 43v, 45v, 46r, 46r bis, 47v, 69v, 70v, 71v, 76v, 77v, 95v, 96v, 97v, 99r, 99r bis, 100r, 100r bis, 165v, 170v, 173r, 201v, 204v, 206v, 206r, 206r bis, 407r end/408v reg, 407v end/408r reg. 
1737 MC 1461, 170r. 
1738 MC 1461, 74v, 96v, 155v, 155v bis, 175v, 175v bis, 333r, 337r, 338r, 340v, 340v bis, 409v end/406r reg, 413r end/402v reg, 418r end/397v reg. 
1739 MC 1461, 131v, 140r, 175v, 364r, 366r, 380r. 
1740 MC 1461, 41r, 42v, 46r, 47r, 76r, 91r, 95v, 98v, 99r, 113v, 171r, 171r bis, 176v, 178r, 182v, 188v, 188v bis, 188v tris, 201v, 206r, 230v, 233v, 260r, 260r bis, 331r, 332r, 332v, 333r, 333v, 334r, 334r bis, 334r tris, 334v, 334v bis, 334v tris, 335r, 335r bis, 335r tris, 335v, 335v bis, 335v tris, 336r, 336r bis, 336r tris, 336v, 336v bis, 336v tris, 337r, 337r bis, 337v, 337v bis, 337v tris, 338r, 338r bis, 338r tris, 338v, 339r, 339r bis, 346r, 346r bis, 346v, 346v bis, 346v tris, 347r, 347r bis, 347v, 350v, 350v bis, 350v tris, 351r, 351r bis, 351r tris, 351v, 362r, 362v bis, 363r, 363r bis, 363v bis, 364r, 364v, 364v bis, 371r, 371r bis, 371v, 371v bis, 371v tris, 372r, 372r bis, 372r tris, 372v, 372v bis, 373r, 373r bis, 374r, 374r bis, 374v, 374v bis, 374v tris, 375r, 375r bis, 375r tris, 375v, 375v bis, 376r, 376r bis, 376r tris, 376v, 377r, 377s, 377v, 377v bis, 378r, 378r bis, 378v, 378v bis, 378v tris, 379r, 379r bis, 379v, 380r, 384r end/421v reg, 394v end/421v reg, 394v end/421r reg, 394v end/420v reg, 407r end/408v reg, 410r end/405v reg, 410r end/405v reg, 415v end/400r reg, 418r end/397v reg. 
1741 MC 1461, 75r, 98r, 131r, 132v, 205r, 206r, 406v end/409r reg, 407r end/408v reg. 
1742 MC 1461, 75r, 76r, 115r, 148v, 204r, 206r, 406v end/409r reg, 406v end/409r reg bis. 
1743 MC 1461, 47v, 71r, 72r, 76r, 96r, 204r, 206r.
provisor et massarius, above-mentioned Guirardo Lomellino, at different times consul Caffe and provisor et massarius. 

Illustrissimus dominus: Gianino de Campofregozo.

Dominus: of twelve of them six have a noble family name (cognomen), and five hold [important] positions.

Thus, the titles dominus etc. are normally applied to some office-holders with the exception of some high-standing local people such as Iorbey de Licona and a handful of nobles who are not office-holders, and were meant to highlight the grandeur of the position in the administration or the garrison.

What about the family names as an identifier of nobility? Putting together all those with noble cognomi we should not simply assume that all of them were noble (freedman as well as servants and other dependants could use their master’s family name). Thus, we cannot statistically take all people with noble cognomi as nobles. Nonetheless, putting them together gives us a good idea of the personal networks of members of alberghi, and helps us understand which of the Genoese patrician families together with their clientele and personal networks had stronger links to the Black Sea colonies of the Republic of St. George.

In 1423:

Doria 15, de Franchi 14, Spinola 14.

---

1744 MC 1461, 43r, 45v, 46r, 46v, 67r, 77r, 95v, 101v, 172v, 137r, 137r bis, 180v, 201v, 204v, 206r, 206r bis, 239v, 311r, 407v end/408r reg, 408r end/407v reg, 408r end/407v reg bis.
1745 MC 1461, 96r, 111r.
1746 MC 1461, 96v, 111v.
1747 Ansaldo, a citizen of Genoa, tax farmer, procurator of the Bank of St. George, MC 1423, 12r, et passim.
1749 Andrea MC 1423, 18v Battista, burgensis Caffe, emptor MC 1423, 11r, 30r, 33v, 34r, 44r, 55r, 74v, 121v, 127r, 129v, 144v, 146r, 147v, 149v, 231v, 241v, 261r Benedictus, a citizen of Genoa, MC 1423, 141v Carlo MC
Fieschi 13,1750
Gentile 13,1751
Adorno 8,1752
Recco 8,1753
Centurione 6,1754
Grillo 6,1755
Negro 6,1756


Cantelli 5, 1757
Lazzari 5, 1758
Lercari 5, 1759
Grimaldi 5, 1760
Marini 5, 1761
Lomellino 5, 1762
Pinelli 5, 1763
Salvago 5, 1764
Cattaneo 4, 1765
Levanto 4, 1766
Promontorio 4, 1767

1756 Benedictus interpres Caffe MC 1423, 45v, et passim. Danili magister orguxius Caffe Greek MC 1423, 45r, et passim. Ianonus MC 1423, 41v, 113v Ieronimus MC 1423, 42r, 115r Lucia MC 1423, 44v, 56v Iulianus socius burgi Soldaye MC 1423, 11r, 13r, 15v, 43v, 55r, 56v, 13r, 133v, 146r, 248v, 375v, 385v

1757 Alesianus/Alexianus burgensis Caffe MC 1423, 17r Francesco burgensis Caffe socius MC 1423, 248r, 283r Giovanni burgensis Caffe MC 1423, 122v, 123v, 231v Martinus burgensis Caffe MC 1423, 158v, 206v Sonichi Cantelli bazariotus Caffe bazariotus Greek MC 1423, 209r, 218v

1758 Andrea olim socius Soldaye MC 1423, 8r, 13r Antonio/Amonicus orguxius Caffe Lazzaro (Motta San Giovanni), Calabria? MC 1423, 92v, 313v Antonio socius castri Soldaye, orguxius Caffe, caput centurii? Lazzaro (Motta San Giovanni), Calabria? MC 1423, 15v, et passim. Giorgio prouisionatus Cimbali, interpres Lazzaro (Motta San Giovanni), Calabria? MC 1423, 13v, et passim. Obertus de Lazario Lazzari MC 1423, 42v, 178v

1759 Antoniotus burgensis Caffe prouisionatus Caffe, custos subbarbarie et darsine, olim oficialis deputatus super officis que annuati sortizantur? MC 1423, 2v, 56v, 133v, 245r, 264v, 268v Antonio MC 1423, 41r, 44r, 94r, 146r, 152v, 275r Guilielmus MC 1423, 445r Manoli patronus Greek MC 1423, 124r, 152r Ottobonus olim socius Caffe MC 1423, 42v, 178v

1760 Alarame MC 1423, 3r, 41r Ambrosius MC 1423, 3r, 41r Luchas MC 1423, 29v, et passim. Luchetus MC 1423, 83v, et passim. Obertus olim massarius Caffe MC 1423, 42v, 178v

1761 Augustinus a citizen of Genoa, sindicus et procurator Officii Sancti Georgii de Ianue, emptor commerchii magni Caffe Marino, Lazio OR Marina di Pisa? MC 1423, 6r, et passim. Bartolomeo Marino Marini MC 1423, 152v, 193v Gregorius MC 1423, 113v Olobey orguxius Caffe Muslim MC 1423, 13v, et passim. Pietro olim socius Caffe MC 1423, 42v, 190v

1762 Antonio MC 1423, 18v, 55v Benedictus MC 1423, 28v, 41r Giacomo a citizen of Genoa, bancherius, emptor introytus sive cabelle bestiaminum, officialis misericordie, emptor introytus commerchii magni Caffe, emptor commerchii, emptor commerchii Seuastopoli MC 1423, 8r, 9v, et passim. Martinus olim emptor commerchii magni Caffe MC 1423, 141r Tobias bancherius MC 1423, 29v, 126r, 126v, 146v, 226v, 227r

1763 Carolus MC 1423, 41v, 47r Filipus olim massarius Caffe MC 1423, 41v, 89v, 178r Francesco MC 1423, 41v, 93r, 172r, 192v, 208v Giorgio S prouisionatus Soldaye ballistarius MC 1423, 133r, 248r, 360v, 367v Giovanni de Pinulla Pinelli Pinella, Roquebrune-Cap-Martin, Francia MC 1423, 154r

1764 Babilanus prouisionatus Caffe MC 1423, 45r, 92v, 256r, 268v Francesco MC 1423, 33v, 68r, 93r, 126r Galeacius Salluigus Salvago burgensis Caffe MC 1423, 103v Giorgio de MC 1423, 41v Lodisius socius Samastri MC 1423, 42r, 141v

1765 Antonio olim socius castri Soldayi, socius Caffe MC 1423, 3v, 41r, 45r, 91r, 271v, 288v Galeiacius MC 1423, 41v, 102r Marco MC 1423, 113v Sistus scriba Officii capitum Sancti Antonii de Caffa, scriba officii capitum sarracenorum MC 1423, 45r, 243r, 248r, 253r

1766 Bartolomeo de Leuanto Levanto socius Cimbali additus *** guerre, olim socius Caffe MC 1423, 31r, 44r, 413r, 414v Domenico de Leuanto Levanto MC 1423, 41v, 66v Marco de Leuanto Levanto patronus MC 1423, 124r, 124r bis, 147r, 152r Niccolò de Leuanto Levanto MC 1423, 167r

344
Sauli 4,\textsuperscript{1768}
Zoagli 4,\textsuperscript{1769}
Ceva 3,\textsuperscript{1770}
Cicala 3,\textsuperscript{1771}
Garibaldi 3,\textsuperscript{1772}
Passano 3,\textsuperscript{1773}
de Savignone 3,\textsuperscript{1774}
Caretto 3,
Balbi 2,\textsuperscript{1775}
Cavo 2,\textsuperscript{1776}
Ceba 2,\textsuperscript{1777}
Dotto 2,\textsuperscript{1778}
Seminò 2,\textsuperscript{1779}
Ultramarino 2,\textsuperscript{1780}

\textsuperscript{1767} Luchas MC 1423, 135v Lucianus a citizen of Genoa, emptor introitus commerchii magni Caffe MC 1423, 17v, \textit{et passim}. Michael olim comitus galee Caffe MC 1423, 158v Pelegrinus ciuis et mercator fanue emptor introitus sive cabelle staziete MC 1423, 31r, \textit{et passim}.

\textsuperscript{1768} Giorgio de Saulo Sauli olim socius Samastri Greek MC 1423, 41v, 101r Giovanni de Saulo Sauli olim socius Samastri, patronus MC 1423, 42r, \textit{et passim}. Manfredus Sauli Sauli olim consul Caffe MC 1423, 11v, \textit{et passim}. Obertus de Saulo Sauli socius castri Soldaye MC 1423, 13r, 15v

\textsuperscript{1769} Antonio prouisionatus Soldaye interpres, olim emptor introitus capitum sclavorum et sclavarum MC 1423, 3r, \textit{et passim}. Bartolomeo egregius ur, dominus consul, castellanus et massarius Samastri MC 1423, 105r, \textit{et passim}. Niccolò officialis Soldaye, scriba Soldaye MC 1423, 170r, 355v, 357v Pietro MC 1423, 42v, 188r

\textsuperscript{1770} Antonio socius galee Caffe olim patronizate per Marcum Spinullam MC 1423, 172r, 217v Niccolò MC 1423, 171v Pietro socius Caffe MC 1423, 42v, 190v

\textsuperscript{1771} Antonio orguxius MC 1423, 10r Conradus a citizen of Genoa, emptor introitus commerchii magni Caffe, olim massarius Caffe, itturus ad dominum imperatorum Magni Horde MC 1423, 6r, \textit{et passim}. Ieronimus Cigalla Cicala a citizen of Genoa, MC 1423, 42r, 117v, 148v, 215r

\textsuperscript{1772} Leone MC 1423, 42r. Saul famulus Leo***, olim socius Samastri MC 1423, 43r, 214v Leo de Garibaldo filius Benedicti Garibaldi, filius Benedicti olim prouisionatus Caffe MC 1423, 141v

\textsuperscript{1773} Dagnanus burgensis Cimbali socius additus Cimbali loco Lodisii Grilacii subrogatus MC 1423, 210r, 406v Pietro socius Cimbali additus MC 1423, 46r, 194r, 248v, 412v, 414v Xsalono de Passano Passano MC 1423, 55v

\textsuperscript{1774} Antonio socius Cimbali additus Savignone, Genova, Liguria MC 1423, 241v, 248v, 412v, 414v Basilius socius Cimbali pro magistro Alberto de Alferis, prouisionatus Cimbali subrogatus loco Benedicti de Monte Acuto MC 1423, 91r, 159v, 194r, 401v, 403v, 410v, 414v Blassio MC 1423, 46r

\textsuperscript{1775} Giovanni notarius et scriba communis Caffe MC 1423, 10r, 11v, 16v, 30v, 34v, 44r, 53r, 57r, 63v, 64r, 118v, 120v, 129r, 253r, 276v Luchas MC 1423, 62v, 132v

\textsuperscript{1776} Francesco olim caput (-taneus?) et massarius Cimbali MC 1423, 89r Giacomo, filius Iohanis socius Caffe MC 1423, 136r, 170r, 210r, 210r bis, 245r, 274v

\textsuperscript{1777} Ambrosius MC 1423, 5r, 41r, 78v Gabriel ciuis CAFE MC 1423, 59r, 60r, 120r, 108r

\textsuperscript{1778} Simon prouisionatus Caffe MC 1423, 11r, 248r, 258r, 268v, 447v Tommaso burgensis Caffe curator et tutor, emptor introitus sive cabelle censarie Caffe MC 1423, 9v, 44v, 63v, 107r, 124r, 152r, 195r, 225r, 225r bis, 226v

\textsuperscript{1779} Antonio MC 1423, 18r, 55v Bartolomeo, subcaualerius MC 1423, 45r, 92v, 136r, 152v, 191v, 210r, 210r, 231v
Usodimare 2, 1781
Vento 2, 1782
Bombello 1, 1783
de Camilla 1, 1784
Campi 1, 1785
Campofregoso 1, 1786
Castagna 1, 1787
de Castello 1, 1788
Foglietta 1, 1789
Frevante 1, 1790
Gallo 1, 1791
Garetti 1, 1792
Giudice 1, 1793
Giustiniani 1, 1794
Imperiale 1, 1795
de Mari 1, 1796
Marruffo 1, 1797
Musso 1, 1798
Paoli 1, 1799

1780 Badasal socius burgi Soldaye MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 45v, 120v, 133r, 248v, 376v, 385v Simon socius burgi Soldaye MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 43v, 133r, 248v, 376v, 385v
1781 Andrea consul Synopi sive Silario MC 1423, 7v, 41r, 62v Gabriel officialis MC 1423, 54r, 147r
1782 Giovanni MC 1423, 79v Manuel Ventus Vento socius Caffe MC 1423, 57r, et passim.
1783 Giovanni olim uicarius Caffe MC 1423, 42r, 114v
1784 Carolus quondam Leonis MC 1423, 41r, 47r
1785 Giacomo socius burgi Soldaye MC 1423, 13r, 43v, 56v, 133r, 133v, 244r, 248v, 375r, 385v
1786 Battista dominus olim consul Samastri MC 1423, 27v, 41r Domenico MC 1423, 41v, 66v
1787 Giovanni lime-maker MC 1423, 42r, 116r
1788 Giorgio placerus Caffe MC 1423, 92v, 170r, 207v, 231v, 245r, 248r, 319v, 322v, 320v, 322v
1789 Badasal olim socius Caffe MC 1423, 29r, 41r
1790 Giacomo MC 1423, 42r, 116r
1791 Guilielmus socius Samastri MC 1423, 41v, 102v
1792 Obertus notarius MC 1423, 108r, 262r
1793 Tommaso a citizen of Genoa, MC 1423, 94v, 226v, 242v
1794 Girolamo cius Iannue, spectabilis dominus, egregius dominus alter massarius et prouisor ciuitatis Caffe, icturus Soldaye MC 1423, 1r, 6v, et passim.
1795 Domenico MC 1423, 26v
1796 Cosma a citizen of Genoa, prouisionatus Caffe Greek MC 1423, 45r, 255v, 245r
1797 Antonio quondam Iohannis dominus olim consul Caffe, civis Ianue MC 1423, 2r, 7r, 41r, 54v
1798 Angelus socius burgi Soldaye MC 1423, 13, et passim. Giovanni olim consul, castellanus, capitaneus et massarius Soldaye MC 1423, 33v, 44r, 105r, 121v, 172v, 245r
1799 Gentile MC 1423, 106v, 206v
de Porta 1, 1800
Ratto 1, 1801
Rebuffo 1, 1802
Roccatagliata 1, 1803
Sacco 1, 1804
Teodorini 1, 1805
Veneroso 1, 1806
Vivaldi 1, 1807

In 1461:
Allegro 12, 1808
Serra 10, 1809
Spinola 10, 1810
Adorno 8, 1811
Doria 8, 1812

1800 Giovanni caualerius officialis Soldaye, caualerius Soldaye MC 1423, 43r, 354r, 357v
1801 Girolamo socius Cimbali MC 1423, 46r, 194r, 194r bis, 197v, 248v, 410v, 414v
1802 Giovanni MC 1423, 42r, 114v
1803 Girolamo socius castri Soldaye MC 1423, 13r, 13v, 15v, 42r, 95r, 116v, 389r, 393r
1804 Francesco seruiens Caffe MC 1423, 51r, 135r, 328v, 337v
1805 Giacomo de Roddo Teodorini socius Samastri Rhodes MC 1423, 425r, 436r-v
1806 Raffael Veneroso Veneroso MC 1423, 61r, 209v
1807 Paris de Viualdis Vivaldi a citizen of Genoa, MC 1423, 42v, 191r
Lomellino 8,

Gentile 7,

Giustiniani 7,

Salvago 7

de Porta 6

Cantelli 5

Fieschi 5

de Franchi 5

Giudice 5

Negro 5

---


1816 Bartolomeo MC 1461, 74r Domenico placerius Caffe MC 1461, 39v, et passim. Donatus MC 1461, 44v Francesco MC 1461, 43r Galeotus MC 1461, 95r, 406r end/409v reg Iustinianus MC 1461, 74r Martinus MC 1461, 74r

1817 Antonio socius Caffe MC 1461, 131v, et passim. reg Benedictus socius Caffe MC 1461, 156r, et passim. Lazarinus MC 1461, 139v, 165r Lazarus socius castrum Cimbali MC 1461, 44r, et passim. Lodixius MC 1461, 45v Matteus socius Cimbali MC 1461, 164v, 176r, 379r, 382r, 410r end/405v reg.


Semino 5
Calvi 4
Garibaldi 4
Levanto 4
Marruffo 4
Usodimare 4
Vivaldi 4
Boggio 3
Ceva 3
Squarciafico 3
Basadonne 2
Benedetti (de) 2
Cattaneo 2
Cavallo 2
Centurione 2

1823 Andrea socius Cimbali MC 1461, 44r, et passim. Andrea MC 1461, 156r, 239v Bartolomeo MC 1461, 46v Giovanni prouisionatus Soldaie MC 1461, 332v, 340v Giovanni Bartolomeo MC 1461, 115r, 406v end/409r reg
1826 Battista socius Caffe, acimator MC 1461, 45r, et passim. Domenico socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum MC 1461, 45v, et passim. Giacomo socius Caffe MC 1461, 44v, et passim.
1828 Antonio MC 1461, 246r Antonio MC 1461, 45r, et passim. Battista socius Caffe MC 1461, 175r, et passim. Giovanni socius Caffe MC 1461, 175r, 275r, 287v, 409r end/406v reg
1829 Abram MC 1461, 43v, 148r, 188v, 188v bis Gregorius MC 1461, 73r Guiraldus notarius massarie nostre MC 1461, 41r, et passim. Valentino MC 1461, 99v, 99v bis, 155v, 174v, 258r, 287r, 408v end/407r reg
1830 Antonio socius castrum Cimbali MC 1461, 44r, 164v, 176r, 394v end/421r reg, 396r end/419v reg, 407v end/408r reg, 410r end/405v reg Bartolomeo socius Caffe MC 1461, 73r, et passim. Lodixius socius Caffe MC 1461, 40r, et passim.
1831 Bartolomeo MC 1461, 40r, et passim. Enrichus prouisionatus Soldaie MC 1461, 44r, et passim. Francesco prouisionatus Soldaie MC 1461, 40r, et passim.
1832 Giovanni MC 1461, 43r, 110v, 112r, 212r, 238v, 242r, 306r, 307v, 308v, 406v end/409r reg Iulianus MC 1461, 110v, 406v end/409r reg Giovanni Battista, socius Caffe MC 1461, 99v, et passim.
1833 Battista socius Caffe MC 1461, 45r, et passim. Giovanni MC 1461, 111r, 406v end/409r reg
1834 Antonio prouisionatus Soldaie, interpres MC 1461, 44r, et passim. Francesco socius castrorum Soldaie MC 1461, 40r, et passim.
1835 Caloaiane prouisionatus Cimbali Greek MC 1461, 44r, et passim. Christianus emptor cabelle vini, emptor aspri unius MC 1461, 38v, et passim.
1836 Caualmus MC 1461, 43r Oliuerius MC 1461, 72v, 156v, 337v
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Adanus socius Caffe, castellanus Soldaie</td>
<td>MC 1461, 73v, et passim. Sistus ambassador ad dominum ChiJhibei?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Gregorius</td>
<td>MC 1461, 46v, 46v bis, 95r, 113v, 164v Ieronimus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Tommaso notarius unus ex scribis curie</td>
<td>MC 1461, 41v, 46r, 163r, 203r, 206r, 308v, 408r end/407v reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>MC 1461, 306r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1853 | Bartolomeo | MC 1461, 155v, 277r | 1854 | Domenico socius Cimbali | MC 1461, 44r, et passim. | 350
Carretto 1\textsuperscript{1856}
Cavo 1\textsuperscript{1857}
Ferrari 1\textsuperscript{1858}
Ghisolfi 1\textsuperscript{1859}
Malocello 1\textsuperscript{1860}
de Mari 1\textsuperscript{1861}
Marini 1\textsuperscript{1862}
Montaldo 1\textsuperscript{1863}
Pallavicino 1\textsuperscript{1864}
Pinelli 1\textsuperscript{1865}
Ponte 1\textsuperscript{1866}
Promontorio 1\textsuperscript{1867}
Raimondi 1\textsuperscript{1868}
Ratto 1\textsuperscript{1869}
Rolando 1\textsuperscript{1870}
Scotto 1\textsuperscript{1871}
Sexino 1\textsuperscript{1872}
Stella 1.\textsuperscript{1873}

Thus, from the list above we can conclude that in the fifteenth century Genoese Gazaria was predominantly the field of action of patrician families such as the Adorno, Allegro, Doria,
Gentile, Giustiniani, Fieschi, de Franchi, Lomellino, Salvago, Serra, and Spinola. These families are the most visible, and their members often held positions in the administration and the garrison, and largely controlled tax-farming and trade in the area.

The notion and legal practice of citizenship in the Italian medieval city-state had long been a debatable issue;\textsuperscript{1874} moreover, the legal definition of citizen and citizenship differed in Italy significantly from one city-state to another.\textsuperscript{1875} In Genoa, the Latin word standing for a citizen, that is \textit{civis}, meant something more than the burger (\textit{burgensis}), which I will discuss below. The status \textit{civis Ianue} (I have avoided the English word ‘citizen’) meant that its holder had full political rights for participation in ruling the republic as well as its colonies; this means, eventually, that \textit{civis Ianue} in many cases equalled a member of the patriciate, even when the title \textit{dominus} or \textit{nobilis vir} is omitted by the scribe. The \textit{cives} were in Genoa fully-fledged citizens being allowed to take part fully in the political life and governance of the city. In Caffa they stood above \textit{burgenses} having more rights,\textsuperscript{1876} whether because \textit{cives} in principle were elevated above the \textit{burgenses}, or by virtue of nobility of most of the Genoese citizens coming to Caffa. The \textit{cives} in Caffa had to own houses in the citadel,\textsuperscript{1877} which was actually a visible physical distinction between them and the lower strata of inhabitants, \textit{burgenses}, who were meant to live in the burgs, although this was not always


\textsuperscript{1875} Kirshner, Civitas sibi faciat civem 694. See also: Kirshner, Between nature and culture an opinion of Baldus of Perugia on Venetian citizenship as second nature.
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strictly observed. Thus we cannot infer whether the status of *civis/burgensis* was personal or linked to ownership of property in the citadel or burgs. On the other hand, what we do know is that while *burgenses* could be made up of all sorts of people, even from the most modest social background, the category of *cives* roughly, though perhaps not completely, coincided with that of the patriciate.

Citizenship was normally connected to the metropolis of Genoa (*civis Iauensis*, see e.g. a document listing the citizens;\(^{1878}\) one could be a *burgensis* or *habitator* in Caffa or any other colony, but a citizen of Genoa. It appears that this is a feature revealing an essentially colonial nature of the Genoese overseas domains: on the one hand, they were not ‘extended Genoa’; on the other hand, people there were Genoese citizens and remained linked to the metropolis.\(^{1879}\) However, it looks as if besides the Genoese citizenship there was also citizenship of Caffa. *Cives Caphe* are mentioned in the notarial deeds of the fifteenth century,\(^{1880}\) and according to Balard the rights of *cives* and *burgenses* were becoming roughly equal, the main difference being that *cives* lived in the citadel, while *burgenses* lived in the burgs, which indeed seems to have been the case.\(^{1881}\) It seems that the Genoese or other nobility was an unofficial requirement for Caffa citizenship.

Reading the *Massariae Caffae* we note that the title of *civis* is used sporadically and pretty much in the same way as the titles *dominus* or *nobilis vir*; it was mainly applied to the office-holders and to tax farmers. In 1461 it is not used a single time, whereas in the *Massaria Caffae* 1423 there are four *cives Caffe* (indeed a rare describer) and thirty-one *cives Iannue*. Seventeen of the *cives Iannue* have a noble *cognomen*, which is expected, and indeed it is unclear why the rest do not (perhaps they preferred to identify themselves differently). Twenty-three Genoese citizens holding an office in administration or were tax farmers; this fits my initial hypothesis that normally the titles are used together with the names of the offices and positions.

To end with titles, I should mention the one that had nothing to do with either nobility or citizenship was that of *magister*, or maestro. Being applied to a person, it could mean: (1) a Master’s academic university degree; (2) proficiency in some kind of arts and crafts, and

\(^{1878}\) ASG, Sindicamenta Peire 1402, f. 70v.  
arguably sometimes also headship in a Western-style guild; headship in some military team, such as the one of the crossbowmen; (4), a position in the schooling system of Caffa, in this case a title magister and the name of the position magister scholarum are often used separately.

In 1423, there are fifteen persons described as magister, including: three magistri scholarum (Vincenzo de Merlano, Alberto de Alferiis, and Oberto de Alferiis, perhaps these two people are one and the same?), one interpreter (Niccolò de Bassignana), one physician (Tommaso de Ferrara, fixicus et medicus comunis), one barber (Nicolino de Novàra), a public crier (Francesco de civitate Pennarum cirigicus), and three artisans, notably two of them Greek (a blacksmith Christodorus, a baker and a custos nocturnus Caffe Danili, and a painter Matteo Rizzo). For the rest of them the reason for using this title is not clear, because they do not bear any additional describers.

In Massaria Caffae 1461, there are twenty magistri: two barbers (Giovani de Bonifacio and Giovani subcapitaneus Soldaie), one axeman (Guglielmo, magister assie), and two artisans (blacksmith Cen[***] and builder Niccolò murator), for the rest of them we do not know the reason for using this title, since the additional describers are missing.

**Burgenses.** Normally in Italian practice a burgensis was a burgher or a property-owner domiciled in the city, and therefore had certain rights, privileges, and obligations. The

---

1882 The Oriental heads of artisans, like builders and stonemasons, were called protomastori (a mix of a Greek word “protos” and an Italian vernacular “maestro”). They were not guild masters in the Western European sense, and their working teams were not guilds. The protomastori were rather taskmasters of the local teams, responsible before the Genoese authorities of Caffa.

1883 MC 1423, 15v, 44v, 45v, 133r, 133v, 133v bis, 232r, 248r.

1884 MC 1423, 45r, 113r, 122r, 125v, 132v, 133v, 136r, 172v, 225v, 248r, 259r, 262r, 268v, 277r.

1885 MC 1423, 59r, 126v, 159v, 258v, 341v.

1886 MC 1423, 42v, 43r, 53v, 58v, 57r, 75r, 76r, 76r bis, 76v, 85v, 126r, 168r, 171r, 248r, 315r, 318r.

1887 MC 1423, 125v, 130r, 133v, 136r, 152v, 248r, 255r, 268v, 276r, 277r.

1888 MC 1423, 16v, 45r, 245r, 259v, 268v.

1889 MC 1423, 13v, 45r, 126v, 245r, 260v, 268v.

1890 MC 1423, 50r.

1891 MC 1423, 55r, 147v, 248r, 276v, 342v, 352v, 447v.

1892 MC 1423, 82r, 82v.

1893 MC 1461, 71r.

1894 MC 1461, 75r, 139r, 155v, 174r, 213r, 408v end/407v reg.

1895 MC 1461, 44r, 156r, 174r, 175v, 236v, 338v, 407v end/408 reg, 408v end/407r reg.

1896 MC 1461, 45r, 76r, 175r, 283r, 287v, 409r end/406v reg.

1897 MC 1461, 71r.

1898 For burgenses see Jacoby, “Citoyens, sujets et protégés de Venise et de Gènes en Chypre du XIIIe au XVe siècle,” in *Recherches sur le Méditerranée Orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle: Peuples, sociétés, économies*
burghers of Caffa are first mentioned in the thirteenth century,\(^{1899}\) at this point either as just \textit{burgenses} or sometimes as \textit{burgenses et habitatores de Caffa}.\(^{1900}\) In the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth century the role of \textit{burgenses} of Caffa in administration relatively grew, as the burgs grew (however, they were always far from outplacing nobility/cives from the leading positions). Thus, the deeds of Lamberto de Sambuceto mention just one Ligurian person, who was called \textit{burgensis Caffe}, which is a sign of the formative stage of the colony, high renovation of the population, and low stability. About fifty years later, in the deeds of Niccolò Beltrame (1343-1344), there are twenty-three persons (7% of the total mentioned) who are referred to as \textit{habitatores et burgenses de Caffa}, both Latin and Orientals.\(^{1901}\) In 1361, three Genoese in Chilia describe themselves as \textit{burgenses de Caffa}.\(^{1902}\) In 1374–1387, those who chose Caffa as their place of permanent residence are already significant.\(^{1903}\)

According to the Statute of 1449, in Caffa the word \textit{burgensis} meant a person living in the burg and enjoying a certain degree of legal rights, in contrast to those living in the citadel.\(^{1904}\) This easily explains why in the preceding époque there were many non-Latins, e.g. Greeks, Armenians, and Georgians,\(^{1905}\) among the \textit{burgenses}.\(^{1906}\) Nonetheless, there were restrictions connected to this status, since only a Christian could be a \textit{burgensis},\(^{1907}\) thus excluding Muslims and Jews.\(^{1908}\) Such \textit{burgenses} were virtually Orientals naturalized as Genoese – the Republic of St. George did not confer citizenship on Orientals, but gave them most of the rights afforded by citizenship.\(^{1909}\) It was once suggested that the \textit{burgenses} were the non-Genoese patriciate of Caffa,\(^{1910}\) and indeed the status of a burgher was normally given by the Genoese to the Oriental urban elite close in its standing to the nobility,\(^{1911}\) or to merchants.\(^{1912}\) However, obviously, the majority of burghers were Genoese, Ligurians, and

---

\(^{1899}\) Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-Mer}, No. 190, 598.
\(^{1901}\) Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 1, 258.
\(^{1902}\) Pistarino, \textit{Nota genovesi}, No. 54, 55, 60, 62, 65, 69, 81, 85.
\(^{1904}\) ASG, Notaio Giovanni Balbi; Not. Ignoti, Busta 24.
\(^{1906}\) Sometimes, however, exceptions were made: Airaldi, \textit{Studi e documenti}, No. 44.
\(^{1908}\) [Badyan, Chiperis]. Бадян, В. В., А. М. Чиперис, “Торговля Каффы в XIII – XV вв. [Trade of Caffa in the thirteenth-fifteenth centuries], in \textit{Feudal Tavrica} (Kiev, 1974), 175.
\(^{1910}\) Schreiner, \textit{Bizantini e genovesi a Caffa}, 97-100.
other Western Europeans, who did not have a noble background and therefore would not normally qualify to be *cives Caphe*, even though many of them were *cives Ianue*\(^\text{1913}\) - the group of the burghers was larger, more heterogeneous, and much more inclusive than the one of the *cives*.

*Burgenses* had to be permanently resident in Caffa, own property in the burgs, participate in the city initiatives, and pay taxes.\(^\text{1914}\) Legally, they were considered equal to the Genoese, but not Genoese\(^\text{1915}\) (apart from cases when they already had Genoese citizenship but not Caffiote citizenship). Therefore, they had all same privileges, monopolies, and immunities as the Genoese, and all the rights of free trade and free passage applicable to the Genoese were also applicable to the *burgenses*.\(^\text{1916}\) On the other hand, they also had same responsibilities as the citizens of Genoa, and the limitations imposed on the Genoese also applied to *burgenses*, most importantly those concerning illegal alliances and offshore trade with the Muslim rulers, as well as a ban to engage into salt mining; similarly, they could not build castles and fortifications without the permission of the Genoese authorities, or be engaged in collecting the *commerchium canluchorum*, etc.\(^\text{1917}\) In Caffa the *burgenses* enjoyed considerable political rights, having one-fifth of positions in the municipal magistrates according to the regulations of 1316 and half of these positions in 1449. The question of belonging to this group was decided by the consul – to be enrolled as a *burgensis* a person had to originate from Genoa or Liguria or be the son or daughter of a Genoese father, with two witnesses to testify to this.\(^\text{1918}\) Sometimes, however, these requirements were taken in a relaxed manner, especially in the cases of legalizing illegitimate children or the children of mixed marriages,\(^\text{1919}\) and obviously, in cases where the consul *motu proprio* received the Orientals into the status of *burgenses* this requirement was waived.

The regularity of usage of the title *burgensis* in the *Massariae Caffae* seems to follow the same logic as the use of the titles *dominus, nobilis vir*, or *civis*: namely, the title is in many cases omitted even when simple logic shows us that a person had it, and used mostly when the person was an office-holder or a tax farmer. Thus, in *Massaria Caffae* 1423, there

\(^{1914}\) Statutum Caphe, 636.
\(^{1915}\) Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 380.
\(^{1916}\) This created a problem for the neighbouring states like the Byzantine Empire or the Empire of Trebizond, who were not favouring the growing strata of people exempt of their taxation and tolls policies. А.Г. Еманов, Латиняне и нелатиняне в Кафе, 115-116. This was probably the reason for legal provisions of 1449 that explicitly forbade the Genoese to use their status conducting trade on behalf of the foreigners.
\(^{1917}\) Statutum Caphe, 628-629, 636-637, 644.
\(^{1918}\) Imposicio Officii Gazariae, col. 348, 401.
are 39 burgenses of Caffa (besides these 39, there are also 2 burgenses of Cembalo, 5 burgenses of Pera, and two burgenses of Soldaia). 15 out of 39 burgenses of Caffa have noble cognomen (albeit it was obviously not a must to be a noble to become a burgensis of Caffa, unlike the status of civis, which is an equivalent of belonging to the Genoese patriciate). 25 out of 39 burgenses of Caffa hold an office in administration or were tax farmers; this confirms what I stated above. In 1461, there is only one mention of a burgensis Caffe – Giovani Gentile1920 – which makes me think that although the status of burgensis as a legal category continued to define the social reality of Caffa, its use in the curial paperwork became obsolete.

Habitatores. Habitatores were in legal terms a lower strata of Caffa’s free inhabitants, both Latin and Oriental, owning real estate in Caffa, residing in the city for more than a year,1921 paying taxes, without electoral rights,1922 but with a license to work in the sphere of trade and craftsmanship within the Genoese jurisdiction, as well as the Genoese legal protection of their person and property.1923 Unlike the burgenses, they were literally just inhabitants of Caffa, and while the former enjoyed all the rights of the Genoese citizens being considered everywhere pro ianuensibus, the latter did not. Thus, most of non-Ligurian people from the West, as well as many Orientals were by default habitatores, and unlike the burgenses it was not even mandatory to be a Christian; it looks as if this status was open for people from any ethnic and religious background, and the main, if not only requirement was to live in Caffa for a year.1924 There was a clear border between the canluchi, who were vassals of Caffa, but under the legal jurisdiction of the Tatar Khans, and the habitatores

Caphe, who were indictable only to the consul and his magistrates. A khanluck could become a habitator after he had lived in Caffa for a year, and the Khan’s authorities including the Lords of Solkhat and the titanus canluchorum lost every kind of jurisdiction over such people and their families. Most of the habitatores were merchants and artisans, but among them there are all kinds of people from knights to peons and other popoli piccolo. Some of them were so poor that they tried to sell themselves into slavery, which was thence explicitly and severely prohibited by special provisions of the Statutes of Caffa and carried a fine of 1,000 aspres. The fact that habitatores including those who came from the khanlucks were protected under the laws of Caffa, that they were indictable only to the Commune, and that their personal freedom was guaranteed means that to a certain extent they were becoming Genoese Caffiotes. Indeed, they were to a certain extent members of the Commune covered by the Genoese law and the legislation of Caffa.

In Massaria Caffae 1461 there is no mention of habitatores at all, which makes me think that the fate of this describer was the same as that of burgensis: its usage in the curial paperwork became obsolete, although it was still in use as a legal category. Nonetheless, the describer was still very widely used in 1423, although we do not have the regularity of its us and/or omission. There does not seem to be any clear logic behind why the scribe chose to underline the presence of this status. There are eight people styled habitator, many of them Orientals, either Greeks or converts to Catholicism: a stonemason Caloiane son of Teodori, who was sent to Simisso to work on the reconstruction of the castle, another stonemason Nicolla de Coichaise, sent to Simisso for the same purpose, Teodorus de Soldaya, who was appointed as orguxius Caffe instead of Olmassi Ichatti, Vassili, Dimitrius de Caiachara, servant of Teodori Cassani from Cimbalo serving as orguxius Caffe (this Dimitrius was in fact habitator Cimbali), Sottira Iachoichi from Lusta (modern Alushta), habitator in Soldaia, orguxius Caffe, Giovanni Catolicus, olim turchus, and Marietta Catolica, habitatrix in castro. Although it was important for a person to have rights as a

---

1925 Statutum Caphe, 635-636, 650. 1926 Musso, Gli orientali nei notai genovesi di Caffa, 97-110. Pistarino, I Gin dell ‘Oltremare, 122. G. Airaldi, “Etnie e strati negli insediamenti medieval i italiani del Mar Nero,” 249. 1927 MC 1423, 438r, 446r. 1928 MC 1423, 437v, 446r, 446v. 1929 MC 1423, 60r, 83r, 248r, 303v, 313v. 1930 MC 1423, 43r, 231r. 1931 MC 1423, 56v, 245r, 302r, 313v, 447r. 1932 MC 1423, 217r, 299v. 1933 MC 1423, 81v, 113r. 1934 MC 1423, 42r, 156v.
habitator, in the paperwork of the massarii this describer was most commonly applied when the person lived in some specific place and temporarily moved to another place.

**Professional division of the population of Caffa**

What other overlapping social groups are there, apart from these legally defined categories connected to the measure of rights?

*Merchants.* Ibn Battuta visited Caffa in the 1330s and wrote that there all the inhabitants were merchants. In a certain sense it was true, because people from all social strata from noblemen belonging to aristocratic families down to slaves, servants, and recent freedmen were generally engaged in trade in one way or another – investing in trade, conducting it personally, giving loans, issuing letters of cambium, appointing procurators etc. However, if almost all Latins invested in some commercial transactions, there was also a group of people – aristocrats, popolani, and employees, for whom trade was a main profession. The majority of merchants were the Genoese themselves, followed by other Ligurians, other Italians, other Latins, and Orientals. They were engaged in diverse commercial activities, and arguably some types of merchants with a certain specialization or of a certain scale can be identified. The old Genoese aristocracy together with some nouveau riche from the popolani was the supreme group that stood above the rest and directed the trade. In 1289–1290, Genoese noblemen constituted a large part of those mentioned in deeds of Sambuceto, which is evidence that the commerce was mainly in the hands of nobility, who often worked in partnerships. In the deeds of Sambuceto, over 50% of the mentioned partnerships had a capital ranging from 1,000 to 5,000 aspri; 17.5% of them had capital from 5,000 to 10,000 aspri; 13.5% had funds above 10,000 aspri. Apart from the relations of stationary and travelling partners, merchants could sometimes simply hire trade agents: thus, in 1290, Guglielmo de Salucio hired Bonacia de Astrico to conduct trade on his behalf and fixed his salary at 1,200 aspri for eight and a half months, thus more than 141 aspri per month, which is almost three-quarters of the regular consul’s salary. The group of merchants can be characterized by considerable wealth in terms of money, goods, and real

---

1935 Ibn Batoutah, 358.
1937 Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, 237. For place of provenance see Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, 243. The natives of Genoa among the people mentioned in deeds from 1289-1290 were 128 out of a total of 698.
estate, and also by fast liquidity of all three groups of property, since they extracted money from one sector to invest it into another with a remarkable intensiveness.\textsuperscript{1939} For them, more than for anybody else, profit was the key issue and the ultimate goal of their activity in Gazaria. Before the crisis, the merchants of the earlier period (as in 1289–1290\textsuperscript{1940} or 1344)\textsuperscript{1941} bequeath in their wills mainly money, with a considerably varying amounts. Later on, in the less stable commercial situation, the diversification of capital became more important. Balard narrates a case of a rich Caffiote called Pietro di Fontaneggio, who left a good amount of expensive clothes, utensils, jewellery, money, and loans given by him; this is an example that the funds of such people were pretty much diversified \textendash; in addition to their capital invested in trade, they also invested in land, houses, financing the state, etc.\textsuperscript{1942} This diversification or distribution of investments could however occur earlier, because the profit margin of the merchants in the Black Sea area.\textsuperscript{1943} Merchants could be either from a Latin or Oriental background. There are different types of their scope, which could vary from transcontinental to regional or even local (e.g. small-scale retailers and hawkers called bazarriotae), as well as all kind of specialization on various traded commodities.

Traders and other commercial people are repeatedly mentioned in the \textit{Massariae Caffae}, although rarely (if ever) as merchants. The title \textit{mercator} was used, for instance, in the Venetian notarial deeds from Tana in the same period, but it was not the preferred describer for the \textit{massarii}, even when they are writing about large-scale deals involving large sums of money. There are few exception such as Pelegrino de Promontorio, who was styled \textit{civis et mercator Iamue};\textsuperscript{1944} otherwise, we hardly ever find this reference. However, what the scribes really found necessary to indicate were the more specific professions connected to trade and money otherwise. \textit{Massaria Caffae} 1423 holds mentions of five drapers or haberdashers (\textit{draperii}) Giovanni de Gentile, son of deceased Caizer,\textsuperscript{1945} Giovanni de San Francesco,\textsuperscript{1946} Marco Adorno,\textsuperscript{1947} Niccolò Adorno,\textsuperscript{1948} and Niccolò Logio.\textsuperscript{1949} Besides that, there are three

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1939} Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 1, 341.
\item \textsuperscript{1940} Brătianu, \textit{Actes des notaires}, No. 228. Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, No. 704, 882.
\item \textsuperscript{1941} Notai genovesi in Oltremare, No. 15, 19, 32.
\item \textsuperscript{1942} Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 1, 342.
\item \textsuperscript{1943} Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, 38.
\item \textsuperscript{1944} MC 1423, 31r, 42v, 44v, 57v, 64r, 68r, 105r, 119v, 122v, 126r, 126v, 127r, 142r, 151r, 157v, 191v, 193r, 194r, 196v.
\item \textsuperscript{1945} MC 1423, 44r, 77v, 79r, 119r, 128r, 136r.
\item \textsuperscript{1946} MC 1423, 32v, 76v, 77r, 83v, 126v, 126v bis, 130r, 131r.
\item \textsuperscript{1947} MC 1423, 55r, 81r, 82r, 83r, 126r, 136r.
\item \textsuperscript{1948} MC 1423, 32v, 75r, 76v, 84v, 126r, 130r, 171v, 172r, 180v, 231v, 231v bis, 278r.
\item \textsuperscript{1949} MC 1423, 170r.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
weighers of gold and silver (*ponderatores auri et argenti*), one of them also an officer in the
bank and in the mint, sons of deceased Isac brothers Battista\(^\text{1950}\) and Giuliano,\(^\text{1951}\) and Pietro
de Roncho, *ponderator auri et argenti ad bancum communis Ianue in Caffa, officialis ceche Caffe*.\(^\text{1952}\) We should add two proxy agents of brokers (*censarii*), Armenian Agops,\(^\text{1953}\) and a
broker in wool trade (*censarius lani*) Konstantinos Cocharinus,\(^\text{1954}\) a banker (*bancherius*)
Gregorio *rubeus* (i.e. he could be of Russian origin) and two other bankers, both from the
same family, Tobia Lomellino\(^\text{1955}\) and Giacomo Lomellinus, the latter also being a tax farmer
(*emptor introytus sive cabelle bestiaminum, emptor introytus commerchii magni Caffe, emptor commerchii Seuastopoli*), and an officer in a commission (*officialis misericordie*).\(^\text{1956}\)

In 1461, the mentions of people connected to trade are scarcer; nonetheless, there is a proxy
agent/broker (*censarius*), and once again it is an Armenian called Aragop;\(^\text{1957}\) besides that,
there are a banker Gaspare Giudice\(^\text{1958}\) and a former banker Paolo Doria.\(^\text{1959}\)

**Tax farmers.** Tax farmers are perhaps the most numerous among all kind of
occupations mentioned in the *Massariae Caffae*. First, there were a large number of different
taxes. Second, tax farmers had contact with the treasury, and therefore with the *massarii*,
more often than anybody else. We can make an interesting observation – many tax farmers
were given the title *civis Ianuelburgensis Caffe*, which is normally only used among the
officers. This means that to a certain extent tax farmers were considered as part of an
‘extended colonial administration’. Otherwise it is hard to explain why the scribes almost
always applied the title *civis Ianuelburgensis Caffe* to the tax farmers as well as the titles
*dominus* and *nobilis vir*, when they are noble. The only possible explanation is that in this

\(^{1950}\) MC 1423, 29r, 34r, 41r.
\(^{1951}\) MC 1423, 29r, 41r.
\(^{1952}\) MC 1423, 45r, 56v, 59r, 196r, 226v, 242v, 245r, 248r, 253r, 262v, 268v.
\(^{1953}\) MC 1423, 83v.
\(^{1954}\) MC 1423, 41r, 47r.
\(^{1955}\) MC 1423, 29v, 126r, 126v, 146v, 226v, 227r.
\(^{1956}\) MC 1423, 8r, 9v, 10r, 11r, 13r, 14r, 14v, 16r, 32r, 32v, 33v, 34r, 42r, 44r, 44v, 53v, 55r, 57v, 58v, 59r, 59v, 62v, 68v, 74v, 79r, 81r, 81v, 84r, 91r, 93r, 103v, 104r, 105r, 105r bis, 107r, 108r, 118r, 118v, 120r, 121v, 122r, 122v, 123v, 125r, 126r, 126v bis, 127r, 127r, 128v, 129r, 129v, 130r, 131v, 132r, 132v, 133r, 134v, 143v, 146v, 149r, 149v, 151r, 152v, 159v, 160v, 171r, 171v, 181v, 191r, 191v, 193v, 194r, 195r, 196r, 196v, 208v, 209v, 215v, 225r, 225v, 226r, 231v, 241r, 241v, 242v, 242v, 245v, 255r, 259r, 260v, 278r, 445r.
\(^{1957}\) MC 1461, 76v.
\(^{1958}\) MC 1461, 37r, 39r, 39v, 40v, 41r, 41v, 43r, 43r, 44r, 46r, 69v, 76r, 77r, 77v, 95v, 96r, 96v, 97v, 97v bis, 98r, 98v, 99r, 99v, 101r, 101v, 111v, 111v, 112r, 139v, 139v bis, 139v tris, 148r, 157r, 163r, 164r, 164v, 171r, 171r bis, 172r, 172r bis, 178v, 182r, 204r, 211v, 245r, 254v, 255r, 258r, 261v, 268r, 300v, 303v, 306r, 331v, 363v, 406v end/409r reg, 406v end/409r reg, 408v end/407v reg, 412r end/403v reg, 418r end/397v reg.
\(^{1959}\) MC 1461, 163r, 407r end/408v reg.
way the scribe underlined the fact that the tax farmer was part of the ruling system and acted in a state capacity. Doubtless, the tax farmers constituted part of the elite of the Genoese Black Sea colonies, being mostly from large Genoese patrician families and often switching from holding an office to tax farming and *vice versa*. As we will see below, it was not uncommon to combine tax farming with other positions.

The *Massaria Caffae* for 1423 mentions the following tax farmers: Giacomo Lomellino, *bancherius, emtor introytus sive cabella bestiaminum, emtor introytus commercii magni Caffe, emtor commercii Seuastopoli, officialis misericordie*; Frederico Spinola de Luculo, *consul Caffe, alter massarius Caffe, missus pro capitaneo Cimbalum super galeota, emtor introytus multili/martilii Caffe*; Antonio de Zoagli, interpreter, formerly a tax farmer (*olim emtor intrytus capitum sclavorum et sclavarum*); Tommaso Dotto, a teacher (*curator et tutor*), emptor introytus sive cabelle censarie Caffe; Clamelotto Petri; Gregorio de Camazarino; Lanfranco de l’Orto, *emptor cabelle censarie Caffe*; Giovanni de San Donato, *emptor cabelle sive introytus vini*; Giovanni Spinola, *emptor introytus cabelle vini Caffe*; Giorgio de Palodio, *emptor introytus sive cabella terraticorum communis Ianue in Caffa*; Battista Spinola *emptor cabelle tamoge magne, emtor tamoge uelatorum camocaturum bocassorum et aliorum pangorum tam sirici quam cotoni communis Ianue in Caffa*; Andrea Cipollino, *socius Caffe, emtor cabelle vini Cimbali, cintracus comunis Caffe, socius Cimbali subrogatus loco Bartholomei de Levanto*; Niccolò Bergoglio, *cintracus comunis in Caffa, emtor terraticorum comunis
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1960 MC 1423, 8r, 10r, 11r, 13r, 16r, 28r, 32r, 34r, 42r, 44r, 44v, 53v, 55r, 57v, 59r, 60v, 62v, 68v, 74v, 78v, 81r, 81v, 84v, 91r, 93r, 103v, 104v, 105r, 105r bis, 107r, 108r, 118r, 118v, 120r, 121v, 122r, 122v, 123v, 125r, 126r, 126v bis, 127r, 127v, 128v, 129v, 130r, 131v, 132r, 132v, 134r, 143v, 146v, 149v, 150v, 151r, 152v, 159v, 160v, 171v, 171v, 181v, 191r, 191v, 193v, 194v, 195r, 196v, 208v, 209v, 215v, 225r, 225v, 226r, 231v, 241r, 241v, 242v, 245v, 255r, 260v, 274v, 445v.

1961 MC 1423, 1r, 16r, 44r, 52r, 55v, 59r, 68v, 82r, 90v, 91v, 93r, 94r, 122v, 123v, 126v, 127r, 146r, 152r, 160v, 194v, 206v, 226r, 231v, 231v bis, 253r, 243v, 244v, 264v, 271v.

1962 MC 1423, 3r, 13r, 15v, 41r, 43v, 133r, 48r, 360v, 367v.

1963 MC 1423, 9v, 44v, 63v, 107r, 124r, 152r, 195r, 225r, 225r bis, 226v.

1964 MC 1423, 41v, 52v.

1965 MC 1423, 10v, 10v, 10v, 28v, 115v, 115v, 117v, 118r, 122v.

1966 MC 1423, 42v, 44v, 64r, 128v, 142r, 144r.

1967 MC 1423, 42v, 58r, 62v, 106v, 115v, 117v, 118r, 122v.

1968 MC 1423, 10v, 10v, 10v, 28v, 33v, 44v, 56r, 74v, 81r, 81v, 92v, 94v, 103v, 121v, 126v, 127r, 132v, 133v, 134r, 135v, 136r, 144v, 146v, 147v, 149r, 151v, 172r, 194v, 195r, 216v, 244v, 246v, 248v, 255r, 257r, 259r, 262r, 264v, 270v, 274v, 275r, 276v, 276v.

1969 MC 1423, 32r, 33v, 44r, 54v, 85v, 92v, 103v, 104r, 105r, 106r, 121v, 126r, 126v, 126v bis, 127r, 132v, 133r, 136r, 157r, 170v, 197v, 207v, 210r, 210v, 248v, 271v, 278v, 289r.

1970 MC 1423, 11r, 30r, 33v, 34r, 44v, 55r, 74v, 121v, 127v, 129v, 144v, 146v, 147v, 149v, 231v, 241r, 261r.

1971 MC 1423, 8r, 13v, 41r, 43r, 62v, 92v, 132v, 147v, 207v, 248r, 248v, 254r, 256v, 257v, 268v, 274r, 288v, 414r, 414v.

\textsuperscript{1972} MC 1423, 17v, 32v, 42v, 44v, 45r, 54r, 55r, 57r, 60r, 67v, 68v, 75r, 76r, 77r, 77v, 79r, 81v, 82v, 83r, 83r bis, 91r, 91r, 92v, 104v, 105r, 128v, 132v, 147v, 152v, 169v, 171r, 172r, 173r, 206v, 206v bis, 207v, 209r, 218v, 225v, 227r, 244r, 248r, 254r, 256v, 257v, 262r, 268v, 268v, 276r.
\textsuperscript{1973} MC 1423, 78r, 151v.
\textsuperscript{1974} MC 1423, 103r, 133v, 136r, 160v, 171r, 172r, 173v, 257v.
\textsuperscript{1975} MC 1423, 42r, 76v, 82r, 127r, 143r, 147v, 147v, 148v, 150v, 151r, 241v, 445r.
\textsuperscript{1976} MC 1423, 53r, 122v, 125v, 159v, 195r.
\textsuperscript{1977} MC 1423, 17v, 57v, 105r, 107r, 128v, 133v, 149r, 151r, 154r, 157v, 195v, 248v, 277v, 415v, 415v bis.
\textsuperscript{1978} MC 1423, 6r, 41v, 44v, 50v, 51v, 52r, 57v, 58v, 60v, 118v, 125v, 128v.
\textsuperscript{1979} MC 1423, 30r, 44r, 67v, 78r, 118v, 126r, 126v, 127r, 128r, 128v, 129r, 135v, 231v, 245r, 248v, 256v.
\textsuperscript{1980} MC 1423, 16v, 30r, 44r, 92v, 103v, 105r, 106r, 107r, 108r, 127r, 129v, 130r, 136r, 146v, 277r.
\textsuperscript{1981} MC 1423, 30r, 30v, 41r, 44r, 54v, 62v, 63r, 105r, 120v, 127v, 146r, 148r, 170v, 241v, 244r, 245r, 245v.
\textsuperscript{1982} MC 1423, 31r, 42v, 44v, 57v, 64r, 68r, 105r, 119v, 122v, 126r, 126v, 127r, 142r, 151r, 157v, 191v, 193r, 194r, 196v.
\textsuperscript{1983} MC 1423, 30r, 30v, 33v, 44v, 55r, 55v, 103v, 104v, 121v, 127r, 127v, 127v bis, 144v, 149r, 151r, 209v, 243r, 263v, 278r.
\textsuperscript{1984} MC 1423, 12r, 14v, 16r, 17v, 57v, 68r, 107r, 108r, 122r, 125v, 126r, 126r bis, 127r, 130r, 133v, 149r, 152v, 152v, 194r, 209r, 219v.
\textsuperscript{1985} MC 1423, 9r, 12r, 30v, 33v, 42r, 44v, 53r, 74v, 94r, 108v, 118v, 125r, 126r, 127r, 129r, 130r, 132r, 141r, 143v, 145v, 146v, 152v, 152v, 193v, 209r, 209v, 216r, 241v, 244r, 245v, 245v, 247r, 248r, 255r, 256v, 260v, 263r, 264v, 275r, 277r, 278r.
\textsuperscript{1986} MC 1423, 6r, 11v, 16r, 41r, 53r, 58r, 122v, 125v, 126v, 127r, 132v, 133v, 195r, 262v.
Besides the tax farmers, there are also mentions of the tax collectors: Teramus de Oliverio from Parma, socius Caffe, collector introytus censarie Caffe, and Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.

In 1461, tax farmers remain as visible as they were about forty years earlier. They are frequently mentioned in the sources: Domenico de Levanto socius Caffe, emptor cabelle baratarum; Giuliano Marchesani, socius Caffe, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali; Bartolomeo de Garressio, collector introytus terraticorum.
de Gaspe, emptor cabelle tamoge magne, emptor cabelle victualium campagnie;2005 Andrea de Zaccaria, emptor cabelle tamoge parve;2006 Giuliano de Gaspe, emptor cabelle victualium campagnie;2007 Lazzaro de Cavo, emptor cabelle victualium, emptor cabelle victualium maris;2008 Cristoforo Narico, emptor cabelle vini Cimbali;2009 Cristiano Cattaneo, emptor cabelle vini;2010 Clemente de Valterii, emptor commerchii magni;2011 Bartolomeo Bonaventura, emptor commerchii parvi, emptor commerchii unius cum dimidie pro centenario, emptor campanie;2012 Paolo de Resturopi, emptor commerchii unius pro centenario;2013 Galeotto Bonaventura, emptor ihegatarie granorum;2014 Gregorio de Prerio, emptor ihegatarie granorum;2015 Lodisio de Gaspe son of Emin Coia, emptor multilis;2016 Giacomo de Santo Salvatore, emptor ponderis et scaliatici;2017 Antonio de Santo Petro, emptor ponderis septe;2018 Niccolò de Carmazarino, emptor staziete vini;2019 Giacomo de Zoagli, emptor suprastantarum seche;2020 Niccolò de Gaspe, emptor tamoge parve;2021 Gregorius rubeus (i.e. Russian), emptor, bancherius, emptor commerchii magni, ambassador ad dominum ChiJhibei, emptor cabelle aspri dimidie vini;2022 Giorgio de Prerio, emptor

2005 MC 1461, 46v, 71v, 113r, 113v, 130v, 131r, 132r, 133r, 133r bis, 147r, 172r, 189r, 225r, 234r, 234v, 239v, 239v bis, 272r, 406v end/409r reg, 406v end/409r reg bis.
2006 MC 1461, 68v, 113r, 114r, 211v, 220r, 221r, 231r, 235r, 406r end/409v reg.
2007 MC 1461, 74v, 97r, 113r, 113v, 147r, 170v, 188r, 406v end/409r reg.
2008 MC 1461, 46v, 68r, 97r, 100r, 113r, 130r, 132r, 155v, 212r, 261r, 380r, 406v end/409r reg.
2009 MC 1461, 37r, 47r, 77v, 180v, 406r end/409v reg.
2010 MC 1461, 38v, 39r, 44v, 45r, 45v, 74r, 74r bis, 76v, 100v, 101r, 113r, 148r, 229v, 239v bis, 243r, 245v, 246v, 247v, 249v, 252r, 267v, 271r, 272v, 273r, 273v, 274v, 280r, 280r bis, 281v, 282r, 282v bis, 282v tris, 283r, 283v, 283v bis, 285r, 310r, 351v, 381r, 406r end/409v reg, 406r end/409v reg, 407v end/408r reg.
2011 MC 1461, 37v, 38r, 39r, 40r, 41v, 43v, 69v, 73r, 74r, 132v, 156r, 163v, 164v, 172v, 202v, 210v, 210v bis, 211r, 220v, 220v bis, 221v, 222r, 222v, 228v bis, 229r, 231v, 243v, 246r, 246r bis, 246v, 247r, 250r, 250r bis, 250v, 252r, 252v, 258r, 261v, 262r, 265r, 274v, 274v bis, 303v, 331r, 331v, 332r bis, 332v, 333r, 334r, 334v, 335v, 335v bis, 336r, 336v, 337r, 337v, 337v bis, 337v tris, 338r, 338v, 346r bis, 346v, 346v, 347v, 350r bis, 350v bis, 350v tris, 351r, 351r bis, 351v, 407v end/408r reg, 407v end/408r reg.
2012 MC 1461, 25r, 42r, 45r, 46, 72r, 73r, 73v, 95v, 113r, 113r bis, 131r, 201v, 204v, 204v bis, 210r, 211r, 232v, 406r end/409v reg, 406v end/409v reg.
2013 MC 1461, 40r, 62r, 68v, 101r, 113r, 114v, 163r, 164v, 178r, 178v, 189r, 189r bis, 203r, 212r, 227r, 233r, 248r, 248v, 249r bis, 413v end/402r reg, 415v end/400r reg, 418r end/397v reg, 418r end/397v reg bis.
2014 MC 1461, 46v, 46v bis, 46v tris, 95v, 100v, 131r, 201r, 201r bis, 201v, 406v end/409v reg.
2015 MC 1461, 113r.
2016 MC 1461, 39r, 40v, 44v, 61r, 72r, 74r, 113v, 130r, 130v, 131r, 147v, 202r, 210v, 256v, 266r, 303r, 395r end/420v reg, 406v end/409r reg, 406v end/409r reg, 408r end/407v reg, 410r end/405v reg.
cabelle ihegatarum granorum pro anno uno;\textsuperscript{2023} Teodoro de Fieschi son of the deceased Luchino, emantor commercii parvi, emantor commercii unius cum dimidio pro centenario;\textsuperscript{2024} Damiano Ottaviano, prouisionatus Soldaie, emantor cabelle vini, rudie et bestiaminium Soldaye.\textsuperscript{2025} Most of the tax farmers are Genoese subjects, with a couple of notable exceptions such as Gregorius \textit{rubeus},\textsuperscript{2026} i.e. a Russian but who could also be a Latinized person of remote Russian origin, perhaps a freedman or a descendant of the freedmen, or maybe \textit{rubeus} in this case can be just a family name, thus, Gregorio Rubeo.

Besides tax farmers, there were those who acquired consulates of secondary political importance, but economically sufficiently lively to compensate for the expenses of buying them. For instance, in 1423 Battista de Valetari was an \textit{emptor consulatis Copa/Copparie},\textsuperscript{2027} a place of doubtful military and administrative importance populated predominantly by the Orientals, namely the Circassians and Zikhs, but at the same time one of the major fishing places in the entire Northern Black Sea area. In 1461, a \textit{socius Caffe} Battista Sidracco was an \textit{emptor consulatis Vospori},\textsuperscript{2028} a point on the strait controlling the passage from the Black Sea to the Azov Sea, and therefore an important link between two large colonies – Caffa in Crimea and Tana in the embouchure of the River Don. Another Ligurian, Lazzaro de Torriglia, was an \textit{emptor consulatis Savastopolis}, a place important for the trade with Georgia and Northern Caucasus.\textsuperscript{2029}

\textbf{Captains of the private ships (patroni).} Obviously, ship-owners in the colonies of the maritime Republic of Genoa were wealthy people deeply engaged in trade, including overseas trade, especially in the colonies. What is striking (although by no means counterintuitive) is the sharp decrease of the Genoese patrons from the period before 1453 to

\textsuperscript{2023} MC 1461, 70r, 73v, 100r, 100r bis, 131r, 131r bis, 131v, 132r, 148v, 178r, 223v, 280r, 406v end/409r reg, 416v end/399r reg, 418r end/397v reg.
\textsuperscript{2024} MC 1461, 61r, 62r, 68r, 113v, 132r, 172r, 188r, 202r, 300r, 407r end/408v reg.
\textsuperscript{2025} MC 1461, 44r, 62r, 68v, 97v, 112r, 113r, 155v, 156r, 175v bis, 235r, 237r, 331v, 339r, 340v, 340v bis, 409v end/406r reg.
\textsuperscript{2026} MC 1461, 25r, 39r, 39r bis, 40v, 41r, 42r, 42v, 44v, 61r, 68r, 68v, 68v, 70r, 71v, 72v, 91r, 96r, 96v, 97r, 97r bis, 97r tris, 97v, 98r, 98v bis, 99r, 100v, 101r, 101r bis, 102r, 103r, 113v, 132r, 132v, 164r, 164r bis, 171r, 171r bis, 181r, 188v, 210v, 256v, 266r, 303r, 395r end/420v reg, 406v end/409r reg, 406v end/409r reg, 408r end/407v reg, 410r end/405v reg.
\textsuperscript{2027} MC 1461, 38v, 43r, 98v, 100r, 113r, 131r, 178v, 181v, 201r, 202r, 204r, 220r, 222r, 222v, 223v, 240v, 242r, 243v, 244v, 244v, 245r, 253r, 256v, 261r, 261r bis, 261r tris, 262r, 266r, 310v, 310v bis, 332r, 332r bis, 332v, 334v, 336v, 338v, 338r, 339r, 340v, 340v bis, 351v bis, 352r, 406r end/409v reg, 412r end/403v reg, 418r end/397v reg.
\textsuperscript{2028} MC 1461, 40v, 42r, 44v, 44v bis, 46v, 113r, 132r, 132r bis, 139r, 156r, 156r bis, 172v, 174r, 210r, 220v, 239v, 255r, 259r, 266v, 310r, 318r, 339r.
\textsuperscript{2029} MC 1461, 68v, 73r, 112r, 113r, 131v, 132v, 147v, 155v, 205r, 248r, 249r bis, 254r, 254r bis, 257r, 260v, 364r, 380v, 395r end/420v reg, 408r end/407v reg.
the period after it. In 1423, there are twenty-four patroni, sixteen of them are Latins and eight are Greeks. In 1461, two people bear the describer patronus, and both are Muslim.

Thus, a striking number of twenty-four people in total are mentioned in 1423. Among them, there are twelve patroni: Giovanni de Sauli, Ansaldo Doria, Antonio Centurione, Antonio Gallelo, Cristoforo Arangio, Francesco Marsalia, Giuliano de Remezzano, Leone de Malta, Manoli Lercari, Marco de Levanto, Tommaso de San Donato, and Raffaele de Marco. Besides that, twelve people more are bearing a describer patronus sue navis: Astelano de Pastino, Papa Manganari, Corrado de Manarola, Domenico de Salario, Filippo de l’Orto, Francesco Cipollino, Manoli Pissifara, Saua Teofilatus, Teopestus Macrevi, Vassili Fraschera, Michali de Ianachi, and Iane Costa merdatus. In 1461, there are just two patroni mentioned in Massaria Caffae, both Muslim: Ter Hajji (Ter Agi) and Muhammad (Macomet saracenus patronus de Sinopi). This cannot be explained by the personal preferences of the scribe of Massaria Caffae 1461, who decided not to identify people this way, because he actually did – in two cases, both of which are Muslim ship-owners, probably slave-traders. Therefore, the closure of the straits in 1453 had a very serious impact on Genoese trade and Black Sea navigation. It is not the first time that we have the same picture of the life of the Genoese

---

2030 MC 1423, 42r, 62v, 114r, 124r, 134v, 150r.
2031 MC 1423, 12r, 14v, 16r, 17v, 57v, 68r, 107r, 108r, 122r, 125v, 126r, 126r bis, 127r, 130r, 133v, 149r, 152v, 152v, 194r, 209r, 219v.
2032 MC 1423, 124r, 150r.
2033 MC 1423, 28r.
2034 MC 1423, 124r, 150r.
2035 MC 1423, 124r, 147r.
2036 MC 1423, 124r, 150r.
2037 MC 1423, 124r, 152r.
2038 MC 1423, 124r, 124r bis, 147r, 152r.
2039 MC 1423, 124r, 147r.
2040 MC 1423, 52r.
2041 MC 1423, 54r, 56v, 62r, 62v, 129r, 207r, 256v.
2042 MC 1423, 17r, 147r, 124r, 150r.
2043 MC 1423, 198r.
2044 MC 1423, 198r.
2045 MC 1423, 41v, 90r.
2046 MC 1423, 124r, 147r.
2047 MC 1423, 32r, 124r, 147r.
2048 MC 1423, 63v, 134v.
2049 MC 1423, 63v, 152r, 219v.
2050 MC 1423, 226v.
2051 MC 1423, 55v, 232v.
2052 MC 1423, 32r, 124r, 147r.
2053 MC 1423, 63v, 134v.
2054 MC 1461, 112v.
2055 MC 1461, 40v, 42r, 42r bis, 42v, 112v.
colonies: a prosperous and vibrantly evolving urban community with intensive trade controlled predominantly by the Latins before 1453, and a rapid decay afterwards.

**Sailors.** Sailors are underrepresented in the sources. They were of modest social standing and came from all kinds of ethnic backgrounds, not limited to Genoese or Italians at large. Orientals were often hired on Genoese ships so that a person with a Turkic name *Cotolboga de St. Theodoro filius quondam Nicolai marinarius fugitivus galleae Iohannis de Burgaro habitator ad St. Theodorum* is known to have run away from the galley of Giovanni di Burgaro.2056 See also the section on the garrison for the information on the soldiers of the galleys of Caffa.

**Artisans.** In the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries we find artisans of different profession and particularly of different ethnic background in Caffa. First of all, a certain amount of artisans and small traders or shopkeepers satisfying the most basic needs were present in the city from the outset.2057 Naturally, most of them came from the lowest strata of society with modest incomes (although there are some examples of wealthy and prosperous craftsmen).2058 Most often, they owned their workshops;2059 sometimes, however, artisans could work for others: thus, in 1290, a certain spinner hired his colleague Niccolò for three months and fixed his salary as of eight *perpers* with additional lodging and board.2060 There were people of about thirty professions in the late thirteenth century Caffa: blacksmiths, tinsmiths, whitesmiths, bell-moulders, armour smiths, producers of swords, lances, pikes, spears, and helmets, minters, furriers (there was an intensive fur trade with Russia), several types of curriers (*corrigiarii, confectores coriorum*, etc.), several types of artisans dealing with cloth (*sartores, taliatores, filatores, acimatores, canavacerii, bambaxarli*), weavers, shoemakers, candle-makers (a speciality of Caffa not found in other Genoese colonies), and money-changers, *khamals* (i.e. loaders or porters), carpenters, caulkers, cooperers, potters, evaluators, barbers, tax farmers, money-changers, and people connected with food supply, namely innkeepers, bakers, and an impressive number of butchers (39 butchers out of 470

2058 Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, 352.
2059 Statutum Caphe, 680.
artisans, i.e. 8.3%, perhaps thanks to a large supply of meat from the Tatars of the steppe).\textsuperscript{2061} Furthermore, as local production developed more specialized crafts appeared and Caffa began exporting goods itself thanks to craftsmen such as tailors, dyers, weavers, spinners, and silk workers. Moreover, as almost everyone in Caffa, the craftsmen took part in trade.\textsuperscript{2062} In the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto there are many artisans directly engaged in commercial activity and money transactions alone or in partnerships involving sums of money of up to several thousand aspri; we find among such artisans the representatives of such professions as tailors, furriers, blacksmiths, etc.\textsuperscript{2063}  

As already mentioned, the ethnic background of the artisans was quite diverse. Apart from Italians, a large number of craftsmen were Greeks, Armenians, Jews, and Tatars. Balard made a study on the Greeks on the Genoese territories, and discovered in the \textit{Massaria Caffae} (1386) quite a number of Greek craftsmen and traders in Caffa in the late fourteenth century. He found Greek caulkers, shipwrights, blacksmiths, makers of arrows and bombards, spinners, tailors, weavers, furriers, chandlers, hatters, barbers, innkeepers, bazaar shopkeepers (one-third of the total).\textsuperscript{2064} Caffa was supplied by the raw materials for its workshops’ production from the East both directly and through the brokerage of the Tatars.\textsuperscript{2065} Progress in military science and the development of local weapon and armour production stimulated the emergence of new more specialized professions connected to it such as the producers of cuirasses (\textit{corazarii}), bombards (\textit{ferrarius factor bombardarum}), and espringalds (\textit{magister fabricationis spingardarum}). A document dated 1455 lists those who had to pay for a loan assessed by the Commune, and among the 102 Greek names there are 58 people with a specified profession: 8 \textit{molinarii}, 5 workers with cotton \textit{cotonerii}, 5 \textit{linarolii}, 5 \textit{capelerii}, 4 \textit{fabri}, 3 \textit{candelarii}, 3 \textit{tabernarii}, 3 \textit{tinctores}, 3 \textit{censarii}, 3 \textit{filatores}, 3 \textit{bazarioti}, 3 \textit{macelarii}, 2 \textit{sartores}, 1 \textit{tornator}, 1 \textit{piscator}, 1 \textit{clavonerius}, 1 \textit{stivalerius}, 1

\textsuperscript{2061} Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 2, 713-715. Judging on the amount of butchers, Balard suggested that Caffa probably not only bought meat for local consumption, but also exported salted meat; however, he says, the meat consumption in Caffa itself could be above average, since in Caffa there were three special taxes on meat not found elsewhere in the Genoese colonies – \textit{introitus tamoge bestiarum macelli}, \textit{introitus macellorum}, and \textit{introitus cranium recentium}. Two other professions peculiar to Caffa and absent or poorly present in other Genoese colonies are furriers and candlemakers.  

\textsuperscript{2062} Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 2, 520-521, 713.  

\textsuperscript{2063} Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, No. 366, 410, 578, 645, 786, 893, 900.  


The modest position of the Greeks reflected the general technological and commercial lag of Byzantium and formerly Byzantine Greeks cities compared to the communities of Northern Italy.

According to Ponomarev, the artisans of Caffa were not organized into guilds in the Western European way, since the number of members of each profession was not high enough to need the guild structures to minimize competition, and *protomastori* frequently mentioned in the sources are elders of a certain profession (e.g. *protomastori* of the masons, blacksmiths, ship-makers, carpenters, saddlers, and caulkers) who had to supervise their colleagues and to ensure that they would not work outside Caffa.

In 1423 there were:
- ten tailors Andrea from Palermo, Andrea Catolicus, Erminio Mi[cio], Hovhannes, Pietro de Sancto Petro, Theodoros, Antonio de Multedo, Antonio de Neo, and Bartolomeo from Parma.
- ten blacksmiths labelled as *ferrarii* Konstantinos, Cossatec, Christodoros, Dimitrius, Hovhannes (Ochanes), Sara(ī)-ad-din (Saradinus), Giovanni, Iorbei, Soltansa, and Carabet.
- five blacksmiths labelled as *fabri* Asambey son of Mgrditch, Esambey son of Christodoros, Francesco faber, Parronus Vassili armenus faber, Paolo de Beluedere.

---

2068 Ponomarev, “Население и территория,” 393.
2069 MC 1423, 95r, 405v, 429v, 436r-v.
2070 MC 1423, 16v, 132r.
2071 MC 1423, 55v.
2072 MC 1423, 14r.
2073 MC 1423, 44v, 179v.
2074 MC 1423, 160v.
2075 MC 1423, 43r, 224r.
2076 MC 1423, 133v, 168r, 210r, 210r, 241v, 245r, 274v.
2077 MC 1423, 13v, 15r, 45r, 57r, 60r, 91r, 152v, 210r, 241v, 245r, 262v, 271r, 280v, 288v, 289r.
2078 MC 1423, 33r, 55v, 245r, 245v, 245v, 291v, 293v.
2079 MC 1423, 41v, 50v, 218r.
2080 MC 1423, 41v, 50v.
2081 MC 1423, 50r.
2082 MC 1423, 41v, 66r.
2083 MC 1423, 42v, 179r.
2084 MC 1423, 43r, 214r.
2085 MC 1423, 4v.
2086 MC 1423, 42r, 118r.
2087 MC 1423, 13v, 43r, 45r, 53v, 54v, 58r, 75r, 84r, 92v, 105v, 107v, 148v, 208r, 215r, 217r, 218r, 241v, 261v, 263r, 268v, 445r.
2088 MC 1423, 135r, 329r, 337v.
2089 MC 1423, 129v, 153v.
burgensis Caffe faber, socius galee Caffe olim patronizate per Marcum Spinullam Forte Belvedere, Sampierdarena, Genova, Liguria

eight skinners (peliparii) Antonio de Septa, Krikor (Chricor), Cotolbei, Melchiorre de Castiglione, Niccolò de Bobio, Pietro, Teorodus, and Collinus

two masters of carts (carraterii/cartarii) Giovanni de Oneglia and Antonio

2090 MC 1423, 43v, 44r, 76r.
2091 MC 1423, 44r, 90r.
2092 MC 1423, 189v.
2093 MC 1423, 42v, 134v, 146r, 157r, 191v, 217v, 263r, 272v.
2094 MC 1423, 208v, 445v.
2095 MC 1423, 55v, 56r.
2096 MC 1423, 55v, 59v, 60r, 129r, 207r, 276v.
2097 MC 1423, 56r, 225v.
2098 MC 1423, 5r, 9v, 41r.
2099 MC 1423, 17r, 56v.
2100 MC 1423, 59v.
2101 MC 1423, 135r.
2102 MC 1423, 43r, 53v, 55v, 76r, 339v, 352v.
2103 MC 1423, 33v, 41v, 54v, 60r, 74v, 79r, 81r, 81v, 82v, 83r, 84r, 84r bis, 85v, 92v, 125v, 130r, 132v, 136r, 145v, 448r.
2104 MC 1423, 219r.
2105 MC 1423, 210r, 210r bis, 227r, 245r, 256v, 257v, 276r.
two locksmiths (*clavonerii*) Giorgio or perhaps Giorgas, and Sava.

two stonecutters/stonemasons (*fractores lapidum*) Sava and Chiriacus Constantinus Christodorus.

two stonemasons building the walls (*muratori*) Paraschiva and *protomastro muratorum* Theodorinos.

one coppersmith (*calderonerius*) Amil,

one draper or haberdasher (*draperius*) Lodisio de Gibeleto.

one lime-maker (*calsolatus*) Giovanni Castagna.

one ship-builder (*magister galearum*) protomastro Alexius.

one watchmaker, or person in charge of the town clock Leonardo Italiano.

one cellarer (*celarius*) Pandaseni.

one painter (*pictor*) maestro Matteo Rizzo.

one weaver (*textor*) Abram.

one armour-maker (*coyrasarius*) Antonio de Torriglia.

In 1461 there were:


four tailors (*sartores*) Damiano, Dimitrius, Issufi, Giusto.
three stonemasons building the walls (*muratori*) Tocebi, S***, and Niccolò, two dyers (*tinctores*) Sarchis son of Aragop and Bogos, two butchers (*macellarii*) Mkrtich (Migirdich) and Nicogos, two shoemakers (*calligarii*) Pietro de Caffa and Saac, one gardener (*iardinerius*) Hovhannes, one candle-maker (*candelerius*) Christofforus, one weaver (*testor*) Cotolbei, one person dealing with spices (*speciarius*) Guiraldus, one locksmith (*clavonerius*) Bartolomeo de Nigro, one armour-maker (*coyrasarius*) Antonio Pino/de Pino coyrasarius.

One should take a special notice on the cotton-makers (*cotoneri*). In 1423, *Massaria Caffae* lists twenty-six cotton-makers residing in the city and paying tax: Alipassa son of the deceased Asam Coati, Avac de Andrea, Avac parum son of the deceased Morat, Caloiane son of the deceased Michalli, Caloiane son of the deceased Teodoros, Chricor son of the deceased Panini, Dimitrius de Nicolla, Elia de Mgrditch, Emin de Sarchis, Emin de Simon, Eminadinus son of the deceased Manuel, Eminbey son of the deceased Stefanos, Fotti de Nicolla, Georgius de Cotolbei, Nichita son of the deceased Sauli, Ordabei, Hovhannes de Vartiros, another Hovhannes, Paraschiua de Morati, Paraschiua son of the deceased Konstantinos, Suaa de Nicolla, Sinan son of the deceased Ionas, Tatiros son of the deceased Vartiros, Teodoros son of the deceased Papa Sava, Teofilato son of Georgas, and Terbac son of...

---

2145 MC 1461, 164v, 164v bis, 174v, 270v, 287r.
2146 MC 1461, 44r, 175v, 364v, 366r, 409v end/406r reg.
2147 MC 1461, 44r, 164v, 165r, 175v, 364r, 366r, 380r.
2148 MC 1461, 407v end/408r reg.
2149 MC 1461, 44r, 72v, 175v, 375r, 382r, 410r end/405v reg.
2150 MC 1461, 70r.
2151 MC 1461, 71r.
2152 MC 1461, 76v.
2153 MC 1461, 77r.
2154 MC 1461, 140r.
2155 MC 1461, 45v, 76v.
2156 MC 1461, 45r, 76v, 139r, 174v, 247v, 259v, 285v, 287v, 287r, 409r end/406v reg.
2157 MC 1461, 76v.
2158 MC 1461, 156v, 172r, 202v.
2159 MC 1461, 156r, 156v, 307v.
2160 MC 1461, 40r, 44r, 337r, 340v.
2161 MC 1461, 77r, 101r.
2162 MC 1461, 39v, 40v, 42r, 42r bis, 44v, 44v bis, 70r, 71v, 74r, 98v, 172v, 174r, 210v, 213r, 408r end/407v reg.
2163 MC 1461, 40v, 70r, 156r, 156r bis, 174r, 202v, 206r, 249v, 252v, 408r end/407v reg.
of the deceased Stefanos. These people are mainly local and their production seems to be the most widespread or at least labour-consuming craft in the city. In 1461, however, only one cottonerius Vasili is mentioned in the book of accounts. We can hypothesize on the same thing as previously – the fall of Constantinople and the growing Ottoman threat transformed both the structure of trade and the structure of production in Caffa.

We should also mention the professions which were near to the artisans in both practice and social status. Six inn-keepers are mentioned in 1423: Kosma, Michele Filandara, Alexandrinus, Iarchasius, Borzono Curlo (who was also a tax farmer, emptor introytus sive cabelle baratarie et carcerum Caffe), and Giorgio de Bobio. At least six bakers (fornarii) are present in Caffa in the same year: Kazarbei, Fotti, Theodoros, Agop, Stefano de Torriglia, and Danili. Sellers in the bazaar (bazarioti) mentioned in 1423 are the following: Kaloiane, Kazar, Kirikas, Kosta, Theodosios, Sonichi Cantelli, tailor Emin son of Taros and his anonymous brother (referred to as an Armenian son of Taros). The inn-keepers, bakers, and sellers in the bazaar are not found any more in Massaria Caffae 1461, which obviously did not mean that there were none (indeed, the city could not live without people of these professions); however, for whatever reason, they either stopped contacting the administration, or the massarii stopped to identify them using their professional describer. This is quite strange,

---

2164 The list of cotton-makers can be found on MC 1423, 127v. Ordabei cottonerius is also mentioned on MC 1423, 61r, 181r; an Armenian Hovhannes is also mentioned on MC 1423, 181r; Caloiane son of the deceased Michalli is also mentioned on MC 1423, 231r.
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2183 MC 1423, 209r, 218v.
2184 MC 1423, 80v, 129r, 160r.
2185 MC 1423, 15v.
since it was not the case, for instance, with the *cargadors*, or *khamals*, which are even slightly more numerous in 1461 than in the 1423. In 1423, there are four *cargadors*: Alexianus, Khatchatour (*Caichador*), Konstantinos, and Sonichi. In 1461, there are five: Bairamoc, Georgius, Anton son of Itpacmas, Eleutherios (*Lefteri*), and an anonymous Muslim khamal. Finally, we should note that while the craftsmen were diverse in terms of ethnicity, and at least we find both Latin and Oriental representatives of many professions, the absolute majority of the representatives of these professions were Oriental.

**Notaries and other curial officers.** In general, I discussed the administrative functions of the notaries above, also mentioning those found in the sources. On the other hand, the social standing and social performance of the notaries as individuals and members of society deserves to be dealt with in a separate study, which I do not venture to undertake at the moment, but I will add some brief remarks. The notaries appear in Caffa since its initial stages. In 1289, we find a notary Bernabono di Porta engaged in quite a number of commercial operations not less than any successful professional businessman: he was acting in several partnerships, buying and selling goods, owning a ship, and making money transactions. In the same year, another notary, Oberto de Bartolomeo, was investing money in several partnerships and travelling for commercial purposes. In 1289–1290, Andrea di Bartolomeo, bought four houses in Caffa for 3,300 aspri. In 1344 a judge Nicolino left after him according to his testament 12,000 aspri, fifty-two sommi (around 2,870 aspri) of debt to be paid by him and 3,479 aspri of debt to be received, thus a positive balance of about 609 aspri to be added to the already mentioned 1,2000. In 1371, a post-mortem inventory of property of a notary Niccolò Bosono was composed, and all his

---

2187 MC 1423, 59r.
2188 MC 1423, 16v.
2189 MC 1423, 49r.
2190 MC 1423, 446v.
2191 MC 1461, 172r.
2192 MC 1461, 172r, 406v end/409r reg.
2193 MC 1461, 76v.
2194 MC 1461, 155v.
2195 MC 1461, 42r.
2199 *Notai genovesi in Oltremare*, No. 39, 40, 78, 79.
possessions (including real estate and clothes) were sold on the auctions for 27,000 aspri. In 1381, a notary Paolo di Reza was a procurator of Bartolomeo de Casanova and conducted active trade, selling on his behalf gems and spices (indigo, pepper, ginger, etc.), purchasing large amounts of wax (over seven tons) and 3,400 crossbow quarrel, and sending it together with 1,800 pearls to Bartolomeo. For the notaries in the fifteenth century, see the chapter on administration.

Physicians and barbers. Fully-trained physicians worked in Caffa, and it seems it was a good place to begin a career, with less competition than in the metropolis (the same was true for notaries, and perhaps for many other professions). In 1290, a doctor called Guglielmo was trading canvas, clothes, and silver, being in two business partnership, while a surgeon (cirurgicus) Giacomo was investing money in trade in the same year. Massaria Caffae 1374 has some data on a physician (medicus) called Antonio. There were poorer doctors as well. Maestro Tommaso from Ferrara is mentioned in 1423 as fixicus et medicus communis, as well as another medicus Paolo. Using the comparison of the source data, this Tommaso from Ferrara was not able to pay taxes in Genoa and maintain his family, and decided to go to Caffa as a doctor (pro medico), leaving his wife in the care of his mother. For many years, he earned his livelihood in Caffa at everyday work (ad iornatam), but his family in Genoa remained in a dire condition (in maxima egestate), and eventually he asked to be released from paying a personal tax called avaria. His colleague, a doctor who came from Genoa to Caffa to work there for five years in 1426, seems to have been more prosperous and was paid 50 sommi per year.

Otherwise, there was a profession of barber (barberius or barbitonsor), and these barbers were educated in the skills of medical first-aid and basic treatment, being something like a Feldsher, or physician assistant, or paramedical practitioner today. Barbers are perhaps presented even in the Venetian documents from Tana than in the Genoese documents from

---

2201 Airaldi, Studi e documenti, No. 7.
2202 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-mer, No. 646, 687, 688.
2203 MC 1374, 282r.
2204 MC 1423, 125v, 130r, 133v, 136r, 152v, 248r, 255r, 268v, 276r, 277r.
2205 MC 1423, 125r, 260r.
Barbers were *ballistarii* (crossbowmen) with basic medical skills and formed part of the crew on galleys (according to the requirements, there had to be two barbers out of ten *ballistarii*). However, in Caffa in 1423 there were at least two *barberii*: Niccolò, *olim custos nocturnus*, and maestro Nicolino de Novàra; otherwise, there was a barber in Cembalo Matteo de Serra, a barber in Samastro Andrea from Vicenza, and yet another barber, Lodisio Grilaccio, who served in Cembalo as a soldier (*socius additus Cimbali*) and as a mariner/sailor on the galley of Caffa (*socius galeae Caffe olim patronizate per Marcum Spinullam*), but was transferred to Samastro in order to work as a barber (*transmissus Samastri pro barberio*). In 1461, we find more barbers in Caffa, then previously; they were Francesco from Florence, Gianino (*Ianinus*), Gracia, Giacomo from Bonifacio, and maestro Giovanni from Bonifacio. In Soldaia we also find an increase in the number of barbers: Biagio de Cristoforo, Giovanni de Castellacio, and maestro Giovanni who also was a *subcapitaneus* of Soldaia. One should add here Andrea de Riva, who served as a barber and a soldier in Cembalo. Thus, it looks as if in the difficult and tumultuous years after the fall of Constantinople the Genoese authorities had to bring more people with basic medical training to Caffa because of the increasing military threat.

**Teachers.** Caffa had a schooling system, although we do not know much about it. The teachers, however, are repeatedly mentioned in the sources; thus in 1423, there are four people: Oberto and Alberto de Alferiis (each is called *magister scholarum*), and *burgensis Caffe* Tommaso Dotto, who was a curator of the school(s) as well as a teacher (*curator et tutor*), and a tax farmer (*emptor introyitus sive cabelle censarie Caffe*). There
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2213 MC 1423, 38r, 156r, 174v, 211v, 245r, 246v, 247v, 248r, 286v.
2214 MC 1423, 73v.
2215 MC 1423, 97v, 406v end/409r reg.
2216 MC 1423, 211v.
2217 MC 1423, 75r, 139r, 155v, 174r, 213r, 408r end/407v reg.
2218 MC 1423, 40r, 75r, 175v, 221v, 333r, 334v, 335v bis, 335v tris, 336r, 337r, 340v, 351v.
2219 MC 1423, 114r, 408r end/407v reg.
2220 MC 1423, 44r, 156r, 174r, 175v, 236v, 338v, 407v end/408r reg, 408v end/407r reg.
2221 MC 1423, 111v, 175v, 372r, 382r.
2222 MC 1423, 59r, 126v, 159v, 258v, 341v.
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was at least one school in Soldaia, with Vincenzo de Merlanis, *magister scholarum*. Should we take the absence of teachers in *Massaria Caffae* 1461 as a sign of decay of public schooling in Caffa after 1453?

*Clergy* of Caffa was not so numerous, or at least does not look numerous in the sources; however, it played an important role in urban life. Besides their direct duties, clerics were benefiting from the Black Sea commerce and ecclesiastical institutions often used to be investors. In 1289–1290, a cleric called Opecino was conducting trade (mainly grain trade), as a member into several partnerships (one with a capital of 3,000 *asprü*, another one with a capital of 8,000 *asprü*), and travelling for commercial rather than spiritual purposes to Tana. Most of the Latin clergy, and most if not all bishops of Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo belonged to the mendicant orders, namely the Franciscans and Dominicans. The region was considered to be a missionary one, so the friars were the most obvious choice to be appointed there. This was, therefore, quite an international collective with a number of people from outside Italy.

In 1423, Soldaia had a bishop maestro Fra Lodovico de Sancto Petro, a Franciscan and three chaplains: Fra Luca de Caffa and two Franciscans serving in the church *usque Sancte Marie* Fra Giacomo from Padua and Fra Niccolo. Cembalo also had a chaplain, Fra Roderico from Cordova, as well as Samastro, where the chaplain was Fra Antonio de Framura. The bishop of Caffa is not directly mentioned, but he was probably Fra Lodovico Vico, a Franciscan, because he is the only friar mentioned in Caffa rather than in the other colonies and bearing the title of *dominus* reserved to the nobility and senior clergy. In 1461, the bishop of Caffa is mentioned without the name (*reverendus dominus episcopus Caffensis*), arguably he could be Fra Battista Fattinanti, who is described as a *dominus*, but it is by no means given for granted, because as a member of the patrician
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2228 MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 121v, 361v, 367v.
2229 MC 1423, 133r, 365r, 367v.
2230 MC 1423, 13r, 15v, 147v, 244r, 257r, 364v, 367v.
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family Fattinanti he was entitled to be styled this way by virtue of his birth. Soldaia had a bishop Fra Giovanni (reverendus dominus episcopus Soldaye)\textsuperscript{2237} and another friar Fra Tommaso from Chios.\textsuperscript{2238} Cembalo received a bishop (was there one before?), Fra Bartolomeo Capono,\textsuperscript{2239} and also had two friars: Fra Luca from Ancona\textsuperscript{2240} and a Franciscan Fra Giacomo de Lu, who was the chaplain of Cembalo.\textsuperscript{2241}

Not so much can be said about the Oriental clergy beyond what has been said in the section on religion in Caffa. The problem is that Greek and Armenian clergy had a title ‘Papa’ (i.e. father, from the same stem as ‘pope’), but in many cases it was not used as a describer of a priest, but as a part of a personal name of a lay person. Therefore we cannot automatically call all ‘Papas’ priests, since they were doing things which a member of clergy would normally not do. For example, Papa Manganari, a merchant and a ship-owner (patronus sue navis),\textsuperscript{2242} who is probably the same person as Papa Manganari from Samastro.\textsuperscript{2243} For the rest, we can generally hypothesise that unless ‘Papa’ was part of the given name, such people were priests.

In 1423 there are six or more Greek ‘papas’: Papa Christodoros (serving in Caffa as a scriba litteratum romeum sive grecalium),\textsuperscript{2244} Papa Costa\textsuperscript{2245} (arguably the same persons as Papa Costa from Lusta, i.e. Alushta, Crimean hinterland),\textsuperscript{2246} Papa Focha\textsuperscript{2247} (probably the same persons as Papa Focha de Sancta Marina),\textsuperscript{2248} Papa Zakharia,\textsuperscript{2249} Papa Imboni,\textsuperscript{2250} and Papa Nichita de Sancto Constantini;\textsuperscript{2251} plus the above-mentioned Papa Manganari, who clearly was not a priest. In addition to the Orthodox clergy there is a Greek Costal Paramarius,\textsuperscript{2252} who can also be considered by default as a low-ranking member of clergy, παραμοναριος standing for the church ministrant. In addition, there are six Armenian papas:

\textsuperscript{2237} MC 1461, 74v, 96v, 155v, 155v bis, 175v, 175v bis, 333r, 337r, 338r, 340v, 340v bis, 409v end/406r reg, 413r end/402v reg, 418r end/397v reg.
\textsuperscript{2238} MC 1461, 44r, 175v, 336v, 340v, 409v end/406r reg.
\textsuperscript{2239} MC 1461, 131v, 140r, 175v, 364r, 366r, 380r, 409 end/406v reg.
\textsuperscript{2240} MC 1461, 111v, 176r, 364r, 380r, 382r, 408r end/407v reg.
\textsuperscript{2241} MC 1461, 44v, 75v, 176r, 178r, 373r, 381r, 382r, 410r end/405v reg, 415r end/400v reg, 418r end/397v reg.
\textsuperscript{2242} MC 1423, 198r.
\textsuperscript{2243} MC 1423, 63v, 124r, 154r.
\textsuperscript{2244} MC 1423, 45r, 56v, 170v, 248r, 258v, 268v, 447r.
\textsuperscript{2245} MC 1423, 225r.
\textsuperscript{2246} MC 1423, 74v, 205v.
\textsuperscript{2247} MC 1423, 231v.
\textsuperscript{2248} MC 1423, 161v.
\textsuperscript{2249} MC 1423, 44v, 136r, 216r.
\textsuperscript{2250} MC 1423, 52v.
\textsuperscript{2251} MC 1423, 60r, 276v.
\textsuperscript{2252} MC 1423, 60r, 135r, 328r, 337v.
Papa Emin,2253 Papa Gazar,2254 Papa Sarkis,2255 Papa Tateos,2256 Papa Taniel de Michie de Sabcachi,2257 and finally Papa Saac,2258 who was probably a monk, because he has an additional describer caloiéris (καλόγερος or καλόγηρος, καλός being ‘good’ and γήρας being ‘of old age’), which stands for ‘monk’ in Greek and Russian usage; it is interesting to see how a Greek word penetrated the Armenian ecclesiastical lexicon. In 1461 there were five Greek ‘papas’, Papa Christi,2259 Papa Georgi,2260 Papa Luca,2261 Papa Sisto,2262 and Papa Toca,2263 and one Armenian – Papa Khachatur (Caiador).2264

Soldiers accounted for up to 10% of the male population of Caffa and soldiering was perhaps the most widespread occupation in the city. It comprises those who were serving the Commune of Caffa or in other colonies as salaried warriors (without forgetting that owning a weapon and being able to use it was a causa sine qua non for everybody in that uncertain world). The garrisons were full of stipendiarii (mercenaries) from Italy or of local origin. In the fifteenth century, garrison staff increased.2265 Besides the mercenaries from Italy, in the Genoese époque we also find some Cossacks (cazachi),2266 who were sometimes mentioned in the Massaria Caffae along with their salaries (salaria cazachorum). These were the light cavalry troops and local mercenaries in Genoese service. The majority of Cossacks’ names are either of Turkic or Armenian in origin. For more information see chapter 4 on administration, where I deal with the garrison of Caffa in more detail.

2253 MC 1423, 197v.
2254 MC 1423, 60r, 92v.
2255 MC 1423, 276v.
2256 MC 1423, 11r, 57r.
2257 MC 1423, 147v, 231v.
2258 MC 1423, 231v.
2259 MC 1461, 77v.
2260 MC 1461, 71v.
2261 MC 1461, 156v, 332r.
2262 MC 1461, 47r, 77v.
2263 MC 1461, 172v.
2264 MC 1461, 163r, 407r end/408v reg.
2265 Venice was also strengthening its military presence on the Black Sea in the fifteenth century, and augmenting the expenses. Moreover, one can notice the growing concern of Senate, which led to the restriction of the procedure of recruiting crossbowmen. See, for example, ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 58, f. 65. ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 59, f. 112. Nonetheless, the money was always delayed, so some people used to give loans to the mercenaries, maybe with usury.
2266 Musso, Il tramonto di Caffa genovese, 324.
**Paupers.** The phrase *pauper et inops* is used frequently in the petitions of Ligurians wanting to return to Genoa, but who were incapable of paying their taxes,\(^{2267}\) who claimed poverty and petitioned to be exempt taxation (*avaria*). This is an evidence of the stratification of incomes and of relative poverty of certain strata of Italians in Caffa.\(^{2268}\) However, most of the Latins mentioned in the notarial deeds normally owned some capital and slaves, which suggests that there was not any significant stratum of poor people of Latin origin in Caffa. People went to the colonies in order to become richer, and most of them succeeded. Utter poverty is mentioned rarely, although this effect is partly created by the nature of the sources, since very poor people without any property had few grounds to contact the treasury on financial affairs. Still, some poor and indeed even homeless people are reported in the *Massaria Caffae*: two good examples are homeless girls or women Mistra (*Mistri vagabonda*) in 1374\(^{2269}\) and Benedicta (*Benedicta vagabonda*) in 1423.\(^{2270}\) Judging from her name, the later was Latin, which would imply that not all colonizers settled down well in Caffa, or perhaps she could be a slave converted to Roman Catholicism and then freed without any fortune.

**Servants.** Servants were relatively numerous in Caffa, and their services were cheap. The conditions of servants were very close to those of slavery, and we can only distinguish these two groups (slaves and servants) from the formal legal perspective. In 1344, Emmanuelle de Langascho hired a Greek Iane de Provati for a period of ten years in return for lodging, clothing, shoes, board and medical help if needed, but with a ban on marrying without her master’s permission.\(^{2271}\) In 1414, a Greek merchant from Candia and domiciled in Tana Georgius Chalotari hired a fourteen-year-old Bulgarian boy for three years in return for board and dress and without any salary.\(^{2272}\) This leads us to suspect that from the point of view of social history domestic servitude complimented slavery in terms of the redistribution of labour, and servants from poor strata of the Oriental communities were in fact ‘bought’ for a specific time period, and often ‘sold’ themselves into temporary slavery. These were mostly people from nations which could not legally enslaved, such as Greeks or Bulgarians.
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\(^{2267}\) Karpov, “New Documents on the Relations between the Latins and the Local Populations in the Black Sea Area (1392-1462),” 35.

\(^{2268}\) Karpov, *Diversorum…*

\(^{2269}\) MC 1374, 123v.

\(^{2270}\) MC 1423, 28r, 41r.

\(^{2271}\) *Notai genovesi in Oltremare*, No. 68.

Servants to the officers in the garrison often had positions in the garrison’s divisions, which allowed them to increase their salaries, if they had one, or allowed them to earn some money. The Caffae Massaria mentions some servants (*famulus* or *familiaris*): Giovanni de Rossiliono, the servant of Manfredo Sauli, Mavrodi, Gianino (*Ianinus*), and Dimitrius de Caihachara, servants of Theodoros Cassano from Cembalo, Giovanni Corsolo servant of Francesco de Andoria, Agostino de Bassignana servant of the interpreter Niccolò de Bassignana, Battista servant of Antonio de Sancto Georgio, Guglielmo servant of Girolamo Giustiniani, Guglielmo servant of a certain Giovanni, Tangriberdi servant of Antoniotto Lercari, Giovanni from Montpelier servant of maestro Tommaso de Andoria, Nicolla servant of maestro Francesco *de civitate Pennarum*, Benedetto servant of Pietro de Fieschi, Saul de Garibaldo servant of a certain Leo, Cadir Cohaia servant of Sacberdi, and Attabey Michali servant of Giovanni de Compagnono.

*Slaves.* Slaves formed a large part of the population in Caffa, and besides being treated as a commodity within the framework of economic history, they were also a part of society of the colony and from this prospective one of the elements of Caffa’s social environment. Slaves were displaced persons at the very bottom of the society of Caffa. They worked as domestic servants or labourers in the workshops of Caffiote craftsmen. Petrarch called slaves *domestici hostes* (domestic enemies) — “inmates of every household, so alien and yet so close”, and the author of a treatise of domestic economy in Sicily, Caggio, held the same
opinion: “We have as many enemies as we have slaves.” On the other hand, female slaves often became concubines of their masters, and therefore part of the family. Moreover, either in Italy or in the Genoese colonies, freed slaves also became part of the Latin society and intermarried with its lower classes, adding new blood to the Italian gene pool, which is why we often see faces with high cheek-bones and slanting eyes on the pictures of the Italian trecento and quattrocento. Balard estimated the slave population of Caffa in 1385–1386 at around 530 persons (4,240 aspres of tax collected to 8 aspres per slave). We cannot say whether the societies of Genoa or other Italian cities and Caffa or other Genoese Black Sea colonies were totally similar in respect of the proportion of slaves, given the rather fragmentary knowledge on the extent of slavery in the colony and in the metropolis. We can say, however, that slaves were a visible part of the population of Caffa and of its social life.

Legally, Italian medieval slavery had partly inherited the elements of the Roman perception of slaves and legal boundaries between freedom and slavery; however, in medieval Italian society slaves were no more than objects. Christian attitude towards slavery obviously influenced master-slave relationships as well. Slaves could impose conditions on their masters and demand promises from them. Slaves were often allowed to work for themselves and to have their own property – at least their own money, as we do not have any examples of slaves owning real estate. The examples of families owning more than one slave are rare, so we should not project the stereotypes made by the images of Roman or New World slavery on medieval slavery. In Italian households (and in both Latin and Oriental households of Caffa) slaves were treated rather like a non-lifelong domestic servants or workshop apprentices. Female slaves often became concubines of their masters, and their children were normally freed together with the slave herself.

Conversion to Christianity was an issue that gave slaves more legal rights (besides the ban to sell slaves to the infidels, they were more likely to be freed earlier than Pagan slaves.

2290 Origo, “Domestic Enemy The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries,” 321. However, the influx of slaves in the fourteenth century made up for the imbalance and extreme shortage of labour resulting from the huge population losses caused by the Black Death. Thus, slavery was a tool of the labor distribution in the absence of modern geographic mobility and opportunities of migration. The slave trade, whatever its scale, could obviously not drain the local societies of their productive manpower.

2291 He also inferred that the overall population of Caffa must have been around 20,000 based on an assumption that the correlation between the free and slave population in Genoa and Caffa must have been the same, which is 3%. The assumption is however very dubious, since Genoa and Caffa had basically very different structures of society.


2293 Here in fact slavery coexisted with other forms of compulsory or semi-compulsory labour, because the terms of hiring free servants could sometimes be close to slavery in practical terms, see a case with a Bulgarian servant boy: ASV, CI, 121, notaio Donato a Mano, No. 17, 9/V/1414.
and for the latter conversion to Roman Catholicism was often a prerequisite for being freed). Thus, in 1420 the Genoese authorities inspected the houses of the city’s inhabitants asking the slaves if they wanted to be baptized; those who agreed could be bought out, but would normally be re-sold to their Christian owners.2294 According to the Statute of Caffa of 1449, the Commune of Caffa had to offer protection to fugitive slaves exercising communal jurisdiction over them. The bishop of Caffa had to give asylum in his house to any fugitive slave from the Golden Horde or any other area besides Solkhat, who reached the area within one mile around the city moat of Caffa. If fugitive slaves wanted they could be baptized and then presented within three days before the syndics of Caffa, who had to resell the slaves to Christian owners by public auction and reimburse their price to their previous masters. If the syndics did not have any information about the owner of a slave, which was mostly the case for fugitive slaves from Tatar or distant lands, the fugitive slave would obtained his or her freedom and become habitatores of Caffa after a year.2295 Slaves could collaborate with the masters in their professional sphere, and indeed sometimes even helped them on their own right. There are some particularly striking examples of slaves owning money and other property as in two cases when the masters freed their female slaves on condition that they pay all the[ir] masters’ debts [sic].2296

We know less about the coercion imposed on slaves, which is surprising in a world full of violence. What we do come across are cases where a testator bequeaths a slave to somebody, but imposes a condition that this slave must be well-treated, otherwise he or she will be taken away from the new owner.2297 Although a tension in slave-master relationships was probably not something unknown, slaves never lived compactly and were normally treated well, and this is maybe the best explanation why we do not find any evidence of either violence against slaves, or of slave resistance. The coercion of slaves must have taken place, but we do not have much evidence for this in the sources which are otherwise abundant with various examples of violence. Neither is there any evidence of the personal experiences of slaves which would allow us to see the institution of slavery from their perspective.

Slaves were normally freed after some time,2298 and together with their freedom they received ‘Roman citizenship’, becoming full-fledged members of Italian society. Freeing

2294 Dopp, Traité d’Emmanuel Piloti sur le Passage en Terre Sainte (1420) (Louvain/Paris, 1958), 143.
2295 Statutum Caphe, 590, 621, 634–635.
2296 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 28r – f. 28v, f. 30r – f. 30v.
2297 See, for example, ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 23r.
2298 Although legal terms for slavery did not formally oblige masters to free their slaves.
slaves was generally done quite early on/early on in the master-slave relationship, and the
slave would normally receive a sum of money or, in the case of female slaves, a marriage
dowry.\textsuperscript{2299} To free a slave was considered an act of piety in medieval Europe, at least since
Late Antiquity, and therefore a dying person was often highly motivated to list all or some of
his slaves in his testament and give them their freedom (indeed that is why this type of
manumission by testament was the most widespread one,\textsuperscript{2300} at least before the early fifteenth
century, when the Genoese statutes of 1403-1407 however explicitly prohibited freeing
slaves by testament, because this practice led some slaves to a conscious murder of their
masters).\textsuperscript{2301}

The deeds of Lamberto Sambuceto (1289–1290) and the documents of the following
1291 and 1293 only report the sale of slaves, and therefore give little or no information on
their role in society (indeed we do not even know whether sold slaves remained in Caffa or
were sold on to Eastern or Western slave markets). At this point, it is likely that many more
slaves were exported from the Black Sea and only a few remained in Caffa, since the Latin
population of the city was not big enough and the demand for slaves was relatively low. As
early as 1289–1290 we find some cases of freeing slaves, mainly in testaments. Thus, in 1290
Archona received his freedom from Iohanes de Alba, Margarita from Rollandinus de Robino,
and Maria and Guillielmus from Georgius de Gavio.\textsuperscript{2302} However, most of the sources from
Caffa that I studied say little about slaves. Thus, in \textit{Massaria Caffae} 1423 slaves are only
mentioned twice: Martino slave of Demelode,\textsuperscript{2303} and larchassius (i.e. ‘Circassian’, which
was often used as a name) slave of Antonio de Sant’ Ambrogio.\textsuperscript{2304} Yet if we turn northwards
from Caffa, the Venetian deeds produced in Tana in the 1430s contain several cases of slaves
being freed, mostly by testament, and not unsurprisingly many slave owners are Genoese.
The common condition imposed on slaves was they should serve a period from two to seven
years before being freed.\textsuperscript{2305} Another condition was to pay their master’s debts.\textsuperscript{2306}

Freed slaves often received a dowry or a gift. Thus, a noble \textit{ser} Cristoforo de Colonna,
son of the late Giorgio, a Genoese domiciled in the Genoese quarters of Tana, freed his Zikh

\textsuperscript{2299} See, for example, a case of Agnesia and her master Iuncta in: Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, No. 406. See
also Venetian cases in Tana: ASV, NT. Cart. 917, 1.
\textsuperscript{2300} Danuta Quirini-Popławska, \textit{Włoski Handel Czarnomorskimi Niewolnikami w Późnym Średniowieczu}
(Kraków: Universitet Jagiellonski, 2002),45.
\textsuperscript{2301} Leges Genuensis, col. 882.
\textsuperscript{2302} Balard, \textit{Gênes et l’Outre-mer}, No. 689, 704, 882.
\textsuperscript{2303} MC 1423, 55v, 67v, 160v, 207r.
\textsuperscript{2304} MC 1423, 92v.
\textsuperscript{2305} ASV, NT. Cart. 917, 1. ASV, NT. Cart. 750, 8. ASV, CI. Cart. 231. f. 2r, 2v, 3r, 3v, 5r – f. 5v, 21v – 22r.
\textsuperscript{2306} ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 28r – f. 28v, f. 30r – f. 30v.
slave, Magdalena, with her (future, see below) children. In the next deed (his will) he bequeathed her clothes and all her belongings and gave her a dowry. If she died without legitimate heirs, her property was to pass to the fideicommissari. Antonello Crescono gave his slave, Magdalena of late Basani, 12 bezants and some land as a dowry in addition to her freedom. In some cases, the slaves received considerable sums of money. Thus, Baldassare son of the deceased Marco gave 200 ducats to his freed slave, Sirina, and 25 ducats to his freed slave Spertus, and bequeathed all the money stored at Maria Sarazena’s house to his adolescent slave Pietro. His companion, Bartolomeo Rosso, freed his slave, Giovanni, and gave him 100 ducats, his clothes, and a bed, and to his Russian slave Marina he also gave a dowry of 100 ducats and the license to retain her clothes in addition to her freedom.

The relatively humane way of treating slaves in Caffa, as well as in medieval Europe in general, was dictated to slave-owners not by any Christian or moral principle, but on material grounds. First, the perspective of being freed and living as a freeman in a society much more prosperous than the one from which they came was a stimulus for slaves to work better, and therefore increased labour productivity. Second, the Genoese model of slavery was not paternalistic-patriarchal; no slave owner wanted to fund ageing slaves unable to work. This is why instead of taking care of old slaves owners preferred to get rid of them as soon as they had fully exploited their labour while they were still young and strong and before they lost their economic value for the owner. Third, in a flexible society of businessmen like Caffa, a slave owning property and running his own workshop could often bring profit his former master. Fourth, most cases of freeing slaves involved conditions and can be considered a form of a hidden buyout: a slave had to serve to his master or some other person for several years or until their death, and would only receive their freedom after that.
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2307 ASV, CI. Cart. 231. f. 5v – f. 6r. What is more interesting, he drafted a special deed for this while others found it suitable just to mention the case of freeing a slave or slaves in their wills. Cristoforo even demanded that a notary gave him an instrumentum (original deed).
2308 ASV, CI. Cart. 231. f. 8v, 9r, 9v.
2309 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 23v – 24r.
2310 Who lived in Venice and was apparently a domestic servant.
2312 We have no sources to draw quantitative conclusions on the productivity of slave labour, but the fact that many artisans of different professions owned slaves makes us to think that it was high enough to cause interest.
2313 There could be exceptions, like in ASV, CI. Cart. 231. f. 3r – f. 3v, where a German called Heinrich Stangelin liberated his Russian slave Stefan, who was only twenty years old under the condition that he would serve to Heinrich for only two years more. This however was a special case of master’s benevolence. Slaves were normally liberated when they were old and no longer of any interest to the owner.
or immediately, but with the same imposed condition to serve for a specific period of time. Thus, we can sum up that the relatively humane terms of treatment and the flexible life opportunities for slaves resulted from the very nature of Genoese medieval slavery, which was a market-oriented capitalistic use of manpower and an integral part of the culture of the city of merchants.

**Social prestige and the factors shaping it: a statistical analysis**

Having demonstrated the main groups of the population of Caffa and having discussed in general categories its social structure, we should ask ourselves a question about its stratification and, most importantly, the factors that determined this stratification. Quantitatively, regression analysis is generally used as one of the most reliable ways to trace the relationship between dependent and independent variables. Armed with the ledgers of the Caffiote treasury, i.e. the *Massariae Caffae*, we can define, which variables given for the people mentioned can be considered indicators of social prestige and which are its determining factors? Although the link is not direct and is to some extent counterintuitive, the main proxy that can be an indicator of social prestige is social activity reflected in the number of times mentions a person is mentioned in the ledger, i.e. the number of property-involving contacts between him and the administration (taxes, salary, etc.). The frequency of contacts reflecting social activity and prestige is therefore taken as the outcome to be explained, i.e. the *dependent variable*. The factors that possibly can explain the levels of this social activity and prestige will therefore be treated as *independent variables*, and there are three: 1. belonging to a certain ethno-religious macrogroup; 2. noble or non-noble status of a person; 3. belonging to a certain professional group.\(^{2314}\)

The descriptive statistics for the three independent variables in *Massaria Caffae* 1423 are as follows:

\[^{2314}I\text{ aggregated professional groups myself based on the proximity of certain professions to one another.}\]
Community-macrogroup, MC 1423

Number of times mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3,308</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noble or non-noble, MC 1423

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noble</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noble</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>9,203</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-noble</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4,570</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profession, MC 1423

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artisan</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3,944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clergy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>11,447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slave</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soldier</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>3,581</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax farmer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>19,069</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of dependent variables can be illustrated by the following graph. The number of times mentioned is skewed to the right, i.e. Poisson distribution:
Therefore on the first stage we run basic Ordinary Least Squares regression. Zero-skewness log transformation is used which is ln(Count-.8354222). Then the normalized variable is used for the regression (CountNormal). The reference categories in the model are ‘noble’ for the social status, ‘soldier’ for profession and ‘Latin’ for ethnicity. The results of the regression for the data of Massaria Caffae 1423 are as follows:

| Source    | SS          | df | MS          | df | MS          | df | MS          | Number of obs | F(15, 1408) | Prob > F | Adj R-squared | R-squared | Root MSE |    |
|-----------|-------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|----|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|----|
| Model     | 880.435578  | 15 | 58.6957052  | 15 | 58.6957052  | 15 | 58.6957052  | 1424          | 34.86       | 0.005     | 0.2630    | 0.2708     | 1.2977    |         |    |
| Residual  | 2370.93189  | 1408| 1.68390049 | 1408| 1.68390049 | 1408| 1.68390049 |               |             |           |           |            |           |         |    |
| Total     | 3251.36747  | 1423| 2.28486822 | 1423| 2.28486822 | 1423| 2.28486822 |               |             |           |           |            | 1.2977    |         |    |

Dependent var.: CountNormal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coef.</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Significance P&gt;</th>
<th>95% Conf.</th>
<th>Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-noble*</td>
<td>-.2701532</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.2.78</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-.4604486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artisan*</td>
<td>-0.8395212</td>
<td>0.134 -0.622</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.104087</td>
<td>-0.5749555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy*</td>
<td>-1.026727</td>
<td>0.369 -2.78</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-1.751804</td>
<td>-0.30165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant*</td>
<td>-0.6717712</td>
<td>0.2639 -2.54</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-1.189585</td>
<td>-0.153974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official</td>
<td>0.1524716</td>
<td>0.1387 1.10</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>-1.196875</td>
<td>-0.1196875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant*</td>
<td>-1.431031</td>
<td>0.4383 -3.26</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-2.290856</td>
<td>-0.5712064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>-1.054529</td>
<td>0.9232 -1.14</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-2.865587</td>
<td>.7565291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax farmer*</td>
<td>1.248495</td>
<td>0.2576 4.85</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>.7430449</td>
<td>1.753945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown*</td>
<td>-1.394713</td>
<td>0.0851 -16.37</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-1.561822</td>
<td>-1.227603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker*</td>
<td>-1.54038</td>
<td>0.7535 -2.04</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-3.018523</td>
<td>-0.0622378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armenian*</td>
<td>-0.4660529</td>
<td>0.1293 -3.60</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.719876</td>
<td>-0.212296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek*</td>
<td>-0.3713536</td>
<td>0.0926 -4.01</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-0.553006</td>
<td>-0.1897004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>0.3415204</td>
<td>0.4629 0.74</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>-0.566931</td>
<td>1.249734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>0.2445585</td>
<td>0.1836 1.33</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>-1.157798</td>
<td>.6048969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN*</td>
<td>-0.5445106</td>
<td>0.1697 -3.21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.877523</td>
<td>-0.2114982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### _cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>_cons</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.270761</td>
<td>0.1046 12.14</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.065446</td>
<td>1.476076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of observations = 1424
R-squared = 0.27

All groups, excluding officials and slaves among the professions and Jews and Muslims among the communities-macrogroups are statistically significant.

The descriptive statistics for the three independent variables in *Massaria Caffae 1461* are as follows:

### Community-macrogroup, MC 1461

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.726</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>11.337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Noble or non-noble, MC 1461

Number of times mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noble</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>13,293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-noble</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profession, MC 1461

Number of times mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3,601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merchant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20,654</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>26,138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7,899</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax farmer</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>16,645</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5,254</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the regression for the data of *Massaria Caffae* 1461 are as follows (same as in *Massaria Caffae* 1423 in the first case the referent group was ‘noble’, in the second ‘soldier’ and in the third ‘Latin’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
<th>= 1031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>756.62049</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58.2015762</td>
<td>Prob &gt; F</td>
<td>= 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>773.745456</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>.760811658</td>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>= 0.4944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1530.36595</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1.48579218</td>
<td>Root MSE</td>
<td>= .87225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dependent var.: CountNormal | Coef.        | Standard Error | t    | Significance P>|t| [95% Conf. Interval] |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|-------------------|
| Noble                       | -2597305     | .0702          | -3.70| 0.000          | -0.3975104 -0.1219507 |
| non-noble*                  | -.7429897    | .1378          | -5.39| 0.000          | -1.013504 -0.472475 |
All groups but the clergy among the professions and the Jews among the communities-macrogroups are statistically significant. The explained variance is rather high, especially in the second analysis: 49% of the variance of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables in the current analysis.

If we assume that the Ordinary Least Squares regression reflects the reality, we obtain the following figures:

In 1423:
- non-nobles are mentioned 27% less than nobles;
- artisans are mentioned 84% less than soldiers, the clergy is mentioned 102% less than soldiers, merchants are mentioned 6% less than soldiers, servants are mentioned 143% less than soldiers, slaves are mentioned 105% less than soldiers, workers are mentioned 154% less than soldiers, and the people in the ‘unknown’ category are mentioned 139% less than soldiers; on the other hand, tax farmers on average are mentioned 124% more often than soldiers and officials are mentioned 15% more often than soldiers;

---

2315 But its representatives are too few and statistically insignificant. The same is true for Jews, who are therefore even included in this data.
- Armenians are mentioned 46% less than Latins, Greeks are mentioned 37% less than Latins, Muslims are mentioned 24% more than Latins, and the people in the ‘unknown’ category are mentioned 54% less than Latins.

In 1461: - non-nobles are mentioned 26% less than nobles; - artisans are mentioned 74% less than soldiers, the clergy is mentioned 55% less than soldiers, merchants are mentioned 120% less than soldiers, workers are mentioned 175% less than soldiers, and the people in the ‘unknown’ category are mentioned 146% less than soldiers; on the other hand, tax farmers are the only category where people on average are mentioned 0.46 more often than soldiers and the officials are mentioned 60% more than soldiers; and
- Armenians are mentioned 46% less than Latins, Greeks are mentioned 30% less than Latins, Muslims are mentioned 45% less than Latins, and the people in the ‘unknown’ category are mentioned 60% less than Latins.

However, in fact the Ordinary Least Squares regression is based on the normalized. We can therefore run two other types of regression, namely Negative Binomial regression and Poisson regression, which are more reliable in our case, and compare the results.

Three regressions: MC 1423 (the reference groups are soldiers, non-nobles, and Latins)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>odds ratio</th>
<th>odds ratio</th>
<th>odds ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ordinary</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least</td>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Square</td>
<td>regression</td>
<td>regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regression</td>
<td>regression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Artisans</td>
<td>0.432***</td>
<td>0.785***</td>
<td>0.806***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0647)</td>
<td>(0.0636)</td>
<td>(0.0427)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clergy</td>
<td>0.358***</td>
<td>0.515***</td>
<td>0.523***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.0953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Merchants</td>
<td>0.511**</td>
<td>0.719**</td>
<td>0.726***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.135)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.0770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Officials</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>1.588***</td>
<td>1.571***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.171)</td>
<td>(0.119)</td>
<td>(0.0632)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Servants</td>
<td>0.239***</td>
<td>0.424***</td>
<td>0.420***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.102)</td>
<td>(0.130)</td>
<td>(0.0969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Slaves</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.301)</td>
<td>(0.340)</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tax farmers</td>
<td>3.485***</td>
<td>3.088***</td>
<td>3.146***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.646)</td>
<td>(0.402)</td>
<td>(0.166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Unknown</td>
<td>0.248***</td>
<td>0.457***</td>
<td>0.458***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0197)</td>
<td>(0.0241)</td>
<td>(0.0160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Ordinary Least Square regression</td>
<td>Negative Binomial regression</td>
<td>Poisson regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisans</td>
<td>0.476***</td>
<td>0.638***</td>
<td>0.654***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0751)</td>
<td>(0.0817)</td>
<td>(0.0494)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.676**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.234)</td>
<td>(0.194)</td>
<td>(0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>0.287**</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>1.362**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
<td>(0.293)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>1.960***</td>
<td>2.470***</td>
<td>2.649***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.372)</td>
<td>(0.306)</td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax farmers</td>
<td>1.588**</td>
<td>2.088***</td>
<td>2.054***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.320)</td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.0886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.232***</td>
<td>0.386***</td>
<td>0.400***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0142)</td>
<td>(0.0225)</td>
<td>(0.0138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td>0.173***</td>
<td>0.260***</td>
<td>0.262***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0323)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobles</td>
<td>1.297***</td>
<td>1.247***</td>
<td>1.172***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0944)</td>
<td>(0.0785)</td>
<td>(0.0338)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>0.628***</td>
<td>0.562***</td>
<td>0.555***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0585)</td>
<td>(0.0562)</td>
<td>(0.0345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OLSR</td>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Greeks</td>
<td>0.739***</td>
<td>0.648***</td>
<td>0.681***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0606)</td>
<td>(0.0542)</td>
<td>(0.0334)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jews</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.311)</td>
<td>(0.261)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Muslims</td>
<td>0.636***</td>
<td>0.501***</td>
<td>0.467***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0750)</td>
<td>(0.0791)</td>
<td>(0.0518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unknown</td>
<td>0.549***</td>
<td>0.550***</td>
<td>0.533***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0683)</td>
<td>(0.0672)</td>
<td>(0.0426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.758***</td>
<td>8.091***</td>
<td>8.084***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.246)</td>
<td>(0.325)</td>
<td>(0.158)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>1,031</th>
<th>1,031</th>
<th>1,031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Note: For the interpretation and counting percentages for all values where odds ratio is smaller than 1 applies a special formula; those greater than 1 are analysed normally.

Thus, according to the results of these three regressions:

In 1423:

- Artisans are mentioned 132% OLSR or 28% NBR or 23% PR less than soldiers;
- Clergy is mentioned 178% OLSR or 96% NBR or 92% PR less than soldiers;\(^{2316}\)
- Merchants are mentioned 96% OLSR or 39% NBR or 37% PR less than soldiers;
- Officials are mentioned 16% OLSR or 59% NBR or 57% PR more than soldiers;
- Servants are mentioned 317% OLSR or 138% NBR or 138% PR less than soldiers;
- Slaves are mentioned 186% OLSR or 82% NBR or 75% PR less than soldiers;
- Tax farmers are mentioned 250% OLSR or 209% NBR or 214% PR more than soldiers;
- Workers are mentioned 376% OLSR or 112% NBR or 112% PR less than soldiers.

\(^{2316}\) See above; clergy and Jews are disregarded in my analysis because these groups are not numerous enough.
• Nobles are mentioned 31% OLSR or 122% NBR or 120% PR more than non-nobles.

• Armenians are mentioned 59% OLSR or 39% NBR or 43% PR less than Latins;
• Greeks are mentioned 43% OLSR or 22% NBR or 30% PR less than Latins;
• Muslims are mentioned 28% OLSR or 24% NBR or 18% PR more than Latins.

In 1461:

• Artisans are mentioned 108% OLSR or 59% NBR or 54% PR less than soldiers;
• The clergy is mentioned 72% OLSR or 51% NBR or 47% PR less than soldiers;
• Merchants are mentioned 244% OLSR less than soldiers or 10% NBR or 36% PR more than soldiers;
• Officials are mentioned 96% OLSR or 147% NBR or 169% PR more than soldiers;
• Tax farmers are mentioned 59% OLSR or 108% NBR or 105% PR more than soldiers;
• Workers are mentioned 488% OLSR or 284% NBR or 284% PR less than soldiers.

• Nobles are mentioned 29% OLSR or 24% NBR or 17% PR more than non-nobles.

• Armenians are mentioned 61% OLSR or 78% NBR or 82% PR less than Latins;
• Greeks are mentioned 35% OLSR or 54% NBR or 47% PR less than Latins;
• Muslims are mentioned 59% OLSR or 100% NBR or 112% PR less than Latins.

A brief glance at our results gives us an image of a fairly structured oligarchic society. First, Latins doubtlessly dominate in social activity, Greeks and Armenians lagging behind with a significant gap. The high prestige and activity levels of Muslims in 1423 can be explained if
we recall that many of the Muslims appearing in *Massaria Caffae* 1423 are not permanent inhabitants of Caffa, but are part of the court of Solkhat staying in the Genoese city temporarily on diplomatic mission. In 1461 this effect disappears and the Muslims, even though many of them are rich merchants and slave traders from Asia Minor, no longer supersede the Latins. The society of Caffa is dominated by the nobility; this trend is clearly visible in 1423 and fairly visible in 1461. As for the professions, at the pinnacle of Caffa society we find the office-holders and tax farmers (mainly noblemen), medium-ranking groups of soldiers and merchants, and lower-ranking groups of artisans, workers, servants, and slaves. Thus in general terms we can say that Caffa reproduced to a certain extent *mutatis mutandis* the Genoese pattern of a society: strictly hierarchical, oligarchic, based on the domination of the elite. “Investments in the eastern Mediterranean... were increasingly financed by large family companies, the predecessors of the big Genoese banking houses of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The rich Genoese families were taking political control of the town, and by doing so, they intensified social tension. In the first half of the fifteenth century the tension reached its climax: No fewer than thirteen urban uprisings and revolutions took place in Genoa between 1413 and 1453.”

To conclude, Caffa was ‘another Genoa’ also in the sense of its social structure.

---

CHAPTER 7. CAFFA AS A CENTRE OF TRADE: DYNAMICS OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY, TRAFFIC, AND COMMUNICATIONS

During the late Middle Ages the Italian city-states emerged as the leading centres for long-distance trade in the Mediterranean, in the Black Sea, and along the Atlantic coasts of north-western Europe. This hegemony was the outcome of a long historical process and linked Italy’s destiny with developments in Europe north of the Alps, in the Middle East, and in Asia.2318

Thanks to the benefits of its geographical location and robust legal system, Caffa acquired a strong commercial position in trade and became a bulwark of Genoese commercial activity on the Black Sea.2319 The political and administrative system of Genoese Gazaria was basically a framework to secure the most favourable conditions for Genoese traffic in the area, increasingly connecting Europe and the East from England and Flanders to China and Japan, which fostered further development of the emerging capitalism in Italy.2320 Trade was the raison d’être of Caffa, as well as of all the Genoese overseas colonies in the East, and this raison d’être was intimately linked with all the dimensions of the life of the colonies discussed above. As Patrick O’Brien correctly notices: “Along with spices, herbs, sugar, botanical drugs, jewels, chinaware, silks, cottons and elaborated metal goods, imported through the Middle East, from India, Southeast Asia and China, the ships of Genoa, Florence

---

2319 Tardy, Kaukázuszi Magyar tükör (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988), 47.
and Venice brought to Europe a lot of information about the broader world.”  

In the words of Philippe Beaujard: “Trade implies not only an exchange of goods, but also an exchange of knowledge, beliefs, and values.”

Many historians agree that the period 1400–1800 marks the beginning of the modern era. At the level of the human species as a whole, the most striking aspect of this period was the enormous extension of networks of communication and exchange that linked peoples and societies more and more tightly. Genoese Black Sea colonies were part of its expansion, and one of the important parts. Caffa was a crossroads of trade routes and a transit point for the goods arriving from the East to West and vice versa. In spite of the economic crisis of the fourteenth century, the Italian trade soon restored its positions on the Black Sea, and this chronologically coincided with the formation of the Genoese colonial empire. In economic terms, the exchange between Genoa (and, in broader sense, Western Europe) and the colonies (and, in broader sense, the East) was predominantly an exchange between the industrial zone and the zone supplying raw materials and manpower for the growing European industry.

Navigation of the Genoese and Venetian trade and maritime republics is one of the best researched fields in our area. The maritime history of these republics, routes and

---

2323 Burke, Big Era Six. The Great Global Convergence. 1400-1800.
2328 It already caused interest in the eighteenth century. See Formaleoni, Storia filosofica. For the material aspects and the vessels see di Tucci, “Costruzione di galee genovesi durante il dogato di Leonardo Montaldo,” in Miscellanea di Studi storici in onore di A. Lucio, vol. 1 (Florence, 1933). L. Gatti, “Costruzioni navali in
directions of trade, freight, and navigation received much attention from the scholarly community since the times of the Enlightenment. Different aspects of the Genoese, particularly studied by Lane, generally Italian and European navigation were in the focus of research of many other scholars. The Genoese perfected their seafaring skills in the high Middle Ages, and a had great many naval skills to help them dominate the Black Sea beginning from the time when they first installed themselves there.

The Genoese had vessels of many different types of different tonnage (galea, cocca, monerius, nava, lignia, panfilis, griparia, fusta, barca, to mention just a few) they also


extensively took their advantage from the opportunity to use local Oriental merchants as their junior partners.\textsuperscript{2335} The trade routes were linking Caffa to the Western Mediterranean, the Levant, the Aegean Sea, and all the coastal cities of the Black Sea and the Azov Sea. The Genoese often owned ships collectively, one vessel being owned in shares (\textit{carati}, which were typically twenty-four per ship) by several people and also particular individuals owning shares in different ships\textsuperscript{2336} – this attracted more investment, avoided or minimized commercial risks, diversified material losses if the enterprise failed, and distributed capital in a more balanced way across several different enterprises.\textsuperscript{2337} Ships were often sold by carat in 1289–1290, and the theoretical prices for the whole ship varied from less than 1,260 to over 39,000 \textit{aspri}, while the prices for renting ships fetched from 2,500 to 11,000 \textit{aspri}.\textsuperscript{2338} The smaller boats were also divided into carats and sold in the same way, and in 1289–1290 varied from 225 to 300 \textit{aspri} for the whole vessel.

The system of maritime trade relied on a symbiosis of the Western and local systems of currency and monetary mechanisms. For accounts in considerable amounts the Genoese used a unit called the \textit{sommo} equalling the Tatar sum or Russian rouble and used both in the Golden Horde and in various Russian lands, particularly in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. It was not a physical coin, but a counting unit that contained in different times various amounts of gold or silver, and therefore different amount of coins.\textsuperscript{2339} The most frequently used physical legal tender was a silver coin minted by the Khans and called \textit{asprum baricatum} after the Khan Berke (1257–1267), the first Tatar khan who converted to Islam and therefore who began to mint his coins in Arabic lettering.\textsuperscript{2340} Their correlation varied through time, meaning that in different years there could be different amount of \textit{aspres} in \textit{sommo}; thus, according to Pegolotti, one \textit{sommo} was the equivalent of 8.5 Genoese ounces of silver.
(224.35 grams or 7.91 ounces). In around 1286–1288 one aspre baricat must have equalled roughly 8 Genoese denarii. In the course of the fourteenth century, the aspre depreciated, and at a certain point it was renewed and was thereafter referred to as aspri novi or aspri boni de cuneo novo in the sources. In 1381, an aspre was roughly 1.3 grams of silver. In the 1390s-1420s, however, the aspre continued to depreciate. At this point there was a notable change: Caffa claimed the privilege to mint and started to produce its own aspres with the symbols of both Genoa (castello genovese) and the Khans (tamga), which reflected its dual status. Otherwise, merchants could use denarius grossus, asprum commenatum of the Trebizond Empire, Byzantium perpers, Turkish akçe or ‘Turkish aspre’, asprum casininus or casaninus of Tabriz, Tatar dirhams, aspres of other Genoese colonies including those in Gazaria, bezants, and various forms of florin (Venetian ducats, Florentine florins, Hungarian forints, or genovino of Genoa).

Long-distance maritime transportation was not the only advantage of the Italians over the local population that led them to the ruling and colonizing position. Without a more progressive organization of commerce they would not have gained domination over the Mediterranean and Black Sea trade. If we look through the existing private deeds of the époque, we will see that in their colonies the Genoese used all the arsenal of commercial techniques and tools of exchange used in the metropolis. We have to consider space, communications, and the difficulties encountered by people travelling long distances; that is why it was crucial to have all these tools at one’s disposal to manage the finances and otherwise property in a flexible way. All levels of Genoese society constantly used the mechanisms of notarial culture, named procurators (this activity is visible in all Genoese notarial deeds from Caffa dated 1289–1290, 1344, and 1382), used cambium

2341 Pegolotti, La pratica della mercatura, 52, 223.
2342 ASG, Not. cart. No. 41, f. 26v; No. 74, f. 149 r.
2344 Balbi and Raiteri, Notai genovesi in Oltremare, 38, 70, 141.
2349 Costamagna, Il notaio a Genova.
2351 Notai genovesi in Oltremare, 3, 4, 6, 16, 47, 75, 81.
2352 Airaldi, Studi e documenti su Genova e Oltremare (Genoa: Istituto di paleografia e storia medievale, 1974), No. 36, 82-83.
organized societies such as commenda or societas maris, made loan agreements, purchase agreements, maritime loans, maritime exchanges, mandates, procurationes, and the insurance contracts.\footnote{Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 732, 746, 747, 842, 855.}

As Wolfgang Reinhard wrote, “the ‘mercantile revolution’ led by the Italian cities of the High Middle Ages, which introduced new forms of monetary transaction and the capital company, the societas or compagnia, with their system of banking, credit and insurance and with trading interests that reached across the world as far as East Asia.”\footnote{For maritime insurance according to the sea concerned see Heers, Gênes au XVe siècle. Activité économique et problèmes sociaux (Paris: Flammarion, 1971), 206-217.} The financial and banking culture of the Genoese was very well developed. The amount of money circulating in the banks in notes payable, or promissory notes, exceeded the amount of available cash in Genoa. Genoese banks were a new institution marking the beginning of the époque of capitalism. Florence with its trading houses (of a different origin) was another cradle of banking in Europe and “although a greater volume of trade moved through Venice than through Florence, Venice never developed any business houses with such large concentrations of capital as those of the Bardi or Medici.”\footnote{Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 8.} However, the Genoese bank of St. George was one of the largest and most prominent banks of the time, and in fact it was the bank that ran the Genoese state, and not the other way around. In other words, the state and the banks were completely interdependent.\footnote{Lane, Recent Studies on the Economic History of Venice, 316. See also: Lopez, The Dawn of Medieval Banking. On the history of banking in the later period see: Lane, Venetian Bankers, 1496-1533: A study in the early stages of deposit banking.} I will not focus on banking here but there is an extensive bibliography on medieval Genoese (particularly about the Bank of Saint George,\footnote{Marengo, Manfroni, Passagno, Il banco di San Giorgio (Genoa, 1911). Musso, “Note d’Archivio sul Banco di San Giorgio,” ASLSP.NS 2 (1964): 292-302. de Guadan, “La amonedación de la banca de San Jorge en el s. XV, y los problemas de abastecimiento de la plata en la baja edad media,” Acta numismática (1976).} among them some works focusing on Caffa), Venetian,\footnote{Felloni, “I primi banchi pubblici della Casa di San Giorgio,” ASLSP.NS 35 (1906). Felloni, “I primi banchi pubblici della Casa di San Giorgio (1408-1445): L’archivio della Casa di San Giorgio ed il suo valore per le ricerche storiche,” ASLSP.NS 31 (1991): 225-246.} and generally Italian\footnote{Sieveking, Genueser Finanzwesen, vol. 1, Nos. 5-8. H. Sieveking, “Studio sulle finanze genovesi nel medioevo e in particolare sulla Casa di S. Giorgio,” ASLSP 35 (1906). Felloni, “I primi banchi pubblici della Casa di San Giorgio (1408-1445): L’archivio della Casa di San Giorgio ed il suo valore per le ricerche storiche,” ASLSP.NS 31 (1991): 225-246.} and European banking.
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In the époque we are discussing, double-entry book-keeping was invented in Italy and spread throughout Europe (accounting historians recognize that double entry bookkeeping did not suddenly appear in Genoa in 1340, and is most unlikely to have had a single inventor). It was another factor of commercial progress, both fostering economic development of the Genoese capitalism and developing and refining thanks to its progress.

According to Max Weber, double-entry book-keeping was a key component of ‘rational
capital accounting’, which in turn is indispensable in modern capitalism.\textsuperscript{2368} These ideas of close link between double-entry book-keeping and capitalism were developed by Joseph Schumpeter\textsuperscript{2369} and Werner Sombart.\textsuperscript{2370} According to de Roover, it mirrored a new capitalistic and rational way of thinking\textsuperscript{2371} and a big shift in mentality, which he called ‘the Commercial Revolution of the Thirteenth Century’\textsuperscript{2372} following the footsteps of Gras,\textsuperscript{2373} the founder of business history,\textsuperscript{2374} considering it a switch from ‘Petty Capitalism’ to ‘Mercantile Capitalism’.\textsuperscript{2375} The role of double-entry bookkeeping was also further studied by Frederic Lane. Partially agreeing with some anti-Sombartian criticism, he stated that “apart from its direct psychological connections with the ‘spirit of capitalism’, accounting as a tool of management played a key role in changing the structure of business organization.”\textsuperscript{2376}

\textbf{ISSUES OF TRADE}

\textbf{Goods exported from or through the Black Sea region or destined for local consumption}

\textit{Cereals and bread}. The Black Sea area served as a granary as far back as antiquity, supplying the Greek city-states of the Aegean Sea. In the Middle Ages, Crimea was thus already established as an important granary supplying the Black Sea areas of Asia Minor with various crops, and this grain was exported to feed Constantinople.\textsuperscript{2377} The first Italian mentions of their grain trade on the Black Sea are dated to 1268. Soon after this, the Italians took over the grain trade and began exporting it to Genoa, Byzantium, cities in Asia Minor, and the Near East, eventually making the capital of Byzantium and other Greek cities
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dependent on this supply,\textsuperscript{2378} and thus using commerce as a means of political pressure. Moreover, the price of grain e.g. in Trebizond, was around three times higher than in Caffa, and in the thirteenth century the net profit of this trade was close to 100\% – this was the period when the highest profit margins of this trade were made.\textsuperscript{2379} Going beyond the Bosphorus, towards Mediterranean Europe, grain was often reshipped in Pera after departure from Caffa. The Byzantine government tried to regulate the Italian grain trade, which was of vital importance for the Empire, at least up to the second half of the fourteenth century,\textsuperscript{2380} but it did not help – Constantinople became dependent on the Italian ships bringing bread (even though most of the grain probably went to Constantinople from Thrace).\textsuperscript{2381} A good example of this dependence can be seen as early as in the winter 1306–1307, when Constantinople experienced a famine, according to the Vita of Patriarch Anastasios I.\textsuperscript{2382} Another example can be seen in 1343, when the siege of Caffa by Janibeg caused a famine in Constantinople\textsuperscript{2383} and a shortage of bread in Venice.\textsuperscript{2384}  

By bringing the Black Sea grain trade, previously a Byzantine monopoly, under Latin control, Caffa took on a function that was probably no less important than its role as the administrative centre of Gazaria – it became a point of concentration and distribution of food supplies for the Genoese colonies and Greek cities of the Black Sea. It therefore controlled most of the grain trade that was directed both within the Black Sea region and towards Genoa, Pisa, Provence, and Syria. The administrative framework for the grain trade was provided throughout the fifteenth century by the \textit{Officium victualium}, meticulously described by Sandra Origone.\textsuperscript{2385} Throughout this period, the crops of Crimea and Trace were a priority, while the grain of the Danubian area was also massively exported,\textsuperscript{2386} although it was considered to be of slightly lower quality.\textsuperscript{2387} Grain was exported from loaded ships to the regular Genoese settlements such as Vicina, Chilia, Licostomo, Moncastro, Soldaia,
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Cembalo, Tana,²³⁸⁸ Porto Pisano, Cabardi, Vosporo,²³⁸⁹ Matrega, Mapa, Lo Fasso, and Savastopoli;²³⁹⁰ the Caffioite merchants also purchased grain, rye, and millet from producers or intermediaries all over the Black Sea coasts, such as San Giorgio, Rosso, Pesce, Taro, Zaccaria, Cabardi, Ciprico, Conestati,²³⁹¹ Calinimeno, Aziachon, Cavalari, Cubacuba, and Chersonesos²³⁹² (where they may have owned anchorages and maybe some Genoese were even domiciled in these sites, but they did not have consulates or other forms of Genoese colonial administration). An area of particular importance here was Zikhia: the Caffae Massaria of 1386 mentions, for instance, a certain Roman (Romanos fillius Izuff de Caffa) staying in Zikhia with the aim of buying grain (qui ad presens moratur in Catays in Zichia).²³⁹³ Part of the purchased grain was sold in Caffa (mainly in spring²³⁹⁴ and autumn),²³⁹⁵ but a large amount was also exported.

We know very little about the production of this grain and what we know comes mainly from the reports of travellers. Thus, a Franciscan friar wrote in the fourteenth century that Tatars “sow a seed which they call monos, something like ajonjoli. It is sown at any time of the year, soon sprouts, and is reaped after thirty days. This is grown in great quantity. It is cooked with milk, and makes very good food, which the people eat and give to travellers.”²³⁹⁶ This, however, clearly indicated sesame, which was normally consumed by the Tatars themselves. Thanks to the description by Giosafat Barbaro, we also know that the Tatar nomads raised crops and had huge harvests of millet, whether close to the Italian settlements or not is unknown;²³⁹⁷ Barbaro provides figures that seem to be incredible, namely 1 to 50, 1 to 100.²³⁹⁸ What we do know is that the grain trade was one of the main trades of Genoese Gazaria, and that the grain from Caffa (or rather, going through Caffa) was of the highest quality in all the Black Sea area.

²³⁸⁸ Karpov, The Grain Trade, 59.
²³⁸⁹ ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, Busta 19, Notaio Benedetto Bianco.
²³⁹⁰ ASC AS, Diversorum filze No. 3021. ASG MC 1374, f. 16v; MC 1386, ff. 400v, 401r, 206r.
²³⁹¹ Karpov, The Grain Trade, 59.
²³⁹³ ASC, SG, MC 1386, 217v.
²³⁹⁶ Book of the knowledge of all the kingdoms, lands and lordships that are in the world, ed. Sir Robert Clements, KCB (London: The Hakluyt Society, 1912), 46 - 47.
²³⁹⁸ I viaggi in Persia, 86.
According to the notarial deeds drawn up by Lamberto di Sambuceto in 1289-1290 around 6,000 *modii* of wheat, millet, barley were exported from Caffa to Trebizond, 410 *modii* to Kerasunt (modern Giresun), around 175 *modii* to Simisso, and 162.4 *modii* to other Black Sea cities; and this is the data of a single notary. At the time (1289–1290), wheat cost 12.50 *aspra baricata* per *modius* in Caffa and 32 *aspora baricata* per *modius* in Trebizond; millet was sold in Caffa at 10.6 *aspers baricatas* of Caffa – 8 Trebizond *aspers comnenats* per *modius*, and in Trebizond it cost 10.6–12.8 per *aspra baricata*. In the early fourteenth century, a place called Leferti was also a source of grain; however, the quality was lower than the grain from Caffa. In 1357 and 1361, the *Officium Victualium* in Genoa received 312 *modii* of the grain of Licostomo at a low price from Caffa. In May 1361, 1,438 *modii* of grain from Chilia arrived in Constantinople. In January 1361, a ship brought 3,248 *minae* of grain from Licostomo, and most of it was bought right away. In 1374–1375, during the period when Caffa exported more grain than it imported thanks to its abundance, the Caffiote’s *Officium Victualium* paid per *modium* of grain 69 *aspers* in September 1374, 120 *aspers* in December 1374, 100–110 *aspers* in January 1375, 108 *aspers* in March 1375, 100–160 *aspers* in May 1375, 120–140 *aspers* in June 1375, and 110–140 *aspers* in July 1375. In 1374, during a famine in Genoa, the price was - according to Stella - 20 *librae grossorum* per *mina*. In 1381, a certain Segurano Boga and Bartolomeo Pegolo loaded around 400 *modii* of millet for 70 *sommio* in Illice. In 1384, the grain imported to Genoa equalled 31,919 *minae* from Romania, 31,344 from Caffa, and 3,710 *minae* from Phocaea (modern Foça), i.e. 77 % of Genoa’s overall imports. In 1385, grain, barley, millet, beans and chickpeas were supplied to Caffa from Simisso, where the local consul Bernabò Fieschi purchased them following the orders of the consul of Caffa. In 1386, the *gripparion* of Niccolò Varolo was loaded with 250 *modii* of wheat, while Ambrogio Bono’s *cocha* carried 248 *modii*. The civil unrest during the second half of the fourteenth century and the early fifteenth century got to a point where Caffa, blocked by the Tatar troops, had to import grain. In 1386, during the war with the Tatars of Solkhat, the authorities in Caffa bought grain in Samastro and
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2399 See in: ASV, Cancelleria inferior, Busta 181, Notaio Conrado de Sidulo.
2400 Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 42.
2401 ASG, Antico Comune, Massaria Comunis Ianue, No. 8, ff. 7v, 8r, 143r, 158v, 164 r-165v, 202v; SG, Gabella grani, 1361, ff. 4v, 7v, 13r, 22v, 132r.
2406 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 65r, 91r, 93v, 360v.
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some other places on the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{2407} Then, in 1386, wheat was sold in Caffa at 175 \textit{aspres} or 1 \textit{sommo 4 saggi 6 carati per modium}.\textsuperscript{2408} However, in 1388, Caffa again supplied Genoa with 30,524 \textit{minae} of grain on twelve ships.\textsuperscript{2409} From 1392 to 1393, only a little grain was sent to Genoa from Caffa because of a disastrous crop failure in Crimea, so Genoa had to support Caffa, sending there 4,000 \textit{minae} of grain bought in Sicily and Southern France. In 1390, Caffa sent to Genoa 9,402 \textit{minae} of grain (14\% of the total supply), in 1391-3,578 \textit{minae} (10\%), in 1393 (from January-June) – 3,709 \textit{minae} (6\%), in 1406 (from January-April) – 5,927 \textit{minae} (36\%), and in 1408 (between January and November) – 11,794 \textit{minae} (22.5\%).\textsuperscript{2410} Normally, the price of grain in Genoa was lower in the autumn; this was obviously because the ships from Caffa arrived loaded.\textsuperscript{2411}

In the fifteenth century, the situation changed for two reasons. First, constant turbulences pushed grain prices in Crimea up, and Caffa experienced a shortage of food several times. Second, despite the difficult conditions, Caffa became a regulator of grain prices within the Genoese possessions, as well as a centralized point of grain redistribution in Gazaria.\textsuperscript{2412} In any case, the prices of wheat and millet in Caffa were much lower than in all the other colonies; therefore, by preserving the commercial importance of the southern direction of the Caffiote commerce the grain trade became an important strategic means by which to solidify the key administrative role of Caffa as \textit{caput Gazarie}. As mentioned above, in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the Genoese established a new committee called the \textit{Officium victualium} to regulate food supplies.\textsuperscript{2413} The \textit{Officium} was in charge of both supply issues and taxation, run by a system of clerks\textsuperscript{2414} who controlled the imports and exports of food, inspected warehouses and loading goods onto ships.\textsuperscript{2415} They also prevented individuals from buying food with the aim of storing it for resale,\textsuperscript{2416} and weighed grain in the bazaar, port, and other specified places, but only until 1420s, after which time the bazaar became the only fixed place for trading grain.\textsuperscript{2417}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{2407} ASG, MC 1386, f. 321r.
\bibitem{2408} ASG, MC 1386, f. 386 v. About the prices in Europe see: AS. Prato, Carteggio Pisa da Genova No. 508.
\bibitem{2409} Musso, Navigazione e commercio, 145-147.
\bibitem{2410} Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise}, vol. 2, 762-764.
\bibitem{2411} ASG, SG, Officium Victualium No. 147.
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\bibitem{2416} Even the millers could not buy grain in order to resell it as flour.
\bibitem{2417} The punishment for those who weighed grain illegally was cutting off the ear. Origone, “L’amministrazione genovese a Caffa nel secóla XV,” \textit{Saggi e documenti} 3 (1983): No. 5, 7, 22, 40.
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Punishments for breaking the regulations pertaining to provisioning the city and exporting food supplies were extremely severe. Those hiding grain for resale were traced and put on trial. In 1436, ship-owners were obliged to endow a pledge guaranteeing the observation of the rules and besides the normal staff of the Officium victualium a special troop of officers was created to pursue the illegal purchase, storing, and sale of food. The increasing role of Caffa as a centre of redistribution of grain to led to its economic domination over the entire area. Trading in grain was in fact becoming an increasingly public enterprise, since the colonial administration had either made contracts with certain grain traders giving them special authority and privileges, or financed the grain traders from the Commune’s budget, or both.

Thus the grain trade in the fifteenth century can be considered as a public enterprise. Above, I discussed the role of the administration in purchasing and regulation; this role was even more prominent in redistribution. The purchased food supplies were concentrated in Caffa; a certain amount was destined for re-export to Genoa, while the remaining amount was stored for the city’s needs in the towers of the city. Despite the severe regulations, compared to the previous period in the early fifteenth century, the grain export from Caffa to Genoa increased – from 5,927 minae in 1406 to 11,794 minae in 1408, and this trend continued, encouraging some scholars to hypothesize that in the fifteenth century, given its scope and international character, the grain trade was the most important of all the Genoese enterprises.

This conclusion cannot be drawn, but we can say that along with the slaves, wax, and fish, grain was one of the main attractions of the Black Sea for the Genoese. Until the 1450s–1470s, the sources of commercial voyages to Moncastro, Vosporo, etc. to buy wheat, are mentioned. Although Pegolotti has shown that there were several taxes on the grain trade, it was still very profitable to trade grain in the fourteenth century provided that the three conditions were present: (i) the grain had to be bought in Crimea during harvest.

---

2418 These merchants could often take the role of envoys or controllers of the others with the rights of requisition.
2419 This could be done directly or indirectly, with credits, subsidies, etc.
2420 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 759-764.
2424 See, for example, ASG, SG, Gabella grani 1361, ff. 1 v, 22v.
time, (ii) the harvest had to be good, and (iii) the parties of the purchased grain had to be big. This remained the case until 1453 at least.

Interestingly, the meticulous state regulations operated not only in favour of the supplier, but also in favour of the consumer: although in the course of the fourteenth century grain prices increased dramatically, in the fifteenth century the Commune of Caffa managed to keep grain prices at a fixed level.2425

**Fish.** This was a regional product and part of a long-distance international trade, and perhaps the main product of trade if not in Caffa, then certainly for Tana and Copa.2426 Fish from the Black Sea and the Azov Sea was in high demand by the Byzantines in Constantinople, and is still appreciated on the markets of Istanbul and in the Black Sea area itself.2427 The fish was exported from the Azov Sea, and especially from the estuary of the River Don, the areas around the main fishing locations of Tana and Copa.2428 Schiltberger mentions that Azaq on River Don was exceptionally abundant with fish.2429 Some scholars, however, have suggested that other places were also extremely important for the export of fish, such as the mouth of the Danube,2430 in Chilia, where the prince of Moldavia charged (already in the late fifteenth century) a tithe on more than twelve tonnes of fish.2431 The Genoese were present and commercially active there; however, there is no surviving evidence of their involvement in the Danubian fish trade.2432 Thus, what we know about the fish trade performed by the Italians relates mainly to the North-Eastern territories.

More precisely, fishing was seasonal in the Sea of Azov, and Genoese ships sailed to Tana to be loaded with sturgeon between July and September, as the fishing and the fish
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2428 See about Copa above. This initially Zikh city on the right bank of river Kuban was an important point for the fish and caviar traffic since times immemorial. Copa hosted a special fish market and the notarial offices. As said above, only Copa had a consul in the whole Easter Azov Sea shore. See: Ю. А. Узлов, “К вопросу об итальянской колонизации Северо-Западного Кавказа в XIII - XV вв.,” in Причерноморье, Крым, Русь в истории и культуре. Материалы II Судакской международной научной конференции (12-16 сентября 2004 г.), Частъ II (Кiev/Sudak, “Академпериодика”, 2004), 216.
2432 Pistorino, Notai genovesi; Balard, *Les Génois dans l’ouest de la mer Noire; Airaldi, I Genovesi a Licostomo.*
market in Tana were closed in September and the departure of the ships was fixed for this month. They took on heavy loads of sturgeon (10–65 milliarii, i.e. 3.2–20.6 tonnes) in either Tana or Copa, which were then transported in three main directions: to Constantinople and Europe, to Asia Minor, and to Caucasus. Needless to say, the most important route was through Constantinople to the Mediterranean and North-Western Europe, although vessels normally stopped first in several coastal colonies, mainly in Azov Zikhia or Caucasus. This trading route supplied Caffa and the other Genoese colonies, Trebizond and, indeed, all the coastal cities of Northern Asia Minor, Constantinople, the cities of the Aegean, and – finally - Europe with fish. Indeed, Pero Tafur reported that fish from the Black Sea and the Azov Sea was even sold in Castile and Flanders. The schedule of the Venetian galleys of muda was drawn up in such a way that the Flanders galleys departed to the North via the Strait of Gibraltar only after the Tana galleys had arrived, and their supplies of fish and caviar had been reloaded onto the latter.

Between April 23 and May 16 1290, a notary drew up eight contracts in Caffa according to which the ship-owners went and loaded their vessels with fish in La Copa, in the mouth of the River Kuban. The ships were meant to stay in La Copa for fifteen days fracto bazali – that is, until the market closed, according to Brătianu; the scribes of the Caffae Massaria also used this phrase to signify a bazaar or suq, also with permanent shops. Brătianu and other researchers have suggested that there was a temporary fish market at the mouth of the River Kuban, which closed after mid-May, after which the above-mentioned fish market in Tana opened and worked from July until September, trading in fine sturgeon and other fish from the Don. (It is also possible that the market continued until September–October, when the merchants of Caffa went to buy fish from Volga and the Caspian Sea, (arguably) transported by land routes to Tana).
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2433 Notai genovesi in Oltremare, Nos. 25, 31. Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 438, 442, 467, 470, 471, 480, 501, 526. Balard, Notes sur l’activité maritime de génois de Caffa, 382. Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 706-707. Balard, however, wrote that there was another market of fish, existing since the thirteenth century; this market remained open even after the closure of the one in Copa.
2435 Tafur, Wanderings and Travels, ed. L. C. Maciel Sanchez (Moscow: Indrik, 2006), 53 -54.
2439 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-Mer, No. 740, 788, 903.
2440 A.G. Еманов, Север и Юг в истории коммерции, 121-124.
The Greeks dominated the fish and caviar trade on the lower regional level of naval communications. This is clear from the notarial deeds of Sambuceto and Beltrame, where most of the fish and caviar merchants were Greeks. Perhaps this was already a longue durée structure that the Genoese found when they penetrated the Black Sea region and which they did not change, but instead adopted to serve their own needs. All the same, the notarial testaments of the fourteenth century show that the Genoese also traded in fish, although in Tana – Manuel de Guarniero, Nicoloso Spinola, and Andalò Basso are all mentioned in connection with this kind of trading. The documents of the fourteenth century stored in Datini’s archive in Prato often mention the sturgeon, salted fish and caviar brought by Genoese vessels from Romania. In addition, the Venetians’ letters of cambium from Tana dated November 1401 and the earlier documents dated as of August 1384, October 4, 1384, November 7, 1384, etc. all, for example, report intense trading in sturgeon. As early as 1427, the Venetian fish trade was placed under the control of a special office called the Ternaria Nuova. The travelogue of Giosafat Barbaro dedicated to the second quarter of the fifteenth century also described the peschiere, that is, the fisheries of the Sea of Azov in Bosagaz, forty miles away from Tana. The owners of peschiere could be Italian (e.g. Giovanni da Valle), and sometimes these peschiere were plundered by the nomadic Tatars; Barbaro wrote that they took thirty barrels of caviar that his friend, Giovanni de Valle, had hidden and covered hoping that they would not find them. These fishing locations were still used after the Ottoman conquest in the sixteenth century. As we can see, the Italians sometimes fished (as in the times of Barbaro). In most cases, however, they were the intermediaries, while the fishermen were usually Greeks or Tatars.

It is impossible to guess the scale of trading in cheap species of fish brought to Constantinople and the Greek cities of Asia Minor and normally consumed by the lower classes. However, the most noticeable object of this trade, that is, sturgeon, are better reflected in the sources. They were an important commodity, and this trade had a long-distance and international character. The Venetian notarial deeds of the 1430s show that the fish trade was flourishing at this point. Thus, a certain Baldassare says that he was given 500
bezants for 4 botte of sturgeon and 1,000 bezants for another 7 botte of sturgeon; Michele de Matteo de Suazio mentions that he sold 25 botte of sturgeon; Giovanni Liardo received 20 ducats from Giovanni Basilio with permission to transfer a cambium to Venice conditional upon a deposit of 2 botte of sturgeon; there are other several mentions of sturgeon, peschiere, and Italian people working there. Thus we can deduce that the prices in 1430s were equivalent to 10 ducats, 125 bezants, and 142.8 bezants per botta.

In the fifteenth century, the seasonal fish market in Copa began to be strictly regulated. Before the merchants of Caffa and special clerks could fix all the prices – and therefore the profits made there – the presence of the consul was needed. In addition, the merchants could begin trading only after the beginning of the season was announced with a special proclamation, together with the announcing of the prices which were fixed by the consul after consulting with the local authorities. The consul also levied the anchorage dues (15 aspres per ship), export toll (1 aspre per botta), and the taxes paid by the purveyors of fish and caviar (10 aspres per botta).

Caviar. The Byzantine Empire consumed caviar and was engaged in the caviar trade long before the Western Europeans first learned to eat this product. The main source of caviar for Constantinople and, later on, Europe was the same River Don, and this means Tana. Western Europeans initially looked at those strange Greeks who ate fish eggs with a mixture of suspicion and contempt, and saw this activity as a sign of perversion. However, in the course of the fourteenth century this fashion was introduced to the tastes and preferences of Europe, and caviar became an object of luxury consumption. As with many other exotic goods in the Middle Ages and later times, the fashion for them among the elites had to be shaped, following which the demand for them led to a more expanded consumption. In a Greek ledger written in the fourteenth century, possibly in Thrace, we find an evidence of the sale of 9.5 cantars of caviar called koupatikon. This can either mean that it was transported in

2448 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 23r.
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2450 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 3 – 3v.
2451 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 26v; 1430.
2452 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 20r – 20v.
2453 Statutum Caphe, 671-674.
2454 Jacoby, “Caviar Trading in Byzantium,” in Mare e littora, ed. Shukurov (Moscow: Indrik, 2009), 349–364.
barrels (Latin *cupa*), or that it came from Copa. Pero Tafur wrote in the fifteenth century about the caviar exported from the region of the River Don. One Venetian was mentioned as having received six barrels with caviar of four *cantar* each, making a total of 24 *cantars* of caviar in all, or 1142.4 kg. In Pera, caviar was sold in 1433 at 6.5–7 *perpers* for a Genoese *cantar*, which means 47.65 kg; in 1438 in Constantinople it was sold in 1438 at 6 *perpers* per *cantar*, and later, at 6.8 and 5 *perpers* per *cantar*. We should note that Badoer bought the caviar on a very large scale coming to hundreds of kilos.

**Salt.** The salt trade played a key role in the economies of both Genoa and Venice, as well as in the entire Mediterranean world. In 1260, Genoa managed to diversify its salt imports so as not to be entirely dependent on its source in Provence; salt was now also imported from Ibiza, Sardinia, and Alexandria. Moreover, special provision was made with the seigniors of Toulon and Hyères, by which Genoa was reserved a special right to export salt. In 1270s, however, Crimea was added to the list of the sources of salt. Northern Crimea with its Sivash, also known as the Rotten Sea (Çürük Deñiz in Tatar), was a natural place for salt-mining. The exported salt was mainly mined and loaded onto ships in either Ciprico or Luprico, otherwise spelled as Luzuprico or Juprico; on the Tamar

2458 Tafur, *Wanderings and Travels*, 166.
2459 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 29r.
2463 Ibiza at that point was a salt mine par excellence. Pegolotti, *La Pratica della mercatura* (Cambridge: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936), 154, 224.
Luxor – Lo Ciprico, near Dousla or Touzlah, 50 miles from Caffa; or somewhere around the Peninsula of Kerch. Other mining locations were Tobechik Lake (Töbecik gölü), Le Saline in the lakes of Saky, Quyzyl-Yar, and Kichik-bel, the lakes in Kiatskoe and near Perekop and (according to Barbaro) in a certain Zuchala Ivi and in 400 other salty lakes.

This Genoese Black Sea salt trade is first mentioned in 1278, when the imperial kommerkiarioi stopped a merchant, Corrado di Rainaldo di Noli, with a ship transporting salt to Constantinople. According to the deeds of Sambuceto, 1400 modii of salt (390.3 tonnes) were exported to Trebizond, 2000 modii (565.8 tonnes) to Sinope, and 400 modii (112.6 tonnes) to Kerasunt, although the figures for export to Constantinople may have been even higher. The Armenians, Alans, and Tatars of Solkhat also took part in the salt trade. Moreover, the deeds of the fourteenth century show that most people dealing with the salines directly and most of the intermediaries selling salt to the Italians had Turkic names, so we can deduce that this business was mainly run by local people.

According to the regulations of 1317, the Genoese were forbidden to transport salt to sell in Constantinople and Pera; they could only transport it to Europe, making a stop in Pera, but not disembarking the commodity itself. In the fourteenth century, this trading was carried out on a large scale, one of the main final destinations being Trebizond. The salt itself was quite cheap: 1.75 aspres baricats per modius near the mines, but the transport costs were not and ranged from around 5.6 to 6 aspres baricats per modius, thus almost three times more than the price of salt bought in situ; the Genoese were therefore obliged to sell
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salt in the Greek cities at a much higher cost, in order to cover the cost of transport and to make a profit.  

The Genoese exported salt to Europe, chiefly to Genoa, although the city was mainly supplied by Hyères, Provence (75%). In 1366, indeed, only around 7.4% of the salt imported to Genoa came from Romania and, in the following years, the only imports of salt were reported as coming from Cyprus and Alexandria. Afterwards, however, the import of salt from Crimea to Genoa was re-established, and in Genoa the salt imported from Crimea was more expensive than that of Ibiza and Alexandria: we can see this in the documents written by Giosafat Barbaro, who compared Crimean salt to Ibizan salt in his Viaggi. However, the main bulk of mined salt did not go beyond the Black Sea region. Fish and salt played a very important role in the regional Black Sea trade for the Genoese. Having transported salt to Trebizond, the Genoese sold it at a much higher price, which allowed them to purchase more silk and spices arriving from the East via Tabriz. Balard wrote that there was a profound solidarity and an intimate complementarity between the ‘heavy and cheap’ and ‘light and expensive’ commodities, as well as between the regional trade and the long-distance one; finding (or establishing?) this balance was an important factor in the formation of the Genoese commercial domination.

**Ceramics.** These were not the most frequently exported products, although some Crimean cities were historically the producers of pottery. The so-called Latino-Palaeologan group of ceramics comprise those produced in Crimea, mainly in Soldaia; some pottery could have come from Tana and the Golden Horde. In Caffa, ceramics must have been produced first in the Greek, Armenian, and other workshops situated in the citadel; later
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on, these were destroyed by fire, and the craftsmanship moved from the upper town to its outskirts. We do not know about Caffa, but the ceramics from Soldaia were exported to other Crimean cities and beyond the peninsula.  

**Timber.** Like many cheap commodities (and unlike salt), timber had low freight rates, and was therefore largely exported to Italy, which needed raw materials.  

**Honey.** Although not the most frequently exported product, being brought from Asia Minor and Danubian area, honey was a complementary commodity in Genoese trade. The documents report only once that 119 cantars of honey had to be sold, and, apart from this, no other reference is made to honey in the sources.  

**Wax.** The role played by wax trading, along with grain and leather, was especially important in the thirteenth century, before other commodities developed. In the course of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Genoa became one of the biggest European wax markets. Most wax was exported to Genoa from the Pontic regions of Asia Minor; however, it mainly went to Genoa through the port of Caffa, although wax from Russian territories was also traded in Tana, and the Genoese correspondent of Francesco di Marco Datini mentioned the wax from Tana in 1390. The peak of the wax trade came perhaps in the late fourteenth century: Datini’s documents mention that in January 1395 the ship Lomellina travelled with 2,000 cantares (approximately 95 tonnes) of wax from Romania on board, while other documents imply that there was a minimum of fifty sacks on board. Pegolotti mentioned the wax from Bulgaria, distinguishing it from the wax coming through Tana, the Genoese sources also mention it fairly often and confirm that the Bulgarian wax was of higher
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quality. Crimea also produced some wax, which was collected in Solkhat. The Danubian regions also supplied wax, Vicina and Chilia being the trading sites for this activity. In general, however, the wax trade reflected the production needs for candles and paper in Europe. The wax trade in Caffa was first mentioned in the 1280s. In 1282, 158 centenaria and 44 librae are reported to have been sold in Genoa. In 1288, wax cost 7 librae grossorum (lire di grossi) per cantar in Caffa. According to Sambuceto, large loads of wax were traded in Caffa in 1289-1290, the load sent to Genoa amounted to 9,000,000 aspres, that sent to Pera amounted to 17,800 aspres, and the load preserved in Caffa for the future amounted to 54,000 aspres. In the fourteenth century, many vessels were used to serve the needs of the wax trade, and as the prices in Genoa were high, the transport expenses were covered and the profit was significant; freights cost 4.5 perpers for 1,000 librae, which was not a lot, and wax must have eventually generated good profits of around 30-40%. In 1381, one cantar of wax was sold in Caffa at 1 sommo 32 saggi. Venetians also traded wax in Tana, establishing special freight rates for it, regarding it, however, as sottili (light and expensive) goods. Sometimes it was among the main objects that attracted the Venetians. Wax accounted for 28.4% of the exports that Giacomo Badoer took from Constantinople to Venice. One Venetian in Tana mentioned twelve cantars of wax in his testament. During the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the trade in wax became the way that the Genoese dealt with the general crisis in trade: their solution was to shift from silk and spices to the heavier and cheaper commodities, which proved to be more profitable in the end.

**Fur.** Caffa became the main centre for the furs from the North and North-East thanks to the stability and security of the routes connecting Crimea to the Russian and Tatar
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territories.\textsuperscript{2504} Thus, Russia was the main supplier of fur on the European markets, and Caffa was the southern transit point of this traffic.\textsuperscript{2505} Yet we should not forget that most of the furs were probably sold to Europe via the Baltic Sea, and even as far as the Black Sea trade is concerned it is possible (or can be inferred) that the people from the merchant Republic of Novgorod were intermediaries in this trade,\textsuperscript{2506} or at least participated in it. The merchants of Moscow must have begun participating later on, and they were connected to the Genoese, who are believed to have had a certain amount of influence on the Russian home policy.\textsuperscript{2507} Unfortunately, the southern direction of Russian medieval trade is poorly studied.\textsuperscript{2508} Nonetheless, we find evidence for its existence and intensiveness of trade on it in the Italian archives. Although Heyd thought that the Russian merchants established their trade in Crimea in the thirteenth century,\textsuperscript{2509} in fact they were present in the Black Sea from the early Middle Ages. By the thirteenth century, their main centres in Crimea were Sougdaia (Soldaia)\textsuperscript{2510} and Chersonesos. Soldaia was thus the centre \textit{par excellence} of this trade and where Russians sold their furs and bought Eastern silk and spices.\textsuperscript{2511}

Ermine and most other costly furs were exported via Constantinople to Genoa and further, often being re-exported to Florence, Pisa, and Naples, and supplied the Mediterranean, being sold in Europe at higher prices; more modest furs were often used \textit{in situ} or sold to local people.\textsuperscript{2512} There are traces of the presence of craftsmanship such as furriers in Caffa. Thus, winter fur coats (шуба in Russian, the word was borrowed and used
in the Italian documents as *subbum*) were often made of the back and/or belly squirrel fur.\(^{2513}\)
The merchants, both Italian and local (mainly Russian, but also Tatar and Armenian), might have used several possible routes to reach the Black Sea. The travels of Russian Metropolitan Pimen, written up by Ignatij Smolnjanin in the late fourteenth century, described one itinerary from the Russian territories to Caffa and Constantinople via the River Oka and the river Don;\(^{2514}\) this route took around forty days to cover.\(^{2515}\) There was also another route via the Volga to Sarai and from there via the Don to Tana and Caffa.\(^{2516}\) Several other routes linked the Black Sea with Russian territories: there was the overland route through the steppe to Caffa and those via the River Dnepr, another from Smolensk and Slutzck to Moncastro, and the yet another via the Volga to Astrakhan,\(^{2517}\) then via the Caucasus to Trebizond and Constantinople.\(^{2518}\)

Having penetrated to the Black Sea, the Italians soon established intensive bilateral contacts with the Russian territories; it was not only the Russians who sailed down the River Don to Tana and Rivers Dnepr and Dniester to Caffa – in 1246, Plano Carpini met Venetian, Genoese and Pisan merchants in Kiev on his way to the Golden Horde.\(^{2519}\) The deeds of Sambuceto, 1289–1290, mention squirrel, fox, marten, and ermine furs;\(^{2520}\) other furs exported were sable\(^{2521}\) and lynx.\(^{2522}\) Squirrel furs were sold in Caffa at 1 asper a piece at that

\(^{2513}\) Delort, “Un aspect du commerce vénitien au XV\textsuperscript{e} siècle: Andrea Barbarigo et le commerce des fourrures (1430-1440),” *Le Moyen Age* (1965): 55-56.

\(^{2514}\) Кarpov, *История Трапезундской империи*, 421.

\(^{2515}\) Tikhomirov, *Древняя Москва* [Ancient Moscow] (Moscow: Moscow Worker, 1992), 77-79.

\(^{2516}\) Скржинская, Барбаро и Контарини о России, 61. Both Giosafat Barbaro (1436) and Ambrogio Contarini (1476) wrote in their travelogues that the cities around the River Volga went into decline after the devastating raid of Tamerlane in 1395 and never recovered. [B. D. Grekov, A. Y. Jakubowski,] B. D. Греков, A. Ю. Якубовский, *Золотая Орда и ее падение* [The Golden Horde and its fall] (Moscow: Moskovskiy Litzev, 1998), 298. However, Sarai still retained its commercial importance in the first half of the fifteenth century, which can be confirmed by the archaeological data. See: А. В. Пачкалов, *Города Нижнего Поволжья в XV в., Золотоордынская цивилизация* 1 (2008): 62. Same could be true for some other cities. In fact, the real decline of Sarai began in the second half of the fifteenth century and was connected to the new rise of Astrakhan (Hagitarkhan). Barbaro wrote about the declining Astrakhan in 1430s, after the wars for succession, after which there was a recovery of the city. The existence of the broad commercial contacts of the Volga region with Turkestan and Persia after the raid of 1395 can be confirmed by the finding of a treasure discovered in village Marfino in the delta of Volga and comprising solid sterling coins from Central Asia and Iran. Additionally, we should not forget that the Genoese and Venetian trading stations in Tana also quickly recovered after the Tamerlane’s devastation. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l’exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien* (XII-XV\textsuperscript{e} siècles) (Paris: de Bocoard, 1959), 365. 2517 This and the previous route via the Volga were often unsafe because of the ushkujniki, pirates operating on the river.

\(^{2518}\) This and the previous route via the Volga were often unsafe because of the ushkujniki, pirates operating on the river.


\(^{2520}\) Balard, *Gênes et l’Outre-Mer*, No. 53, 132, 201, 367. For the other years: ASG, Notai ignoti, B. 11, f. 24, f. 6r.

\(^{2521}\) Кarpov, “Из Таны в Ургенч” [From Tana to Urgench], *SV* 61 (2000): 219.
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This trade continued and increased in the course of the fourteenth century, and starting from this point the presence of Russian merchants is repeatedly recorded in the Italian trading stations. The Genoese, however, often travelled to Sarai, as one notarial deed confirming a transaction of 1,760 squirrel furs drawn up in the capital of the Golden Horde goes to show. Thus, as we can see that the scale of the trade was quite large. Yet another illustration: in the second quarter of the fourteenth century, a Venetian merchant, Nicoletto Gatta, purchased 460 squirrel furs, 100 fox furs, 132 marten furs, and 26 furs of beech marten in Tana. In 1374, one vessel called cocha brought ermines from Pera to Naples (ermines were sold at 600 hyperpers each), while other ships from the East brought squirrel, marten, lynx, and fox furs. In 1386, a large consignment of ermine was brought from Solkhat and sold in Caffa. In Caffa, in 1386, ermine cost 5.5–5.75 aspres per piece, and squirrel belly fur around 1.01 (the same as a century before). The documents of Francesco Marco Datini attest to ships arriving with furs in 1391 and 1401 (this last one bearing 1,000 furs). In 1395, a total of 103,200 squirrel furs were exported from Caffa and Tana to Italy; in 1396, this figure fell to 4,800, in 1397–2,400. However, soon squirrel fur regained its market position with 7,200 squirrel pelts exported in 1401–1402, and 9,600 in 1404. Pero Tafur, who visited Caffa on his return from Central Asia, was shocked by the abundance of furs, and not without reason: in the early fifteenth century, there were 250,000 pelts of fur in the warehouses of Venice imported through the Black Sea.
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2532 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 11r, 37 v
2533 AS. Prato, carteggio No. 514.
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Leather. This commodity was important, although not a priority, at least after the period 1300–1360. Cow, sheep, and goat leather (including fine cordobans) was exported mainly to Italy (and even re-exported to Southern France); however, it was also partly redistributed within the Black Sea region (Constantinople, Trebizond, Simisso). Here, Caffa was the main exporter. The leather from the Black Sea first appeared in Genoa in 1272. In the times of Sambuceto, both Italian and Armenian merchants specialized in the leather trade. In the late thirteenth century, a piece of cow’s leather cost 70 aspres per cantar plus around 15 aspres per cantar for transport. At this point, the leather trade was very important compared to the wax trade; in the course of the fourteenth century, leather partly lost its position in the ranking of trade between the Black Sea and Italy. This probably occurred for two reasons. First, there were competing sources of leather in Spain and Northern Africa. Second, although in the late thirteenth–early fourteenth centuries, the price of leather in Genoa increased, the transport costs for leather prevented profits from becoming very high. In 1357, one ship brought 4,000 pieces of leather to Genoa; in 1385, 6,000 pieces are documented as having arrived from Caffa to Italy; in 1396, another ship brought 1,002 pieces. However, among the ‘heavy’ commodities, leather lost its position to wax. It is generally believed that in the fifteenth century, the export of leather from the Black Sea area diminished.

Animals. In the fourteenth century, the urban life of the Golden Horde started to decline, and therefore, along with the relative depopulation and decay of cities, agriculture, and craftsmanship, there was a certain amount of growth in the nomadic sector. This brought some benefits for the Europeans, because it led to a large-scale animal trade (trafficking in horses and cattle). This trade mainly followed the overland routes and are thus only of secondary interest for us; nonetheless, the movement of horses, bulls, and sheep from the steppe to Hungary, Moldavia, Walachia, and Transylvania, to be taken on to Italy and Germany in a second leg, was also part of the economic life of the Black Sea region. Another
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2543 [Grekov, Jakubowski], Греков, Б. Д., А. Ю. Якубовский, Золотая Орда и ее падение [The Golden Horde and its Fall] (Moscow: Moskovskiy Litzey, 1998), 298.
route went from the steppe to Persia, camels being among the commodities in this case. We do not have any exact figures here, but we do know is that it was large-scale. A description of this trade can be read in ‘Viaggi’ by Giosafat Barbaro.  

**Copper.** The main bulk of this copper travelled from Asia Minor, where it was mined. The Greek inhabitants of Sinope took the lists of metal to Caffa; another source was probably Armenia, from where copper was taken to Tana.  

It has been suggested that the copper from Sinope was used by the Caffiotes for local craftsmanship.

**Alum** This occupied an important niche in the Italian Eastern trade. Alum was exported widely because they were used in the textile and tannery industries for dying and colour fixing. Romania was one of the most important transit points of the alum trade, as we can see in Ducas’ reports of the alum processing. It was mainly mined in some places in Anatolia, the principle centres being Phocea and Koloneia. The commodity was then transported to Caffa through the ports of Trebizond and Kerasunt. According to Sambuceto, in 1289–1290, 9,000 cantars (428.9 tonnes) amounting to 78,000 aspres of alum from Asia Minor was exported from Caffa to Genoa, and 56.6 cantars (2.7 tonnes) was kept in Caffa. The main sources of alum were in the Near East and in Central Asia. Starting in 1390 the documents of Francesco di Marco Datini mention a caravan that arrived in Tana carrying silk, wax, and a large amount of alum.
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**Carpets.** Eastern carpets were sometimes exported to Europe, together with other characteristic goods of the material culture of Latins in their colonies.

**Silk.** The export of silk was important in the Black Sea Italian trade, mainly in its early stages, i.e. in the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries. The silk arrived in Caffa through Solkhat or by sea. There were three main sources of this silk: Central Asia (mainly Khwarazm and Urgench), the inland regions of Iran, Azerbaijan, and Georgia (Astara, Ganja, Talysh, and Gilan), and the Byzantine Empire. The first indications of the Black Sea silk trade were in 1238; this silk was called *seta ledegia* and arrived from Gilan, Southern Caspium, through Armenia Minor. Another type of silk from Gilan was *guelli*, named after this area and widely traded in the late thirteenth century. Chilea silk was mentioned in the 1280s. Balard suggested that it came from the Caspian area and it was mentioned by Marco Polo as coming from Gelachelan. Chinese silk began to be traded in Gazaria during the last quarter of the thirteenth century, but in the early fourteenth century it was replaced by silk from less distant regions. A type of silk called *mercadasia* came from Sogdiana, Central Asia. We also find references to several different types of silk, namely *manzadiani* (perhaps from Tabaristan, the historical area of Iran comprising all the Southern coast of the Caspian Sea, or from one of its interior areas called Mazandaran), *sechexia* (Cheki, province of Arran, Azerbaijan), and *talani*, (from Talysh in Azerbaijan). Georgia produced a silk known as *iurea*, or *iurta*, or *gorgiana* (named after the place Gorgan), mentioned in 1264–1293; other Georgian silks were *canzia* (from Ganja) and *camma* (from Chamaki); we also find cases of *cannaruia* (from Karabakh), and some other silks from Caucasus. Profits from the silk trade must have been at around 10%, on average. Silk from Central Asia, Caspian areas, and
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2556 Bautier, Les relations économiques, 291, n. 1.
Caucasus travelled to the Black Sea via two main routes: through Tabriz and Trebizond, or through Tana; Caffa thus mainly functioned as a transit point in this case.

According to Sambuceto, in his experience the raw silk exported to Genoa from Caffa cost 33,000 aspres. Silk was immensely important throughout the fourteenth century. The commercial interest was so high that, in the early fourteenth century, the Genoese continued the trade with the Muslim Eastern Mediterranean notwithstanding the risk of papal excommunication. In the first half of the fourteenth century the Genoese sometimes used the overland routes to reach Persia to buy silk. Balard wrote that the silk trade was managed by the members of the Genoese commercial aristocracy – Vivaldi, Stancone, Spezzapetra, Ghisolfi, Bestagno, Gentile, Ultramarino, Adorno, Andalò di Savignone. These voyages must have come to an end in the mid-fourteenth century, however, because of unrest on the inland routes of the Ilkhanid states. The importance of the Black Sea silk and spice trade for Italy is mentioned by Giovanni Villani when he cites an abrupt increase of prices in these commodities in 1343, when Janibeg was besieging Caffa. Silk from the Caspian area was among the cargoes that the Genoese found in 1381 on the confiscated Venetian ships. Also in 1381, seta ledegia, cannaruia, and manzadiani were to be found in Caffa. However, it is common knowledge that the sottile commodities of Eastern origin such as silk and spices became less important. The long-distance trade with Central and Eastern Asia declined as a result of the general crisis of the fourteenth century, and the end of the Ilkhanate. Although, for example, the Venetian deeds from Tana in the 1430s occasionally mention silk, Barbaro lamented a visible decay in the trade. By the early fifteenth century silk no longer played an important role in the structure of the Italian Black Sea trade.

In the early fifteenth century, however, Caffa became a centre of silk production. The silk made in Caffa is often mentioned in Russian documents of the fifteenth century. Badoer bought silk in Constantinople at 153–165 aspres commenats per libra, and silk cloth from
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2567 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 8, 19r (3) – f. 19v (4), 20r – f. 20v, 23r, 25r, f. 30v – f. 31r.
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Caffa was mentioned in the regulations of tolls issued by the first Ottoman sultans in Constantinople.

Spices. The Italian spice trade in the Black Sea was first documented in 1284. First of all pepper was traded in Caffa, and it arrived, together with silk, through the ports of Tana and Trebizond. As well as pepper, the Genoese received cinnabar, archill, musk, incense, etc. through the ports of Asia Minor. Francesco Balducci Pegolotti mentioned Tana as a key point in the spice trade, especially for pepper and ginger. Gems and precious stones (Eastern pearls and rubies) were also counted as spices. Spices were one of the main products of long-distance trade in the fourteenth century. It is significant that after Janibeck plundered Tana in 1343 and the trade with Italy came to a halt, the price of spices and silk in Italy shot up twice. In 1382, pepper confiscated from the Venetians was sold for 4 sommi 31 saggi per cantar. The spice trade was very lucrative with up to 40–50% profits. However, the fate of the spice trade was the same as that of the silk trade; the crisis in the fourteenth century and the lack of safety after the collapse of the Ilkhanate brought about a marked decline of the spice trade by the late fourteenth century. Thus, the trade routes shifted from Tana and Trebizond to Syria and Egypt, and trade was mainly conducted by the Venetians. In 1404, the two large transit ports were in recession: only small amounts of ginger, indigo, and rhubarb were sold in Tana, and perhaps even less in Trebizond. At the same time, we know that, in the first half of the fifteenth century, pepper prices fell dramatically (whether this was connected to the shift of the trade routes from the Black Sea
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2577 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, 733.
2578 See: Bautier, Les relations économiques… Nonetheless, in Egypt, from 1429, the Burji Mamluks created a monopoly on the trade in spices, fixed market prices, and overburdened merchants through taxation and the strict restricting of their business, thereby killing “the goose that laid the golden egg” in what was an already difficult international scene. Beaujard, “The Indian Ocean in Eurasian and African World-Systems before the Sixteenth Century,” Journal of World History 16, 4 (2005): 454.
to Syria and Alexandria is not known). However, according to Barbaro, who complained that in the 1430s the spice trade was in deep decline, in the early fifteenth century, six or seven galleys could be loaded with spices in Tana, which were otherwise unavailable even in the Syrian market. In any case, there was a decline, but the trade did not disappear. Eastern spices, medicines, and herbs amounted to 21.4% of the commodities that Giacomo Badoer exported to Venice in the 1430s, which leads me to think that the decline in the spice trade in Tana may have been compensated to some extent by the trade in Trebizond.

Western goods imported from Europe or Romania

European industrial products were imported into the Black Sea area, and by no means only for the use and consumption of the colonizers. Goods such as European textiles, weapons, and many products, were in high demand in the area. We can perhaps speak of a modern pattern of colonial trade: raw materials were imported from the colony, the economic ‘periphery’, in exchange for industrial products from the metropolis, a relatively more developed ‘centre’. There was, of course, another pattern which was still medieval and still prevalent in Genoese Gazaria in early modern times: precious metals were imported from Europe (mainly silver) in exchange for Asian goods.

Textiles. The textiles imported from Europe are probably the best illustration of an early modern colonial pattern of trade in raw materials from the colonies in exchange for the industrial products of the metropolis. We first come across a textile trade in Crimea in the late thirteenth century, in the notarial deeds of Gabriele di Predono (Pera, 1281) and Lamberto di Sambuceto (Caffa, 1289–1290). According to these documents, fairly large amounts of textiles were imported to Caffa over a brief period: Textiles from Champagne,
amounting to 400,000 *aspres baricats*,²⁵⁸⁵ from Vitry-le-François for 90,000 *aspres*, from Lombardy for 21,000 *aspres*, from Châlons-sur-Marne for 10,000 *aspres*, from Ypres and Poperinge for 12,000, as well as several different German textiles at 40,000 *aspres*. The process was bilateral as Eastern textiles were also exported to Europe,²⁵⁸⁶ not to mention the export of raw materials such as cotton, dyes, and alum).²⁵⁸⁷ European textiles were in considerable demand in Byzantium and the Muslim East,²⁵⁸⁸ being perhaps the main commodity imported from the West.²⁵⁸⁹ The Italian textile industry dominated the Constantinopolitan market.²⁵⁹⁰ Later, textiles were also exported from the Black Sea area to Russia; although the main bulk of European textiles satisfying the Russian demand was transported to the North from Flanders and Germany, Italian textiles are repeatedly mentioned in the Russian sources.²⁵⁹¹

As we can see, in the earlier period most of the textiles imported to Crimea originated in northern and north-western Europe rather than Italy. (Crimea was not unique in this sense; the Genoese also exported a large amount of textiles from Flanders, England, etc. to North Africa and Egypt).²⁵⁹² In the fifteenth century, Italian imports to Eastern Europe were more varied than before, and “included not only the luxury textiles of the Flemish *grande draperie*, which was already in decline, but also cloth of middling quality from Flanders, Holland and England.”²⁵⁹³ However, the main bulk of the textiles brought to the colonies in the fourteenth century were still from England or Flanders. In 1387, we find a reference to Italian textiles,

²⁵⁸⁸ Especially among the Tatars: Kolley, “Хаджи-Гирей хан и его политика (по генуэзским источникам). Взгляд на политические сношения Каффы с татарами в XV веке.” [Hajji Geray Khan and his policies according to the Genovese sources: A glance at the political relations with the Caffa Tatars in the fifteenth century], *ИТУАК* 50 (1913): 108.
²⁵⁹³ Malowist, *Poland, Russia and Western Trade in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, 26.
but only as a gift to the envoy of the Emir of Sinope, Coiha Toghan. It was not until the second half of the fourteenth century that the Italian textile industry managed to reach same level of quality as North-Western Europe. As a result, the Massaria Caffae mentions a variety of Italian cloths from Genoa, Venice, Florence, and Milan, mainly in relation to their re-export to the Tatar lands and Asia Minor. Moreover, judging from the presence of German commercial agents in the Genoese and Venetian sources, Caffa and Tana were probably affected by a geographic shift in European textile production: “Italian merchants... introduced production in southern Germany, which soon superseded the Italian industry. Ulm, Augsburg and Nurnberg became leading export centres, selling fustians throughout Europe.” Thus we can assume that the interest of the Germans in the Black Sea colonies (and those whom we find in the sources indeed come from Nurnberg and Ulm) was based on the fact that much of the textiles arriving in the East were of German origin.

We find non-Italian textiles like loesti (cloth from Lowestoff, England, amounting in the 1430s to an average of 1 sommo a piece), other textiles, clothes, and headgear from England, and even Scotland, mentioned in fifteenth-century documents. As for Flanders, we should emphasize that the Venetian trade with the Black Sea and with Flanders were connected: the times of the arrivals and departures of the muda galleys was scheduled so that when the galleys of Tana left the galleys of Flanders loaded with textiles would arrive (at the same time, sturgeon and caviar from Tana and Copa were also re-exported to Flanders).

The fall of Constantinople did not immediately bring a stop to the textile trade. The sources contain the sultan’s regulations on trafficking textiles. Thus, the act of Mehmed II in regulating the tolls dated ‘after 29 May 1453’ stipulates that the toll for Caffa brocade should

2594 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 39r, 90v, 99v, 322v.
2595 Saito, Florentine Cloth, 198.
2599 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 20r–f. 20v.
2600 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 22r.
be 4% and should be charged in *aspres*; another regulation dated ‘after 28 January 1476’ still mentions brocade coming through Caffa.\(^{2601}\)

**Wine.** Wine is an ambiguous commodity when it comes to classification. On the one hand, it was imported to Crimea and other areas of Genoese Gazaria. On the other hand, however, it was also produced locally in Crimea and perhaps re-exported to the Tatar and Russian lands. Since, from the point of view of the Latin Caffiotes, it was brought from the West (e.g. Greece) and then consumed *in situ* or re-exported to the East to the local populations.

Crimea was a wine-producing region – it had in fact constituted the extreme northern border of wine cultivation in Eastern Europe during Antiquity and the Middle Ages. However, Genoese Gazaria did not cover all its own wine needs, and a certain amount had to be imported.\(^{2602}\) This had less to do with the quantity (indeed, Crimea exported wine) but with the poor quality of the local wine. Crimea began producing high-quality wine only after becoming a ‘Russian Riviera’ in the nineteenth century; what Italians found there in the Middle Ages, however, could hardly have satisfied their refined tastes. Thus, types of wine such as Muscat, Retsina, and Malvasia were imported. One of the sources of supply was Trebizond;\(^{2603}\) other areas will probably have been Aegean Greece, Sicily,\(^{2604}\) Milan,\(^{2605}\) Naples,\(^{2606}\) and Provence.\(^{2607}\) In 1289, a large shipment of wine was sold in Caffa for 6,750 *aspres baricats*;\(^{2608}\) all in all, the deeds of Sambuceto indicate that Caffa imported a quantity of European wine that cost 70,000 *aspres* from 1289–1290.\(^{2609}\)

---


2605 Balard, *Gênes et l’Outre-mer*, No. 1, 18, 254, 293, 299, 880, 883


2607 ASG, Not. cart. No. 64, ff. 27 v - 28r. ASG, Not. cart. No. 109, ff. 236 r - 237r.

2608 ASG, *Gênes et l’Outre-mer*, No. 393.

In 1291, a ship from Marseille sailed to Caffa with a cargo of wine. Some of this wine remained in Caffa, and some was transported to Solkhat, Matrega, Vosporo, and Tana, which, according to Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, later imported various types of wine – ‘Greek wine’ from Sicily, Malvasia, the wine of Candia and Triglia; a notary called Benedetto Bianco, who worked in Tana, tells us that ‘Greek wine’, Malvasia, and the wines of Tropea, Larsu, and Cotrone were imported from 1359–1362. In 1362, the price of wine in Tana was 5 sommo per botta. The documentation of Genoese financial inspection of 1351 allows us to build some data on the wine trade. The taxation of wine was 10 aspres per botta, and the annual tax rate is given as 25,000 aspres; thus, 2,500 bottae (12,050 hectolitres) must have been imported that year, covering part of the wine needs of Caffites, the rest being covered by Crimean wine. For 1387, these figures were 295 sommo or 47,200 aspres, thus 4,720 bottae (22,750 hectolitres) must have been imported. We should not forget that wine was used not only for consumption: both in Caffa and in Tana, wine was a currency in trade with the Tatars as a tool for diplomacy and gift-giving to propitiate the Tatar khans and rulers.

The local Crimean wine of Genoese Gazaria was mainly produced in the area known as the Captaincy of Gothia (on the southern coast of Crimea). Since Soldaia gradually declined as a commercial centre, albeit remaining an important military bulwark for the Genoese, it is believed that the much of the population engaged in cultivating vineyards, constituting, alongside Gothia, a wine-producing area in the Genoese domains (we should recall that, in fact, this was one and the same region, as the casalia of Gothia came under the jurisdiction of the consul of Soldaia). The Genoese tried their best to frame this activity in the economic life of Gazaria: in 1381–1382 the expenses of the administration of Caffa on the vineyards of Soldaia equalled 3,352 aspres and actually exceeded the incomes from the tax on wine. The Officium provisionis of Soldaia, constituted of two probi viri, one Latin and one Greek, had to assess the amount of the so-called embelopaticum (from the Greek ampelopakton) to

2610 ASG, Not. cart. No. 64, f. 27 v-28 r (1291).
2611 Balard, Gênes et l’Outre-mer, No. 18, 65, 390, 393, 399, 400, 401, 759.
2612 Pegolotti, La pratica della mercatura, 24.
2613 ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, B. 19, Notaio Bianco Benedetto, various documents of the year 1362.
2614 ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, B. 19, Notaio Bianco Benedetto, testament of Andalo Basso.
2616 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, vol. 2, 844, 845. An illustration of how much did the Tatars (already technically Muslims by that time) appreciated wine can be found in “Viaggi” by Giosafat Barbaro, whose kunak Edelmugh got his fill of it. I viaggi in Persia, 78-79.
2617 Nystazopoulou, Ἡ εν τῇ Ταυρικῇ Χάρσουήσιῷ πόλις Σουγδαία (Athens, 1965), 54-56.
2618 ASG, MC 1381, f. 27r.
be levied on the vineyards; this tax on vineyard production appears to have been the only one paid by Greek winegrowers in Soldaia and in the casalia of Gothia, where in 1381 Abram Gentile was a buyer of the levy of the ambelli apatiti fructus vinearum de Locorso et Lobochdocho.2619

Crimean wine was exported via Tana and the River Don to the Tatar lands and on to Russia. The evidence that this wine reached Russia is provided by archaeology, since the Crimean ceramics for wine transportation can still be found along the River Don and the River Volga up to the area of Moscow.2620 Thus, we can infer that wine from Gothia was traded in Russia,2621 and some scholars have suggested that the Russian word for grapes (Russian виноград) has a German origin (the Crimean Gothic wingart or vineyard).2622 The Venetian deeds of the 1430s sometimes mention the wine trade in Gazaria.2623 Johann Schiltberger, who travelled in Crimea in the early fifteenth century, also mentions that wine production was dominated by the local Greeks. 2624

**Oil.** Oil was certainly an element in long-distance trade, maybe even more so than wine, since it was imported to Caffa and Tana from Andalusia and Southern Italy, though obviously Italians in Gazaria, following the local customs, had to use animal fats more often than they were used to in Italy.2625 Oil is mentioned once in the Venetian deeds of the 1430s.2626

**Honey.** As shown above, honey was occasionally exported from Romania; however, in some cases it may also have been a product that was occasionally imported from the West, as in 1369, 1370, and 1386;2627 Pegolotti also wrote about the honey imported to Tana.2628 Balard suggested that this particular occurrence was due to the turbulence caused when the

---

2620 Векслер, А. Мельникова. Московские клады (Moscow, 1973), 56.
2623 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 23r.
2624 The Bondage and Travels of Johann Schiltberger, 1396-1427 (New York, 1970), 49.
2626 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 19v (4) – f. 20r.
2627 ASG, Not. cart. No. 309/2, ff. 10r-11r; No. 322, f. 162r; No. 367, f. 110r.
2628 Pegolotti, La pratica della mercatura, 24, 34.
Tatars of Solkhat blocked the routes of Northern Crimea in 1386, which is plausible, although the source data is too scarce to draw any reliable conclusions.

**Beans.** Beans were imported to Tana from the South Mediterranean;\(^{2629}\) it is likely that they were for the consumption of the Italian inhabitants.

**Weapons.** The products made in European workshops by gunsmiths and armorers were mostly imported to equip the Italian garrisons. These imports included weapons (swords, crossbows with their quarrels or bolts, longbows and arrows, gunpowder bombards, etc.) and armour (cuirasses, helms, etc.). Although some of it might have been produced in Caffa, the region did not have much iron and there are no traces of it having been imported (the iron trade was characteristic for the East Mediterranean);\(^ {2630}\) moreover, the colonial authorities probably preferred high-quality Italian and Spanish\(^ {2631}\) products. Some merchants supplied large amounts of these products, and a certain Dexerino di Bellignano is known to have sold cuirasses, helmets, and neck armour for the garrison of Caffa in 1381.\(^ {2632}\) Some of the armour imported to the Black Sea from Europe was found in modern Azov and has been preserved, and probably in the fourteenth century served somebody in the guards in Tana.\(^ {2633}\)

**Glass.** Those who have been to Murano know that Venice was historically a leading producer of glass and that this remained the case over the centuries. The glass of Venetian production was occasionally found in Eastern Crimea, and became an important trade product

---


\(^{2631}\) A Venetian notary in Tana recorded 200 or 12 shields from Valencia in one will. ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 28v.

\(^{2632}\) ASG, MC 1374, ff. 146v, 351r; MC 1381, ff. 14r, 226v, 229r.

\(^{2633}\) [Gorelik, M. V., Fomichev, N. M.] Горелик, М. В., Фомичев, Н. М. “Рыцарские доспехи XIV века из Азова” [Armor of the fourteenth century from Azov], in *Northern Black Sea Coast and the Volga Region in the Relationship between East and West in the Twelfth to Fourteenth centuries* (Rostov-na-Donu, 1989).
by the early fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{2634} It is sometimes mentioned, but generally without any details.\textsuperscript{2635} Badoer’s ledger contains reference to a delivery of Venetian glass in Constantinople.\textsuperscript{2636} Nevertheless, glass was not among the main trade products, and as much as this trade was present, it probably remained in Venetian hands.

\textbf{Jewellery.} Nothing is known about imports of jewellery from Europe, although the works of the Caffiote jewellers were in great demand in the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{2637} We do not know who were these jewellers in terms of ethnic origin – Latins, Orientals, or mixed. In Tana in the 1430s there are a few references to various jewellery products,\textsuperscript{2638} but these cannot, however, be treated as a commodity.

\textbf{Bells and clocks.} In the sources, both products were used as gifts to the local rulers; the clocks for bell towers were sent to Byzantium, the Muslim East, and perhaps to the Russian territories. We do not know much about their commercial role.

\textbf{Silver.} Beginning in the Middle Ages, there was a constant flow of silver from West to East;\textsuperscript{2639} and silver played a key role in all Eastern trade conducted by Europeans.\textsuperscript{2640} Caffa was by no exception, with the investment in silver prevailing over those of gold in Eastern trade. The deeds of Sambuceto reveal that in 1289–1290 the amount of silver brought to Caffa from the West equalled 300,000 aspres (compared to only 21,000 aspres of gold); some of the bullion was marked with the emblem of the Genoese mint.\textsuperscript{2641} Silver was destined for the trade in the Tatar lands. The amounts of silver mentioned in the notarial

\begin{flushleft}
2637 П. Савваитов, \textit{Описание старинных русских утварей} (Saint Petersburg, 1896), 35, 38, 117, 126.
2638 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 8, 23r, 24r – 24v, 25r.
\end{flushleft}
deeds are impressive and amount to several hundred pounds; in the fourteenth century, in addition to bullion, the Genoese began to take the works of Western silversmiths to the East. 2642

***

The role of Caffa as a centre of collection and redistribution of goods for Genoese Gazaria is doubtless. However, judging from the overview of the circulation of commodities above, we can make three important conclusions. First, after the end of the époque marked by Pax Mongolica the Genoese Black Sea trade underwent structural changes; it largely shifted from luxury goods such as silk and spices from Asia to goods of local origin from the Black Sea as well as to the goods originating from Eastern Europe. Second, it retained its long-distance nature, connecting Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean. Third, the essentially modern pattern of trade was established, i.e. “raw materials in exchange of the products of the European industry,” the import of goods such as textiles and weapons to the Black Sea area and the export of such goods as fur, leather, alum, grain, fish, caviar, and salt.

THE SLAVE TRADE

Towards the end of the Middle Ages, the Black Sea region, and particularly Crimea and Caucasus, became a zone of growing importance for the exportation of slaves to Europe. 2643 The slave trade is so specific that I have decided to deal with it separately from other types of trade instead of treating the slave trade as just another commodity exported from Eastern Europe to Italy and the Mediterranean through Genoese Gazaria, and chiefly through Caffa and Tana. Under Italian domination, these cities became a major source of supply for slaves for the whole of Europe, maybe equalling that of North Africa. 2644 Thanks to its proximity to the sources of slave supply (Russia, the Golden Horde, and the Caucasus), 2645 Caffa became the main centre of the slave trade in the East Mediterranean area as a whole.

Initially, the Genoese of Caffa passively allowed the embarkation of slaves onto the ships in their harbour and simply levied a tax on this activity. However, they soon realized

the enormous profits to be made from this business and for two centuries they became the slave traders par excellence of the Black Sea, hiring out their ships to local traders or becoming involved themselves, without the help of intermediaries. The merchants were probably encouraged by the Italian authorities of Caffa and Tana to become involved in this kind of trading, since the tolls brought a healthy income to the consuls’ treasury. During the thirteenth century, Genoa became a centre of the slave trade in Europe, and the Genoese attempted to establish a monopoly in Caffa in the Black Sea slave trade. It imported slaves from its Black Sea colonies to the metropolis, the rest of Italy, other regions of the Western Mediterranean, Constantinople, Asia Minor, the Near East, North Africa, and Mamluk Egypt.

It was the combination of two factors that led to the rise of Caffa as a major thoroughfare for the slave trade. The demand for cheap labour in the developing cities of Italy and demographic pressure in Eastern Europe, where the Genoese colonies were situated. Thus, the slave trade became, from the economic and demographic point of view, a tool for the redistribution of labour. As we can see from the relevant sources, the biggest group of slaves in Italy between 1350 and 1475 was that transported from the Black Sea via the ports of Caffa and, to a lesser extent, Tana. The ways and means of enslavement varied (see below). Most slaves were destined to Italy and the Western Mediterranean, Aegean Greece, the Near East, and, particularly, Egypt; nonetheless, some of them remained in the Italian colonies to serve their masters at home or to assist them in the workshops (we do not have any evidence of the agricultural exploitation of slave manpower). While Mamluk Egypt imported slaves, with a preference for young men for its army, through the fondaco of Alexandria (where around 2,000 slaves passed through in one year according to some

2648 Balard, La Romanie Génoise, vol. 1, 132. In the course of time, Genoese regulations regarding the supervising role of Caffa in the Black Sea slave trade were becoming stricter, see: Karpov, “Работорговля,” 142.
2651 Thus, according to Balard, the slaves in Caffa numbered by the late fourteenth century circa 500 persons. Karpov, “Венецианская работорговля,” 197-198.
accounts), the Latins normally expected domestic help from slaves, and they also used female slaves as concubines.\footnote{2652}{2652 Di Cosmo, “Mongols and Merchants on the Black Sea Frotier in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth centuries: Convergences and Conflicts,” 398. Arbel, Levantine Power Struggles... 92-97. Ashtor, “The Venetian Supremacy in Levantine Trade: Monopoly or Pre-Colonialism?” Journal of European Economic History 3 (1974): 11. Amitai, “Mamluk Espionage among Mongols and Franks”, Asian and African Studies: Journal of the Israel Oriental Society 22 (1988), 173-181. Amitai, “Diplomacy and the Slave Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean: A Re-examination of the Mamluk-Byzantine-Genoese Triangle in the Late Thirteenth Century in Light of the Existing Early Correspondence”, Oriente moderno 88/2 (2008), 350-351.} The Venetian merchants generally attempted to act independently of other slave traders when exporting their slaves from Tana. The Genoese, instead, tried their best to impose their control over the Black Sea slave trade and to make it all pass through Caffa. This was moderately successful so that in 1410/1411 around 78.3% of all the navigation connected to the slave trade was carried out in Caffa and the ports of Asia Minor.\footnote{2653}{2653 Karpov, “Работорговля в Южном Причерноморье в первой половине XV в. (преимущественно по данным массарий Каффы)” [The slave trade in the Southern Black Sea coast in the first half of the fifteenth century, mainly according to the Massarias of Caffa], Vizantijskij Vremennik 46 (1986): 143. 2654 Iorga, “Notes et extraits pour servir à l’histoire des Croisades au XVe s.” Revue de l’Orient Latin 5 (1897): 157. Karpov, “Работорговля в Южном Причерноморье в первой половине XV в. (преимущественно по данным массарий Каффы)” [The slave trade in the Southern Black Sea coast in the first half of the fifteenth century, mainly according to Massarias of Caffa]. Vizantijskij Vremennik 46 (1986): 140. On the Officium Sancti Antonii see: Э. В. Данилова, “Каффа в начале второй половины XV в.,” in Φεοδότσιя Тицаріка (Kiev, 1974), 210. Verlinde, L’esclavage..., Vol. 2. 953 – 958. 2655 Belgrano, Cinque documenti, 249-250. 2656 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 322v, 323r.} In the mid-fourteenth–mid-fifteenth centuries, the Genoese slave trade was run administratively by the Caffiote Officium Sancti Antonii,\footnote{2654}{2654 Iorga, “Notes et extraits pour servir à l’histoire des Croisades au XVe s.” Revue de l’Orient Latin 5 (1897): 157. Karpov, “Работорговля в Южном Причерноморье в первой половине XV в. (преимущественно по данным массарий Каффы)” [The slave trade in the Southern Black Sea coast in the first half of the fifteenth century, mainly according to the Massarias of Caffa], Vizantijskij Vremennik 46 (1986): 143. 2655 Belgrano, Cinque documenti, 249-250.} an office whose job it was to secure the Genoese slave trade monopoly, especially against the Venetians and Turks. The Officium normally observed the interests of Caffa in this business, imposing the regulations, taxes, and fines even on non-Genoese slave traders\footnote{2655}{2655 Belgrano, Cinque documenti, 249-250.} (the three taxes levied by this office were known as the commerchium S. Anthonii, introytus censarie sclavorum S. Anthonii, and introytus domus sclavorum). Thus, when, in 1384, a subject of the Emir of Sinope took slaves from Tana to Leffecti without transiting through the port of Caffa, the ambassador of Sinope was obliged to pay 21 sommo pro racione comerchii capitum Saracenorum, a third of which went to the informant.\footnote{2656}{2656 ASG, MC 1386, ff. 322v, 323r.} We can, therefore, see that the Genoese strongly defended their dominant role on the Black Sea, and that even the Muslim traders were subjected to their taxes and commercial regulations. The levies from the slave trade taxes were extremely important: in 1381–1382 the entry for slave trading in the budget of Caffa stood at 1,125 sommo, 27 saggo, and 14 carats, one third of all income tax. Thus, it is clear that the Caffa authorities tried their very best to monopolize the Black Sea slave trade, aiming at a twofold...
benefit: first, it made its citizens more prosperous (and thus strengthened Caffa) and, second, the taxes imposed on the slave trade brought considerable revenue into the Caffa treasury. Balard counted the number of slaves sold in Caffa in 1385-1386 based on the data from the taxation of Officium Sancti Antonii: the sales were taxed at 33 aspres per slave, and for eleven months (from August 11, 1385–July 10, 1386) 45,060 aspres were collected. This means that 1,365 slaves must have been sold. Therefore, we can hypothesize that during a year some 1,500 slaves must have been sold in Caffa.

What can be said about the moral and legal validity of the slave trade? What was the role of slavery in the ideological domain? Was it considered an intellectual problem, or a moral evil? The first thing to note is that there was a certain amount of protest concerning slavery and the slave trade, but this mainly concerned the religion of the slaves. Pope Innocent IV (1243–1254) was infuriated by the fact that the Genoese, Venetian, and Pisan merchants sold Greek, Bulgarian, and Russian Orthodox Christian slaves to the Muslims in Palestine. Moreover, the popes tried to stop the Genoese slave trade with Egypt not only because the slave-traders often sold Christians, but also for political reasons, since the influx of slaves strengthened the Mamluk army (e.g. Clement V in 1311 believed that the only way to weaken Mamluk military force was to limit the Genoese slave trade). Some papal interdicts were pronounced, especially against the Genoese conducting trade with the infidels; these were largely ignored by the Republic of St George. In theory, when the slaves were sold in Caffa, a Genoese priest was supposed to check whether any of them wanted to be baptized. Again in theory, a person who was already a Christian before being sold or who was converted could not be sold to a Muslim. Balard wrote that in the late thirteenth century 77% of slaves had pagan names (Arcona, Balaza, Vassili, Tinais, Corulis, Camoxa, and Cali). This, however, is by no means proof that they were pagans, since most of the Tatars who adopted Orthodox Christianity (or were brought up in it) had Turkic names. In the Greek Orthodox tradition, having a ‘Christian’ baptismal name was not a

2658 Delort, Quelques précisions, 223.
2659 In 1434, as the Pope accused the Genoese of selling Christian slaves, the Commune described in response the limitations that were imposed on the slave trade, saying that the slaves could come exclusively through the port of Caffa, only on the ships belonging to the Genoese, under the supervision of a bishop and clergy (Verlinden, La colonie vénitienne de Tana, centre de la traite des esclaves au XIVe et au début du XVe siècle). In fact, these measures were taken just in order to monopolize the slave trade and concentrate it in Caffa. In 1441, Officium Gazaria imposed new and stricter limitations (Karpov, “Пағорпропағ” [The slave trade], 142), which however served to the same purpose – to maintain the monopoly of the Genoese and of Caffa in the slave trade.
2660 Not to say that ‘Vassili’ is a Greek name, thus a person was an Orthodox Christian.
requirement or (as in early medieval Russia) it was given during baptism, but only used in the liturgical context, and not in the public sphere where an individual retained his ‘national’ name. However, it seems feasible that the rule concerning Christian slaves was observed, since in Genoa three-quarters of all slaves had Christian names,\textsuperscript{2661} probably as a result of having been baptized in the Black Sea area or of having been Christians to start with.

**THE ORIGINS OF SLAVES**

The racial and ethnic backgrounds of the slaves traded through Caffa were very diverse with Tatars, Cumans, Russians, Circassians, Zikhs, Abkhaz, Laz, Mengrelians, Turks, Bulgarians, Hungarians, Mongols, and even Chinese slaves. In the late thirteenth century when this traffic was just starting, the slaves from Caucasus prevailed in the market of Caffa. Most of them were Circassians and Zikhs (44%), other groups being formed of Laz (23%), Abkhaz (11%), Cumans (3.5%), and others such as Bulgarians, Russians, and Hungarians (18.5%),\textsuperscript{2662} totalling around 78% or more from Caucasia. It is very likely that these people (mainly children or teenagers) were bought by the slave traders on the shores of the Black and Azov Sea from their parents, as keeping a large family was always a burden in this region. If one takes the average prices of slaves by nation in the late thirteenth century, Abkhaz slaves were significantly cheaper than Laz or Circassians.\textsuperscript{2663}

In the fourteenth century, Caucasian slaves were still very numerous; nonetheless, a high percentage also appeared to be Tatars. In 1344, in seven deeds drawn up by Niccolò Beltrame and recording the transaction of slaves, there are two Circassians, one Russian, one Cuman, one Abkhaz, one Alan, and one Tatar, and five of these adolescents still had Pagan names (Lachi, Babossi, Borolat, Bicir, and Cotrucha), and therefore were not baptized in captivity. In the 1360s, most slaves were Tatar, Slav, or Caucasian by origin.\textsuperscript{2664} The Italians especially appreciated Tatar female slaves, and while before the mid-fourteenth century their average ages at the time of sale were lower than the general average of all the groups, after 1350 it was lower than the general average. Female slaves also outnumbered males in the

\textsuperscript{2661} Balard, Remarques sur les esclaves, 649.
\textsuperscript{2662} Balard, *La Romanie Génoise*, vol. 1, 291. The Abkhaz slaves were sold at the average of 333 aspres baricats, Lazars – 401 aspres baricats, Circassians – 453 aspres baricats.
\textsuperscript{2663} Pistorino, Presenze abkhaze nel mondo medievale Genovese, 219.
\textsuperscript{2664} Female Tatar slaves were especially popular as household servants. One of them (in the fourteenth century), a Tatar, Karaza, received the name Nastasija in an Orthodox baptism. Perhaps this is evidence of the activity of Russian or Greek slave traders.
Tatar group. In Tana, the number of Tatar slaves was especially high, and sometimes Cumans were still treated as a separate ethnic group. Greek slaves were also quite numerous in the fourteenth century (most probably coming from Asia Minor), but almost disappearing in the fifteenth century; *vice versa*, Russian slaves only appear only in the fourteenth century, becoming abundant only in the fifteenth century. Another group of slaves – the Mingrelians – does not appear before the fifteenth century. Although Jewish slaves were a rarity, they can sometimes be found in the documents. Lajos Tardy noted the cases of Hungarians from Pannonia and Georgians sold as slaves. Some unusual ethnic backgrounds were also present in the initial stage of the slave trade, which was much more diverse and heterogeneous in terms of provenance of the captives than the following two centuries, but most of these unusual backgrounds completely disappear from the market in the course of time. Mongol slaves, for example, were sometimes sold in the fourteenth century, and later disappeared from the market; their presence in the documents underlines that slave-traders and slave-buyers were able to distinguish the Asiatic-looking Mongols and much more Europeoid Tatars based on racial anthropological parameters. Verlinden has suggested that the ‘Mongols’ described in the Italian documents are Kalmyks, the most Western group of Oirats living in Europe; this would mean that they did not originate from Eastern Asia. However, there are cases of some slaves coming from very far away: for example, some slaves were brought from China to be sold on the market. On September 14, 1359, a certain Dominicus de Florentia sold an eleven-year-old female slave of Cataynorum called Characht (thus from China but with a Turkic name), and her distant provenance is particularly stressed in the deed. Given the instability and the crisis events of the following period, it is clear that such a peculiarity as a Chinese slave can only have appeared in Crimea during the *Pax Mongolica*.

Most of the slaves were, however, less ‘special’. As mentioned above, this group was formed by people from Caucasus. As Genoese slave traders frequently sailed around the Eastern shores of the Black and Azov Sea, it was very easy to obtain this lucrative

2667 Karpov, “Mixed Marriages in the Polyethic Society,” 212.
2669 Verlinden, Le Recrutement des esclaves à Venise aux XIVe et XVVe siècles, 84, 96–102.
commodity. First of all, slaves could be sold by the local nobility. They were piracy, and, indeed, the Genoese often seized people. Sometimes, as in later times according to the description of Giosafat Barbaro, the failed attacks of the Caucasians on Tana led to captives being taken as slaves. Heyd wrote that some of the slaves were brought across the mountains, chained together in pairs, from the slave-markets of Dagestan. It is obvious, however, that they did not constitute the main bulk of trade. The majority of Caucasian slaves (mainly Circassians, Zikhs, and Adyghe) were children sold by their parents for bread or cloth (then used as a currency). This was widely practiced, and the result of a combination of overpopulation and poverty that the Genoese traders profited from. The Genoese presence on the Eastern coasts of the Black Sea and the Azov Sea is often recalled in the Adyghe legends, not to mention the archaeological remains. The Caucasian area was therefore the main source of supply of slaves for these merchants.

The Russians were another group, but by no means as big as became in the fifteenth century. Balard claimed that before 1350 Russians made up circa 20% of the slaves from the Black Sea, while afterwards this percentage fell to around 5% (aged mainly 14–25 years, with males outnumbering females, and perhaps converted to Catholicism); he wrote that this shrinking of the group of Russian slaves can be explained by the increase in Tatar slaves, the result of discord among the Tatars after the death of Jani Beg. In any case, in the last part of the fourteenth century, the Caucasians and Tatars shared the first place in this ranking, while the export of Russian slaves had not yet become a significant phenomenon.

Tatar slaves are mentioned (the first being mentioned in 1302), but before the mid-fourteenth century we only find a small handful of them in the sources. This situation

2670 I viaggi in Persia degli ambasciatori veneti Barbaro e Contarini (Rome, 1973), 82.
2672 Balard, La Romanie génoise, 796.
2675 Balard, La Romanie génoise. This point of Balard’s conclusions is arguable, since among the names he provides (Martinus, Andreas, Georgius, Maria, Margarita, Crestina, Lucia, Dimitri, Rubeus, Fimia, Elena) only Lucia is rather Western (although still in rare use in the Orthodox world), while others, aside of maybe Maria, perfectly fit into the Russian Orthodox mediaeval onomasticon.
2677 ASG, Not. cart. No. 47, f. 84v.
changed dramatically after the death of Jani Beg in 1347, with the beginning of the internal civil wars in the Golden Horde, on the one hand, and the Black Death and the shortage of labour in Italy that could be compensated by the influx of slaves, on the other. In the interim between 1351 and 1380, Tatars made up 90.9% of all slaves of the Black Sea origin sold in Genoa, while between 1381 and 1408 this percentage dropped to 80%. In Tuscany, in 1372, Tatars made up 77% of all slaves, in Venice 32.5% between 1360 and 1399, and there were also numerous Tatars in Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples.

The initial diversity of ethnic backgrounds became more homogeneous after the 1380s. From then on, there was a dramatic increase of Tatar and Russian slaves in the percentages of the overall slave trade described in the documents, while the slaves from Caucasus began to lose their numerical advantage. By the fifteenth century, all the Caucasians with the exception of the Circassians and a few other tribal exceptions, had disappeared from the slave market. A handful of Abkhaz are known to have been in Mytilene, Chios, and other places in the fifteenth century, but this trade ceased to be large-scale, even though as many as 160 notarial deeds from Genoa in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries mention that there were Abkhaz in the city (many of these could actually have been made freedmen).

The trend in the increase of Tatar and Russian slaves in the trade structure continued throughout the fifteenth century. The common explanation is that discord within the Golden Horde led to a decline of stability and an intensification of the uncontrolled raids of claimants and minor princes in the Russian territories. In the second half of the fourteenth century, approximately twenty puppet khans came to power there for a period lasting twenty years. This period of destabilization, and the consequent disintegration of the Golden Horde, was therefore paralleled by the constant struggle between the pretenders to power and minor princes. However, it also marked the beginning of a period of spontaneous raids by Tatar troops into this area of Russia. As for the Tatar slaves, it is likely that in the later fourteenth century they must be abundant because of the dynastic wars inside the Golden Horde. As for the numbers of Russian slaves, the reliable source data does not indicate whether or not this

2678 Apart from the sale of captives, the discord and unrest pushed people from poor families to sell their children or relatives. Thus, Bech, son of the deceased Thaiboga sold in Tana his niece Jaobluza for 300 aspres, and another Tatar Anecoza, the son of the deceased Tallay, sold his fourteen-year-old son for 600 aspres. Verlinden, “Le Recrutement des esclaves à Venise,” 187-188.
2679 Gioffiè, Il mercato, 15-16.
2680 Balard, La Romanie génoise. See also: Delort, Quelques précisions, 29.
2681 Origo, The Domestic Enemy, 371
2683 Verlinden, L’esclavage dans le royaume de Naples, 362-63.
2684 Pistorino, Presenze abkhaze nel mondo medievale Genovese, 221–222.
explanation is correct; nevertheless, the increase in Russian slaves in the general traffic of slaves is well-documented, even although Tatar slaves still seem to have been by far the most numerous in Venice in the late fourteenth century: within a period of seven years, there are eight references to female Tatar slaves (Achimelich, Achzoach, Agnes, Caterina, Cita, Katerina, Lucia, and Maria).2685 In Caffa, in the massariae of the 1380s, the majority (over two-thirds) of slaves have Pagan names, either of Tatar or of Caucasian origin (e.g. Achoga, Cotolboga, Mogalboga, Jharcasius, Chexica, Torontai, etc.). Some documents in this period indicate that some slaves did not come from the Black Sea region, e.g. Radoslava from Bosnia (Radoslava sclava patherina de genere Bossniorum)2686 and other slaves from the Balkans and Asia Minor. The Black Sea, however, remained the main source of slave labour for Mediterranean Europe and it retained this role for several decades.

Although some slaves were directed to Egypt or were sold in the Eastern Mediterranean, the influx of slaves to Italian cities was considerable. How much did the slaves influence Italy’s ethnic profile and exactly what ethnic groups constituted the slave population there? Did most of them really come from the Black Sea area rather than from the Balkans or Asia Minor? According to the very scarce and fragmentary data from different samples of documents, the figures of the ethnic composition of slaves exported to Italy were as follows. During the period of more than a century from 1300 to 1408, slaves from the Black Sea region constituted 80.9% of all the slaves sold in Genoa.2687 In the late fourteenth century, the majority of these were Tatars. Unlike the situation before the mid-fourteenth century, when slaves mostly had Turkic or Muslim names, in the second half of the century around 90% of known Tatars sold in Genoa had Christian personal names, which normally meant that they had been converted to Roman Catholicism in captivity, in Caffa, Tana, or Pera.2688 In Genoa, between 1381 and 1408, circa 80.7% of slaves known in sources were imported from the Black Sea area. If this figure is taken as 100%, the ethnic distribution was as follows: 79.3% Tatars, 8.9% Circassians, 1.5% Abkhaz, 0.3% Alans, 0.2% Mingrelians, and 6.7% Russians.2689 Slaves became more expensive in the early fifteenth century, as a

2687 Balard, La Romanie génoise, vol. 2, 796.
2688 There is nevertheless a number of slaves, mainly young, with Tatar names as well: Tabogar, Aspertus, Smerlonus, Iacomacius, Cotralo, Cocolo, Ars Chatom, Carachosa, Melicha, Cali, Bachirigni, Tactabey, Cologos, Corgatan, Jhiborra, Belicha, Cita, Bichaca, Jhayreta, Toctomis. Balard, La Romanie génoise, vol. 2, 796.
2689 Карпов, Итальянские морские республики [The Italian Maritime Republics], 167.
result of the lower numbers of Tatar slaves exported from the Black Sea region.\textsuperscript{2690} However, Balard, who prepared these accounts, documented the Genoese sources only for the period of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. Later on, Russian slaves made up for this gap. According to Gioffrè, the slaves from the Black Sea area constituted 85% in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and 91% from 1425–1449 in correlation with the overall slave population of Genoa. The percentage of Tatars decreased from 63% from 1394–1398 to 20% in the second quarter of the fifteenth century; in the same period, the percentage of Circassians decreased from 28% to 20%, and the percentage of Russians increased from 20% between 1400–1424 to 41.6% between 1425–1449.\textsuperscript{2691} Although the increase in Russians and the drop in Tatars and Caucasians was a trend of the late fourteenth century, the Tatar slaves nonetheless remained quite numerous. However, in the fifteenth century, and especially after 1420s, thanks largely to unrest and dynastic wars in the Russian principalities, the slaves from there outnumbered others.

In Venice, the decrease in the percentage of Caucasian slaves was not so visible, unlike Genoa (and, it can also be said, contrary to the general trend at the time), perhaps thanks to the proximity of Venetian Tana to Zikhia (some researchers have argued that the slave trade constituted the basis of Tana’s economy).\textsuperscript{2692} For the period between 1375 and 1469, it has been established that 89 Circassians, 13 Abkhaz, and 4 Mingrelians were sold. However, the main bulk of slaves in Venice in the mid-fourteenth to mid-fifteenth centuries came from Tatar and, to a lesser extent, from the Russian principalities. The Russians become more numerous in the fifteenth century - a general trend, especially after 1420: 36 Russians were sold from 1406–1420, and 141 Russians from 1420–1455.\textsuperscript{2693} What was true for the metropolis was equally true for its trading station: in Tana, from 1407–1408, the ethnic distribution was roughly 40% Tatars, 40% Circassians, 10% Zikhs, and 10% Russians\textsuperscript{2694} while already from 1413–1419 half of the documented slaves were Russian (mainly women), Circassians came second in this list.\textsuperscript{2695} In Florence, there are 357 contracts of slave sales in 1366–1397: 274 Tatars (76.75%), 30 Greeks (8.4%), 22 saraceni (6.16%), 13 Russians

\textsuperscript{2690} Balard, \textit{La Romanie génoise}, vol. 2, 790–801, and table 54.
\textsuperscript{2691} Karpov, “Венецианская работорговля,” 197-198.
\textsuperscript{2692} Барбаро и Контарини о России. К истории итало-русских связей в XV в. [Barbaro and Contarini on Russia. On the history of Italo-Russian relations in the fifteenth century], ed. Skrzhinskaja (Leningrad: Nauka Publishers, 1971), 53-54.
\textsuperscript{2695} Prokofieva, Акты [The Acts], 43.
(3.64%), 8 Turks (2.24%), 5 Bosnians (1.4%), 4 Circassians (1.12%), and 1 Cretan (0.28%). Slaves formed part of the Italian urban environment, but I will deal separately with the social dimension of slavery in a separate chapter.

Thus, we can see that in the fifteenth century, the general trend was an increase in Russian slaves, a relative, but not dramatic, decrease in Tatar slaves, a general decrease in Caucasian slaves and the disappearance of all the ‘exotic’ groups such as the Chinese, Mongols, Jews, etc. that had been present during the previous period. As stated above, one of the explanations for the increase in the export of Russian slaves was a long-lasting dynastic discord in Russia (known as the Muscovite Civil War or the Great Feudal War of 1425–1453 between Vasilii II Vasilyevich the Blind on one side and Yury of Zvenigorod and his sons Vasilii Kosoy and Dmitri Shemyaka, on the other). Another possible explanation could be the disintegration of the Golden Horde in the fourteenth century mentioned above, and which gave rise to more independent and irresponsible behaviour on the part of the small Tatar princes, and more intensive small-scale raids carried out in the Russian principalities for the sake of bounty rather than for political reasons.

By 1400, the Black Sea slave trade was without any doubt concentrated around Caffa. Besides trafficking slaves from the North and East (Tatars, Russians, and Caucasians), Caffa

2697 There is a thorough study of the slaves of Eastern origin in Florence: Origo, I. Domestic Enemy: The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Slaves from the Black Sea region and otherwise not only formed a part of Florentine society, but were also a perfectly visible part of the urban environment of Florence: “A traveler arriving in Tuscany at this time might well have been startled by the appearance of the serving-maids and grooms of the Florentine ladies. Mostly small and squat, with yellow skins, black hair, high cheek-bones and dark slanting eyes, many of them deeply marked by smallpox and by scars or tattooed patterns on their faces, they certainly seemed to belong to a different race from the Florentine. Sometimes, too, a lady would be attended by a negro, or by a taller, fair-haired woman, white-skinned, but also unmistakably foreign; and if the traveller had friends in one of the Florentine palazzi and went to call, he found several other exotic figures there, too: swarthy or yellow little girls of eleven or twelve, and sometimes a small Moorish boy, acting as nursemaids or playmates for the little Florentine merchant-princes. All these were slaves: most of them Tartars, but some also Russian, Circassian or Greek, Moorish or Ethiopian.” Ibid., 321.
2698 It would be incorrect to think that the populations in Russian lands were always the victims of the Tatars, since the Volga river pirates of predominantly Russian origin called ushkajniki often plundered both Tatar cities and vessels on the said river. In 1360–1375 ushkajniki plundered the area of Volga eight times (that is to say there were eight big expeditions aside of countless minor raids). In 1374, the troops of ushkajniki from Novgorod took Bolgar (nowadays Spassky District, Republic of Tatarstan; notably, this was already the third time they took this city) and invaded the capital of the Golden Horde Sarai. In 1392, they took Kazan and Çukätaw (known as Zhukotin in Russian chronicles). In 1409, a rebellious boyar of Novgorod Anfal Nikitin (not to be mixed with Afanasy Nikitin) plundered with 250 ushkajniki the areas of Volga and Kama. This Nikitin fled from the republic of Novgorod, settled with his clan in the area of the Northern Dvina River, and became a vassal of the Grand Prince of Moscow Vasilii I Dmitriyevich. In 1410s Nikitin founded one of the first Russian cities in Prikamye. He was defeated by the troops of the Republic of Novgorod, but nevertheless continued the raids on Volga and Kama until he was killed in Vyatka in 1417 by another ushkajnik Michael Rozsokhin. Although the raids of ushkajniki continued throughout the fifteenth century, most of them were migrating to Don and formed part of what became later on the Don Cossacks.
controlled the influx of slaves from Northern Asia Minor, thus administering the whole trade system. Karpov has researched six *Massariae Caffae* from 1410–1441 in relation to the slave trade in the Southern Black Sea region. According to this data, there were 2,430 slaves during this period (415 of them from the Southern Black Sea region), and most of those for whom the ethnic background was specified (done only very rarely) were *saraceni* (Muslims), with only six Russians mentioned in 1410. From/In the period 1410–1441, 31.5% of the slaves reported in the *Massariae Caffae* were exported to Samos (27.2% in 1410, 38.1% in 1423/24, and 27.1% in 1441), a transit point for further re-exportation to Mamluk Egypt, while 23.2% were transported to Sinope (25.5% in 1410/11, 40% in 1441/42) and 15.6% to Bursa. The number of slaves, mainly Tatars, brought to Samos confirms the notion of a slave trade whose final destination was Egypt.

In Tana, in the 1430s, some conclusions can be drawn as to the numbers of domestic slaves rather than on the flow of slaves. There are eighteen slaves, including freedmen, known from the deeds: four Russians, four Tatars, one Zikh, one Circassian, two persons with names of Eastern origin without any ethnic descriptor, and six with Christian names without any ethnic descriptor. Females outnumbered males (61% and 39% respectively), which was characteristic of this trade, since the Italians usually used women as domestic servants and concubines, with the men being largely exported to Egypt.

The chronicles of the Russian principalities and Eastern states often mention Tatar raids on the Russian lands. The big raids are described in the sources (1429, 1430, 1438, 1445, and 1452). It seems that these large-scale raids did not often aim at

2699 Капрев, “Работорговля в Южном Причерноморье в первой половине XV в. (преимущественно по данным массарий Каффы)” [The slave trade in the Southern Black Sea coast in the first half of the fifteenth century, mainly according to Massarias of Caffa], *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 46 (1986): 142–143.
2700 I studied Russian chronicles and the available Eastern sources for 1420 to 1455.
2701 “Хроника Литовская и Жмойтская” [Chronicle of Lithuania and Zhemoitia], *PSRL* 32 (1975), 125-127. The Tatars failed in their siege of the citadel, but plundered and burnt the city.
2703 “Патриаршья, или Никоновская летопись” [Patriarchal Chronicle], *PSRL* 12 (1901): 25–26. The chronicler asserts that the Tatars left with many captives. It may have been immediately after this invasion that Edelmugh brought eight slaves to Barbaro.
2704 “Слуцкая летопись” [Chronicle of Slutzck], *PSRL* 35 (1980): 78. See also: “Ольшевский список. Wielkiego xięstwa Litewskiego i żmudskiego kronika” [Chronicle of Olscha], *PSRL* 17 (1907): 466-467. The chronicler clearly made a mistake and ascribed the events of 1445 to the year 1452.
taking captives for sale. Indeed, the Tatars made a great many captives (called *polon*, lit.: ‘captivity’), but this seemed to be more of a sort of racketeering, since after the raids the Tatar army often stopped in the immediate proximity of the place they had plundered, awaiting for a ransom to be paid by the authorities or relatives of those captured.\textsuperscript{2706} In other cases, however, the Tatars captured people with a clear intention of taking them away, often via the River Volga route,\textsuperscript{2707} although sometimes the Muscovites, who were more organized and fortunate in this sense, managed to retake the captives.\textsuperscript{2708} We do not know the scale of the raids or *polon* in the fifteenth century; however, if they were frequent, the Tatar raids must have been a problem, since they will have taken away a fair amount of able labour from North-Eastern Russia – this area had always experienced a shortage of manpower that contrasted the superabundance of the available land.\textsuperscript{2709}

In 1440s–1450s, Russian slaves were to be found as far from the Black Sea as Catalonia. Thus, among other things a tanner (*curtidor*) called Bartomeu Traginer bought six slaves, four of them men (probably for his workshop), among them a Russian Ivan.\textsuperscript{2710} There are also mentions of another Russian Ivan, 16 years old, bought for 50 livres, of a Tatar Martin, 30 years, bought for 57 livres, which is strikingly high for such an ‘old’ slave,\textsuperscript{2711} and of a Circassian Martin,\textsuperscript{2712} who was bought with several other slaves by Bartomeu Riera, son of another tanner Pere, on December 19, 1446.
THE SEX, AGE, AND PRICE OF SLAVES

Slaves were mainly bought and sold as children or teenagers. In the late thirteenth century, they were normally aged 10–14 years, with an average age of 11.3 years for boys and 15.6 years for girls. In Genoa, at the same time, slaves were much older, normally between 17 and 20 years old. As a general rule, boys were normally a bit younger than girls. In 1344, seven deeds (around 10% of the total) drawn up by the notary Niccolò Beltrame record the sale of slaves in Caffa, the people being sold were mainly adolescents aged 12–15 years. In 1362, according to Bianco, the slaves in Tana were mostly aged 11-30 years, with a special preference for those aged 11-16. In Tana, from 1407 to 1408 the average age of slaves was 12-22 years. The traders normally preferred to buy slaves aged around 12-16 years.

As for the sex of slaves, there is a certain regularity of gender. In Caffa, the quantity of men correlated to women was exactly balanced, almost equal, and males were very important in this traffic. In Genoa, female slaves outnumbered males, and this was generally true of Europe as a whole. In other places in Europe (such as Tuscany and Sicily), indeed, females tended to largely outnumber males. This was because, in Europe (and indeed among the Italian population in the Genoese colonies in Gazaria), slaves were regarded as domestic servants par excellence. At the same time, men were largely exported to Egypt. By the late fourteenth century, sometimes up to 75% of all slaves sold through Caffa were male; nonetheless, as in Italy they were rarely used in craftsmanship and agriculture (maybe slightly more after the Black Death), and most of them must have been sold on the Eastern markets.

In Tana, at the same time, most of the source evidence shows us that there the women already outnumbered men among the slaves. In the deeds of Benedetto Bianco drawn up in

2716 Although female slaves prevailed there from the outset as well – according to the deeds of Lamberto di Sambuceto, in 1289–1290 there were 43.3 % male (26 men) and 56.7 % female (34 women) slaves sold in Caffa.
2718 Verlinden, Medieval “Slavers”, 3-4.
Tana in 1362, female slaves prevailed over their male counterparts.\textsuperscript{2720} Charles Verlinden researched 142 notarial contracts of the sale of slaves of Tatar origin in Tana in the fourteenth century: 110 women aged 6-28 years (58\% of them aged 12–16) against 32 men from 8 to 23 years (84\% of them aged 10–15 years), which, in percentages, gives us 77.4\% of women against 22.5\% of men. This seems to have been about the same for the Mongol slaves – 23 slaves in total, 7 boys (aged 7–13 years) and 16 girls (aged from 8–18 years).\textsuperscript{2721} In 1386, the price of an old and ill slave would be 260 aspres, while a young and healthy one cost up to 1,000 aspres. In the late fourteenth–early fifteenth centuries, males outnumbered females (sometimes up to four-fifths of all slaves for a while; females were directed mainly to the West, while males were sent mainly to Egypt, which leads me to think that the Mamluks had particular reasons for such a big demand at that point. Later, in 1407–1408, one quarter of the slaves sold in Tana were males and three-quarters were females, so in general the proportion was similar. Can we therefore conclude that the Tana slave market was more oriented towards girls, and therefore towards the European demand, whilst Caffa and Pera focused more on supplying Egypt and other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean? This question needs to be answered, but the answer requires greater research into the sources.

Slaves were just one of the commodities of the crowded trading routes from the Levant, and came to be one of the most profitable.\textsuperscript{2722} But what exactly can be said about their prices? Regarding the earliest period of the slave trade, not much is known about prices. Obviously, there was some combination of parameters influencing the price that the client was ready to pay. Balard noticed that the race, sex, and age were the main price-forming factors in the slave trade, although by no means the only ones, which also suggests that the extremes in price could occur because of a market conjuncture and seasonal fluctuations. Obviously, the state of health and some subjective factors were also important. We can identify some preferences, such as younger slaves over older ones. It also looks as though in Caffa in the late thirteenth–fourteenth centuries boys were more in demand on the slave market than girls.\textsuperscript{2723} This may be because the local families – parents and at the same time suppliers –

\textsuperscript{2721} Verlinden, “La colonie vénitienne de Tana.”
\textsuperscript{2722} Origo, Domestic Enemy The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, 325.
\textsuperscript{2723} This regularity could be quite different for Tana. In 1362, slaves were sold in Tana for 17.5 to 32.5 persers. 500 aspres of Tana (32.5 persers), 10 ducats (17.5), 400 (26.25), 620 (41.25), 600 (39), 400 (26.25), and 500 aspres of Tana (32.5). See: Les Italiens à Byzance (Paris: 1987), 94, 101. These prices do not differ much from those in Constantinople; therefore, either the expenses of transportation were not high or (probably)
were understandably more reluctant to sell their sons than to sell their daughters. In any case, the variations are explainable if we take into account that the slaves were not sold with fixed prices, like other goods, and that bargaining took place every time, and here both the seller and the buyer had various expectations, considerations, evaluation of the circumstances, etc. This said, I will try to trace some correlations of the prices with other variables that we know in relation to the slaves concerned – those of age, gender and nation.

What dynamics did the slave trade follow? We know that there was a slight decrease in the 1370s–1390s, and that there was a recovery afterwards, during the course of the fifteenth century came about mainly thanks to finding a source of Russian slaves. In 1390s, the situation for slave-traders was particularly difficult on account of both the Ottoman threat and Tamerlane’s expedition to Tana which was burnt in 1395. As a result, the overall commercial situation shrank sharply: in Genoa, from 480 slaves sold in 1383, imports were reduced to 220 in 1396 and 240 in 1400.

AGENTS AND CLIENTS OF SLAVE TRADE

According to Origo, the “Genoese were, perhaps, the boldest, most resourceful and most persistent of all the slave-traders in the Levant.” Even apart from this statement, we can say that the Genoese were the leading agents in the slave trade, both as first-handers and as intermediaries. Yet the Ligurians were not the only people who conducted this trade – merchants of different origin (“traders of every race and creed who had come to Caffa from Turkey and Syria, Armenia and Egypt, Corsica, Catalonia, Provence, and Italy”) bought and sold slaves. Nonetheless, all the slave-traders mentioned originate in a set of archival

the supply on the markets of Constantinople was so high that it kept prices low. Interestingly, all 25 Genoese of Tana mentioned by notary Benedetto Bianco are salve vendors, and none of them is a purchaser, see Balard, La Romanie Génoise, vol. 1, 300. The deliberations of the Senate also show that the Genoese were quite active in this sphere, see Berindei, Veinstein, “La Tana-Azaq de la presence italienne à emprise ottoman,” 140. The source data of Barbaro and Badoer report the same. In 1407 to 1408, in Tana the average price was 289 bezants per slave. In 1436, Giovanni Nigro sold his female Russian slave, Maria, aged 22, to a certain Luciano for 450 bezants. ASV, CI. Cart. 231. f. 3v. See also: Khvalkov, Tana, a Venetian and Genoese Black Sea Trading Station in the 1430s: A Social and Economic History (MA thesis in Medieval Studies, Central European University, Budapest, 2011), 37.

2724 Karpov, “Документы к истории” [Documents on the history] 193. According to Krekic, who analyzed the deeds of a Venetian notary Marco di Raffanelli, in 1388–1389 the slaves aged from 11 to 44 years coasted 25–60 ducats, the average being from 39.2 to 42.2 ducats; at the same time, the average price for the females between 21 and 30 years amounted 45.6 ducats. (Krekic, “Contribute allo studio degli schiavi levantini e balcanici a Venezia (1388–1398),” in Studi in memoria di F. Melis (Naples, 1978), vol. 2, 379–394).

2725 Slaves became more expensive in early fifteenth century after the export of Tatar slaves from the Black Sea region decreased somewhat: Balard, La Romanie Génoise, vol. 2, 790–801, and Table 54.

2726 Origo, Domestic Enemy The Eastern Slaves in Tuscany in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, 325.

2727 Origo, Domestic Enemy, 326.
documents from Genoa, leading us to the conclusion that the latter were very active in this area. Perhaps we can say that the Genoese in the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries were slave traders *par excellence* among all the other nations. In support of this view is the fact that, among the twenty-six Genoese mentioned in the deeds drawn up by a Venetian notary in Tana, Benedetto Bianco, from 1359–1366, all of them are slave vendors and none of them slave buyers. It seems that the Genoese specialized in trafficking people more than, let us say, the Venetians. Nonetheless, we should also add that many agents are simply ignored in these documents.

Thus, the first question to ask here is: what sources of slaves and what initial vendors ignored in the sources do we know of or can we imagine? Local nobility sold people to the merchants, whenever there was a demand, and the demand was almost permanent. Poor parents sold their children. Pirates who captured people were eager to supply them to the slave markets. Tatars coming from their raids brought captives with them. Local tribes, especially on the shores of Caucasus, captured neighbours to sell in order to buy textiles, silk, cotton, rice, glass, ceramics, jewellery, and weapons from the Genoese. However, from the very beginning, we should note that not all these slave-traders were Italians – there appear to have been a number of local people supplying the slave markets of Caffa and Tana, eagerly helping the colonizers and relieving them of the task of going in search of slaves on their own. This is illustrated by an example from a relatively early period: in the fourteenth century, we find an Alan in Tana acting as a slave-trader. He was baptised in Latin Christianity and had a Latin name, which is yet more evidence of the local Orthodox population being firmly integrated into the Italian social environment. Other nations, such as Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Tatars, etc., were also engaged in trafficking people. In 1344, in the deeds drawn up by Niccolò Beltrame, four slave traders are Latins, two are Greek (one of them from Solkhat), and one is Armenian.

2728 The Genoese could sell Tatars, Zikhs, Circassians, and Russians to the Venetians in Tana in order to avoid the taxes imposed by their own administration in Caffa, as in the Venetian trading stations the control over slave trade was not so well organized. This fitted into the general strategy of Genoa and Caffa, which strove to monopolize the slave trade. For example, in 1384 the Genoese arrested a Venetian *cocco* transporting Tatars to Turkey (which was illegal, since they were the khan’s subjects, but both Genoese and Venetians always disregarded the Tatar bans), and the Venetian Senate sent a notary Giovanni Bon to Genoa in order to protest against this ‘violation’. 2729 Ю. А. Узлов, “К вопросу об итальянской колонизации Северо-Западного Кавказа в XIII-XV вв.” in Причерноморье, Крым, Русь в истории и культуре. Материалы II Судакской международной научной конференции (12-16 сентября 2004 г.). Часть II. (Kiev and Sudak, “Академпериодика”, 2004), 218-219. 2730 Verlinden, “La colonie vénitienne.”
Local merchants were not necessarily just suppliers of the slave markets; they could be involved in all stages of the trade. Moreover, in the course of the fifteenth century they took over from the Genoese even before the Ottoman conquest. For 1422–1457, Balard found that 22 out of 122 (18%) slave traders were Greeks from Crimea, Trebizond, Sinope, Samastro, and Simisso; they often transported large consignments such as Chiriaco Velata, who carried 84 slaves in spring 1411, 10 in October 1422, and 125 in October 1425, all from Caffa to Asia Minor. According to Karpov, from 1410-1411, the Massariae Caffae mention 48 patrons of ships transporting slaves (i.e. transporting them to the final buyers), among them: 17 Genoese (35.4%), 16 Greeks from the Southern Black Sea area, namely Simisso, Sinope, Samastro, Trebizond, and Kerasunt (33.3%), 7 Greeks without the name of the city (14.5%), 8 Muslims (16.7%), 6 of them from Sinope. From 1441-1442, 34 patrons of ships transported slaves: 8 Genoese (23.5%), 2 Venetians (5.9%), 11 Greeks (32.4%), 7 of them from the Southern Black Sea area, 13 Muslims (38.2%), 6 of them from the Southern Black Sea area. From 1446–1460, the Muslim merchants (13 out of 20 ship-owners, including 7 persons from Simisso and Sinope) were already managing 65% of slave transportation, while there is documentation of only two Genoese and five Greeks. Thus, the Turks gained leading positions in the slave trade by 1450s–1460s, often not visiting Caffa and sailing from Tana or from the shores of Caucasus directly to the Southern Black Sea cities. This led to the decline of Caffa as a centre of the slave trade: six massariae covering 1410–1441 mention 3,779 slaves, while another six massariae covering 1446–1460 mention only 404. This trend developed after the Ottoman siege of Caffa. The Ottoman taxation registers in 1490 reveal these dynamics: during four months in 1490, 75 ships visited the port of Caffa, among them: 8 Greek (10.6%), 7 Italian (9.3%), 1 Russian (1.3%), and 59 Turkish (78.6%). A total of 157 merchants arrived on these ships, of which: 16 Greeks (10.1%), 4 Italians (2.5%), 3 Jews (1.9%), 2 Armenians (1.2%), 1 Moldovan (0.6%), 1 Russian (0.6%), and 130 Muslims from Constantinople, Bursa, Trebizond, Sinope, Kastamonu, Amasya, and Central Asia Minor (82.8 %). The monopoly of the Genoese was thus substituted by the monopoly of the Ottomans.
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What about the clients of slave trade? Who bought them? Whoever could afford to? From what we know about the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, slaves were an affordable commodity and a fairly liquid asset. The social range of people buying them was therefore broad and diverse, and the social standing of the slave-buyers was often very modest. Thus, in 1289–1290, we see many artisans among the slave-buyers (a furrier,2733 a butcher,2734 a cooper, and two smiths)2735 and even among the slave vendors: a tailor and two bakers are documented as selling slaves.2736 The same is true in relation to the variety of ethnic backgrounds of slave-buyers: in the 1340s we find a consul of Caffa Dondedeo de Iusto and a Muslim merchant Coia Amir functioning as slave-owners,2737 and in 1370s, we see that a notary Nicolaus Bosonus owned several slaves.2738 In Tana, in the 1430s, we can also see how easily people sold their slaves:2739 providing us with proof that the latter were a very liquid asset – and showing us that trading in slaves must have been intense. Bequeathing slaves to people who were not really close to the testator2740 is yet another sign of their availability on the market. Here, again, we see that people of a modest social position often bought, sold and owned slaves: a *ballistarius* Antonio de Marcuola asked to buy two young Tatars of ten-years-old and to send them to Venice, one to the caulker Cristoforo Stronzuolo, and another to the barber Simone.2741 This confirms that in the course of the first half of the fifteenth century the business of trafficking people was intense, and that slaves were a liquid asset, available even to people with average incomes. The situation began to change only after the fall of Constantinople.

***

There is little or no doubt of the key role of the Italian maritime republics in late medieval European trade. In the words of Herman Van der Wee, “in the European re-export trade from south to north, Italy for centuries was the leading power.”2742 It was also true for

2734 *Notai genovesi in Oltremare*, No. 46.
2737 *Notai genovesi in Oltremare*, No. 7, 54.
2739 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 8. ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 28r – f. 28v.
2740 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. f. 20r – f. 20v.
2741 ASV, NT. Cart. 750. 27r. We can infer from this case that the Tatar male slaves were not always destined for the Egyptian markets as future Mamluk fighters, but often became house servants or artisans in the factories of Italy, Romania, and Tana.
the East-West trade flows and the other way around. This is why it was important to look at the dynamics of the Genoese Black Sea trade, being a part of larger proto-global commercial system. As already noted above, three main conclusions can be drawn on the trade dynamics in Caffa in the fifteenth century: 1) a shrinking role of the luxury goods from Asia and an increasing importance of the goods from the Black Sea region and Eastern Europe; 2) and the long-distance nature of this trade, which was not lost in the events of the crisis of the fourteenth century; 3) the modern pattern of colonial trade “raw materials in exchange of the products of the European industry.” Thanks to the advanced commercial techniques and other benefits brought by the Genoese, they became masters of the Black Sea market. Controlling it, they allowed incorporation and integration into their business structures to the local merchants, who served to them, according to a felicitous remark of Prof. Karpov, as junior partners. Nonetheless, even when this partnership is taken into account, there is no doubt that the Genoese dominated the trade and dominated it for a reason that is clear in the framework of Colonial Studies, colonialism being defined as “one people’s control over another people through the economic, political and ideological exploitation of a development gap between the two…” At the same time, the concept of a development gap does not imply “a clear-cut distinction between active colonisers and passive colonised. Rather, both are agents in the process of colonialism, if with different and variable roles. The colonised may have accepted colonialism with resignation, violently resisted to it or ingeniously subverted it; they may have collaborated with the colonial rulers or even enthusiastically taken up stimuli for sociocultural transformation – either way, they actively joined in shaping colonialism…”

In the case of the Genoese domination in Black Sea trade and the economic tools they used to exploit the area, we clearly see this situation of a development gap typical of colonialism.

---

2743 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 1-2.
CHAPTER 8. POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE BLACK SEA AREA IN 1400–1475: TRANSFORMATION AND FALL OF CAFFA

The fifteenth century was a turning point in European history, and especially in the Mediterranean and Black Sea regions. The Ottoman expansion in the Balkans and Asia Minor, the agony of the Byzantine Empire, the collapse of the Golden Horde, the Tatar clashes and discords in the Russian steppes, the danger on the Levantine trade routes, and the consequences of the great crisis of the fourteenth century changed the balance of forces in the Black Sea area began limiting the access of Westerners to the East.\(^{2744}\) Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea area became one of the focal points in international relations, where different actors and agents clashed, allied, betrayed, won, and lost. Genoa, Venice, Florence, Pisa, papacy, England, France, the Holy Roman Empire, the Crown of Aragon, the Duchy of Burgundy, the Latin states of Romania, the Byzantine Empire, Georgia, Russian principalities, Tatar powers, Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Poland, Hungary,\(^{2745}\) and Walachia, the sultans of Egypt, minor Muslim monarchs of Asia Minor, and, finally, the rising power of the Ottoman Empire – this is just a brief list of the actors on the political scene at that time. Alongside these bigger players, we have to consider local political forces such as the new separate Khanate of Crimea or the Trebizond Empire, not forgetting about the Principality of Theodoro, which was not a major force on the European political map, but a big obstacle for the Genoese politics in Crimea and an important ally for the Republic of Venice.

The political changes caused by Ottoman expansion afflicted in particular the Italian colonies overseas starting with Caffa. It was a time of wars and unrest, of commercial ventures and big losses, of intrigues and massacres, of Catholic missionaries and religious military orders, of Catholic councils and union of the churches, of internal struggle of political elites in Genoa and, to a much lesser extent, Venice, of successful Muslim jihad and failing attempts of the last crusades of Latin Christendom. What was the place of the Genoese colonies in the changing realities of the Mediterranean and Black Sea world in the fifteenth century? How did Caffa adapt, or indeed fail to adapt to the deformation of a system of politics in the face of approaching Ottoman threat? What political trajectories did the actors take? Can we examine which political strategies were used by the Genoese to secure their

\(^{2744}\) Thiriet, La Romanie vénitienne au moyen âge (Paris: Ed. Boccard, 1959), 141.
\(^{2745}\) There were diplomatic relations between Hungarian kings and Tartar khans, the later often sent as his envoys Eastern Christians, especially Georgians. Tardy, Kaukázusi Magyar tükör (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1988). 48.
possessions and their trade on the Black Sea, and to what extent they were successful? This chapter will attempt to address and – as far as it is possible based with the available sources – answer these questions.

The agenda of the day in the 1420s to shape an anti-Ottoman league in Latin Christendom, and, particularly, in the Eastern Europe. This coincided with the aspirations of Byzantium, which wanted an alliance of Venice and Hungary against the Ottomans. To this end in 1420 Manuel Philantropinos undertook a mission to mediate between Venice and Sigismund of Hungary, also visiting Jogaila of Poland. Either the Hungarian or the Polish king could seem a possible defender of the Christendom in the Black Sea area (there is indirect evidence of this in the allegiance of the ruler of Moldavia to the Polish king in 1434, paralleled by the intensive land grants to the military men in Moldavia, both being measures of cautiousness in the face of the threat from the south). Sigismund of Luxemburg was very much inclined in favour of the alliance; however, it had finally a zero result, because at that point for Genoa and Venice their confrontation of one against another seemed more important than the idea of a crusade. Moreover, Sigismund’s growing interest in the Black Sea area was a matter of deep concern for the Genoese, who did not want any Eastern European prince to establish power on the shores of the Black Sea.

The 1420s were the beginning of a new period of economic growth in Venice. Respectively, in the 1410s and 1420s Venice temporarily strengthened its positions in the Eastern Mediterranean and in European politics in general. On May 29, 1416, the Venetian fleet defeated the Ottomans at Gallipoli (modern Gelibolu). On October 30, 1418, a new treaty was signed between Venice and Byzantium. In 1419, Venice and the Ottoman sultan confirmed the Venetian possessions in Romania. At the same time, in Italy, Venice continued with its political, economic, and agricultural expansion to Terraferma, approaching the borders of the Duchy of Milan in the 1420s. As the situation in Eastern Europe

2746 Nicol, Byzantium and Venice: a Study in Diplomatic and cultural relations (Cambridge, CUP, 1988), 364.
2747 Barker, Manuel II Palaologus (1391-1425); A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship (New Brunswick/New Jersey, 1969), XXXIII.
2750 Климанов, “Крымские памятники средневековой генуэзской лапидарной эпиграфики: возможности источника,” in Судейский сборник II (Kiev/Sudak, 2005), 481.
Black Sea area was marked by the disintegration of the Golden Horde and the rise of both the principality of Moscow and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and a confrontation between them, and since the Commune of Venice needed an ally on the Black Sea against the Genoese, it intensified relations with the principality of Theodoro, naturally hostile towards Caffa. In 1423, the Venetians added one more pearl to the domains of their Stato da Màr by purchasing Thessaloniki from Byzantium, making a new treaty on September 30, 1423, with the Emperor John VIII Palaeologus who came to Venice specifically for this reason. In general, this treaty confirmed all the privileges conceded by the preceding treaties of 1390, 1406, and 1418. However, the problems lay in wait. Having purchased the rich trading city, the Republic of St Marco automatically found themselves at war with the Ottomans (1423–1429). Murad II (1421–1444, 1446–1451) besieged Constantinople in 1422, sent armies to Morea in 1423, advanced into Bosnia and Albania and obliged the ruler of Walachia to pay a tribute, and finally occupied Venetian Thessaloniki in 1430. Since then, Romania slowly ceases to be the focal point for the Venetians, who began shifting to their Terraferma and the wars in Italy – a priority for the new doge of Venice Francesco Foscari (1423–1457).

The changes in the political situation in Romania were paralleled by the changes in the steppes. We have already mentioned the disintegration of the Golden Horde (1420–1502). For Italians this disintegration meant just one thing, namely instability: the khans in the steppes changed constantly, often several claimants were struggling with one another, the routes remained unsafe, and the Tatars could attack the colonies of Gazaria whenever they liked. In 1423 a new actor appeared in the Tatar political arena – an Uzbek khan Boraq led nomads from the Western Siberia, defeated Olugh Mokhammad, the future founder of Kazan Khanate, who was linked to Vytautas the Great and who then fled to the Grand Duchy of

---

2755 И. Б. Греков, Восточная Европа и упадок Золотой Орды (на рубеже XIV - XV вв.) (Moscow, Nauka, 1975), 300.
2756 Venice had just two bulwarks in the Black Sea area, Trebizond and Tana, and therefore its position was shakier compared to the Genoese one. On the other hand, the Venetians tried their best to retain these sites. Tana and the muda that was sent there were not only of a great commercial, but also of great political importance. It is therefore difficult to overestimate the importance of Tana to Venice.
2758 Barker, Manuel II Palaologus (1391 - 1425); A Study in Late Byzantine Statesmanship, XXXV.
2759 Nicol, Byzantium and Venice, 364.
2760 Daru, Histoire de la République de Venise, 168.
2761 Nicol, Byzantium and Venice, 358.
2762 In fact, the Byzantine Empire owned at that point only Constantinople with its immediate hinterland and Morea, that is the biggest part of Peloponnese.
Lithuania asking for help. However, later he won back Sarai and expelled Boraq to Moghulistan where he was killed between 1427 and 1429. On March 14, 1428, Olugh Mokhammad wrote a letter to Sultan Murad II to mark the re-establishment of diplomatic relations. After Baraq’s defeat in 1427, another khan, Dawlat-berdi, established himself in Crimea. Olugh Mokhammad attempted to invade Crimea in 1430, but as his patron Vytautas died he gave up and retreated. Nonetheless, neither Dawlat-berdi who was assassinated in 1432, nor his son Äxmät who was defeated in 1433, could really control Crimea, where the local rulers had begun to behave independently. In the course of the confrontation that followed, Olugh Mokhammad sided with Sigismund Kęstutaitis, while Švitrigaila and the prince of Moscow supported Sajid-Äxmät, the third claimant to the throne of the Golden Horde being Kutjuk Mokhammad. The balance among three khans (Olugh Mokhammad, Kutjuk Mokhammad, and Sajid-Äxmät) was broken after Olugh Mokhammad, a nominal superior ruler, was attacked by the other two. He retreated and established the Kazan Khanate.2764 Kutjuk Mokhammad became the Khan of what remained of the Golden Horde, which was in fact no longer a unified whole, but several independent principalities.2765 Although the rulers of the ‘Great Horde’ considered themselves superior, they no longer controlled became or was becoming a number of independent new political formations – Kazan, Astrakhan, Crimea, Qasim Khanate, Uzbek Khanat, and the Nogai Horde.

According to the unanimous consensus of the contemporaries of the events and scholars, the politics of the steppe and especially khan-making were largely controlled by the Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas. The Grand Duchy both absorbed a great many Russian principalities and benefited from the disintegration of the Golden Horde, and its powerful prince invested or disposed the khans at will. Indeed, it was in his interest and in the interest of his state to keep the Tatars separated. There is a lengthy panegyric extolling the grandeur

---

2764 Olugh Mokhammad and his son Máxmüd (in Russian chronicles Makhmutek) occupied Belyov in 1437 and Kazan in 1445. Since then, the independent Khanate of Kazan played an important role in Eastern Europe. On July 7, 1445, in a battle near the monastery of Saint Euthymius the Grand Prince of Moscow Vasily II Blind was captured by Olugh Mokhammad; although he was soon ransomed, this is a clear evidence of the military capabilities of the new state. At the same time, some Tatars served the Russian rulers. Thus, Vasily II had at his service two Tatar princes Kasym and Yüsuf (‘Yaqub’ in Russian chronicles), who fled from the persecutions of Máxmüd and received feuds in the Principality of Moscow (Prince Kasym received in 1452 town Gorodets). Using Tatars in the raids against the opponent was common both for Muscovites and Lithuanians; e.g. in 1445 Muscovites and Tatars invaded together the districts of Vyazma and Bryansk, plundered them and almost reached Smolensk (“Летопись Авраамки,” ПСРЛ 16 (1889): 186-187. “Супрасальский список,” ПСРЛ 17 (1907): 69).

2765 И. Б. Греков, Очерки по истории международных отношений Восточной Европы в XIV - XVI вв. (Moscow, Издательство восточной литературы, 1963), 118.
of Vytautas’s figure in some chronicles written in Russian, as well as in the ‘Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi’ by Maciej Stryjkowski. Vytautas’s affairs with the Tatars were a matter which fitted into his broader political vision of his role in Eastern Europe, which can be seen for instance from his correspondence dated 1425 with Paul von Rusdorf, the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights mentioning that one of the Tatar khans at that point was living at Vytautas’s court. Vytautas and the following Lithuanian Grand Dukes were regularly updated on the Crimean politics and had a network of his agents in Caffa, like an Armenian Hovhannes; his direct involvement to Crimean politics for instance is recorded in many documents. The next Grand Duke Švitrigaila did the same, as testifies his correspondence with the Grand Master of the Teutonic knights, as well as his letters to the King of Poland. At the same time, the information on the events in Caffa, the Crimean Khanate, and the Golden Horde were transmitted to the Polish court, and reflected in the chronicles of Maciej Stryjkowski and Jan Długosz (e.g. the dynastic wars in the Crimea); the Western European courts also tracked the political changes and the
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2766 "Витолт своею делностью и менъством всему свету славным был и царя татарских его слухали и без его воли орд нигде не ординовали, а гды царь Зеледин заволский умер, с которым Витолт братерство мел, и з ордами своими на Прусы ходил, Керембердек, сын его, осед, а столец отецский, хотячи шаблею от Витолта отбити, что Витолт не стерпел, почал готоватися з войском, хотячи Керембердека з панства зсадити, Токтамиша Бедзбула в Вилии короновал, яко заволских татар звъчный потребовал, убравши его в злотоглав, шъльк на него зложил перловый, мовячи, иж Токтомыш царь заволский новый. <...> Наостаток Керембердек Токтомишова, котрый утекл з той битвы, знову короновал в Вилни на царство, убравши в злотоглав, и шапку перловую взложил на него, и дал ему в руки шаблю. И так з мурзами и уламами и маршалка своего литовского Радивила з ним до орды послал з войском. <...> И так Еремфердек выиграл и царство опановал, а самого Керембердека, понимавши, замордовал, а Витолтови през Радивила присягл завше на потребу его зо всеми татарами служити, и послал ему дары великие. Того ж року и Едыга, царь перекопский, славный, Витолтови присяг верность, и помочь давати на неприятеля его, быле бы толко от Литвы з своим царством был безпечный". “Летописи Белорусско-Литовские,” Полное собрание русских летописей 35 (1980): 59.

2767 Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi Maciej Stryjkowskiego (Warsaw, 1846), vol. 2., 156.

2768 Codex epistolaris Vitoldi Magni ducis Lithuaniae 1376–1430; coll. Opera Antonii Prochaska (Krakow, 1882), X, 688, doc. 1181. The test reads: Und uff das, so thun wir euch czu wissen, wie das keiserthum in Tatharn in im selbir groslich geszwehit und geteilt ist, also, das itczund sechs dirhaben keiser do sind, der iclicher umb das kaiserthum steet und arbet. Derselben keiser einer czu uns ist, Machmet genant, und die ander wonen do im lande einer do der ander anderswo, wen ire lande czumale gross und weith sint..<...> Naostatok Керембердек Токтомишова, котрый утекл з той битвы, знову короновал в Вилни на царство, убравши в злотоглав, и шапку перловую взложил на него, и дал ему в руки шаблю. И так з мурзами и уламами и маршалка своего литовского Радивила з ним до орды послал з войском. <...> И так Еремфердек выиграл и царство опановал, а самого Керембердека, понимавши, замордовал, а Витолтови през Радивила присягл завше на потребу его зо всеми татарами служити, и послал ему дары великие. Того ж року и Едыга, царь перекопский, славный, Витолтови присяг верность, и помочь давати на неприятеля его, быле бы толко от Литвы з своим царством был безпечный”. “Летописи Белорусско-Литовские,” Полное собрание русских летописей 35 (1980): 59.

2769 Liv-, Est und Kurlandisches Urkundenbuch (Riga/Moscow, 1884), vol. 8, XXXVII, S. 366, No. 624.


2771 Długosz, Joannis Dlugossii seu Longini canonici Cracoviensis Historiae Polonicae libri XII (Krakow, 1877), vol. 4, 221.
struggle of the Tatar princes, e.g. the Burgundian court did this via their ambassador Gilbert de Lannoy, whose reports have been preserved and published.\textsuperscript{2773}

All the information from the Western European, Polish, Lithuanian and other sources confirm one fact: the Crimean Tatars of Solkhat in Crimea were part of the centrifugal process of the disintegration of the Golden Horde. Some scholars believe that Haji Geray Khan had declared himself independent Khan of Crimea in 1428,\textsuperscript{2774} although his first coins only date back to 1441 (at that point he began ruling indeed and settled in Salaçtq, between Çufut Qale and modern Bakhchisaray). The last date is more certain; although Crimean Tatars were virtually independent before, the rule of Haji Geray could not begin in the 1420s. The process of gaining independence by the Crimean Tatar elites was gradual. The Tatars of Solkhat became more autonomous in the course of the dynastic wars of fourteenth century. Furthermore, from 1400 until 1440, the confrontations among different claimants were supported first by Vytautas, and later by other Russian and Lithuanian princes, who did not want to have a strong Golden Horde in their area, but who appreciated the military help of minor Tatar rulers while conducting their own wars. Finally, in 1429–1431 the geographical core of the Golden Horde was struck by the immense drought and plague: “in the lands of the Sarai and in those of Cumania (Desht-i Qipchaq) there was a severe drought and an extremely large plague, which killed an incredible quantity of people, so as only a few of them survived with their herds.”\textsuperscript{2775} The Golden Horde could not exist as a dominating political actor in Eastern Europe. Its collapse and, in particular, the formation of the independent Crimean Khanate became a question of time, irrespective of whether this took place in 1428 or 1441.\textsuperscript{2776}

\textsuperscript{2773} de Lannoy, Voyages et ambassades de messire Guillebert de Lannoy, 1399–1450 (Mons, 1840), 41.
\textsuperscript{2774} It was marked by the appearance of the Caffiote coins with the Genoese castle on obverse side and the tamga of the clan of Geray on the reverse side. They spread after 1433, which is indirect evidence that the disintegration of the Golden Horde and the separation of Crimea \textit{de facto} happened already at that point. These aspres were coined in the mint of Caffa up to 1453. In fact, combined the symbols of the metropolis (\textit{castello genovese}) with Latin legend and the Tatar tamga with legend in Arabic, and this can be seen as a visual expression of their double subordination. Фомичев, “Джучидские монеты из Азова,” Советская археология 1 (1981): 225, 239. Еманов, \textit{Север и Юг в истории коммерции на материалах Кафы ХIII–ХV вв.} (Тюмень, 1995), 111. О.Г. Опимах, “Коллекция генуэзско-татарских аспров в собрании национального заповедника “София Киевская,” Сугдейский сборник 2 (Kiev/Sudak, 2005): 527. Г.А. Козубовский, “О времени появления кафских надчеканок на джучидских монетах,” Сугдейский сборник 2 (Kiev/Sudak, 2005): 156.
\textsuperscript{2775} Tiesenhausen, Сборник материалов, относящихся к истории Золотой орды (Saint Petersburg, 1884), vol. 1, 442.
\textsuperscript{2776} Although Sajid-Äx♠ät was dominating the steppes in 1440s, he was in bad relations with the Polish kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania; thus he invaded Podolia and Lwow in 1442, Lithuania in 1444, again Podolia in 1447 (Spuler, \textit{Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Russland 1223-1502} (Leipzig, 1943), 166), different Polish and Lithuanian territories in 1447, 1449, and 1450 (И. Б. Греков, \textit{Очерки по истории}}
How did it all afflict Caffa and what role did it play in the political unrest of the time? Understandably, as I have shown in the first chapter, by the fifteenth century the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea were no longer a humble supplicant doing trade through a couple of coastal trading stations, a supplicant whose trade and fate depended on the benevolence of the Tatars. Caffa was a large and independent political actor. It was big enough to influence local politics, but still quite vulnerable, and still formally dependent of the Tatars. In the fifteenth century the Genoese understood the inevitability of significant political changes in the Black Sea area and tried to strengthen their own positions, either by direct assertion of their dominance, or by establishing new alliances. The Tatar internal discords were a problem for the Caffiotes only in a sense that the old routes from Eastern Europe to Central Asia remained unsafe. Another menace appeared, however, for the Genoese, namely the figure number one in early fifteenth century Eastern Europe, the Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas, who wanted Caffa to recognize his suzerainty over the Genoese Black Sea colonies. Consuls sent envoys with gifts to propitiate him. One envoy, Battista Gentile, promised Vytautas under the threat of war to raise his banners and blandish his coat of arms in Caffa (he probably did not do so, as the envoy clearly exceeded his authority). Another envoy, Dario Grillo, was robbed on his way to Lithuania by the Tatars (ab imperatore tartarorum); he lost his goods, horses, and money amounting 300 sommo (2,400 Genoese librae). Thus, dealing with this faraway but still menacing prince was one of the concerns of the Genoese.

The Principality of Theodoro, so called after its patron St Theodore (Άγιος Θεόδωρος), a Greek-speaking state in the Crimean foothills with a capital in Mangup had been a stumbling-stone for the Caffiotes since the fourteenth century. The Theodorites confronted the Genoese over access to the shores and routes crossing the harbours of South-Western Crimea. Moreover, the region of the Genoese Captaincy of Gothia (the Crimean coast from международных отношений Восточной Европы в XIV-XVI вв. (Москва, Издательство восточной литературы, 1963), 124), and attacked Moscow in 1451. Indeed in 1449 Sajid-Áxmäit even helped prince Michael Žygimantas to occupy Kiev. Therefore it was no surprise that when Haji Geray, who lived for a long time in Lithuania, proclaimed himself an independent Crimean khan, Casimir IV Jagiellon (then Grand Duke of Lithuania, since 1447 also King of Poland) supported his claim and recognized him as such, being in need of an ally against Sajid-Áxmäit. Crimea had been self-sufficient long before then, no longer being connected with the collapsing Golden Horde – the old routes of trade in Eastern Europe disappeared, and the new ones did not cross the steppes around the Volga. Thus, Haji Geray could enjoy full independence, and his successors on the Crimean throne – broad autonomy under the Ottoman suzerainty.

2779 ASG, AS, 3034, Diversorum, Filze 14, No. 2 (old), 6 (new). Published in: Karpov, Regests… Diversorum Filze… Black Sea in the Middle Ages 3.36.
Cembalo to Lusta, called in Greek Παραθαλασσια, i.e. sea shore) was mainly populated by the Greek-speaking Orthodox people, eager to rebel against their Latin masters. The princes of Theodoro took advantage of this and tried their best to limit Genoese power in Crimea either by instigating the local population to rebellion or by directly invading Genoese lands. Thus, in 1423, prince Alexios attacked Lusta and Cembalo, and the Genoese had to spend as much as 10,000 sommo on defending the towns against him. The ruling dynasty of Theodoro (Gabras, or Chowra in Turkish), was linked to the imperial dynasty of Trebizond (Grand Komnenoi), which initially controlled part of the former Byzantine possessions in Crimea. However, the relations of two Greek states were not always ideal, and this gave the Genoese space to manoeuvre. In 1429, they organized in a coup d’état in Trebizond and the throne passed from Alexios IV to his son John.\textsuperscript{2780} At the same time, the Venetians established relations with the prince of Theodoro – the main local trouble-maker for Caffa and therefore the natural ally for the Republic of St Marco. The scale of the threat of the Principality can be seen from the sums that the Genoese government assigned for the struggle, 10,000 sommo for instance in 1422.\textsuperscript{2781}

The 1430s were a time of latent confrontation of the Genoese and the Venetians on the Black Sea with some sparks of mutual hostility. The Venetians were in a difficult position – they began a new anti-Genoese war in 1431,\textsuperscript{2782} while one of their two Black Sea outposts, Tana, was endangered in 1431 by the Tatar siege,\textsuperscript{2783} which temporarily reconciled the Genoese and Venetian population against a common enemy,\textsuperscript{2784} and the plague, that killed the Venetian consul Vittorio Dolfino\textsuperscript{2785} and made the vice-consul beg the Caffiotes for help.\textsuperscript{2786} However, the Caffiotes wanted to attack the Venetian Tana themselves, which would have happened, unless the wind from the North did not block their exit from the haven.

\textsuperscript{2781} ASG, SG, Sala 34, 590/1230. MC 1422, f. 209v.
of Caffa. The Venetian Senate was informed about this treachery by the bailo of Constantinople and the authorities of Negroponte. On July 5, 1431 it agreed to send thirty crossbowmen to Tana, and five days later it added the sum of 2,000 ducats to defend the city against both the Genoese and the Tatars. This expedition under Andrea Loredano departed in early August, and had instructions to find out the intentions of the Caffiotes and, if they were hostile, to attack Caffa and any Genoese ship he met. However, two galleys of Loredano’s fleet were shipwrecked along the coast of Genoese Gazaria and they landed on Cape Meganom, where they were immediately noticed by the Genoese of Soldaia. The consul of Soldaia Colardo de Palavania informed about that the consul of Caffa Francesco Lomellini on October 8, 1431, and at the same time gathered all the surviving goods and put the Venetian captives in prison. Francesco Lomellini consulted with the city elders and decided to send to Soldaia Giovanni Spinola and Domenico dei Franchi di Manierri to make an inventory of goods. The new consul of Soldaia, Antonio di Montaldo, who had just arrived and taken up office, made an inventory together with the Caffiotes and estimated the bounty at 900 silver Caffa sommo. It was decided to spend them on defeating the Genoese cities, which was quite timely, since Loredano had begun to attack the Ligurians, capturing some Genoese galleys on December 24, 1431.

In 1432, the new Venetian muda coming to Tana and captained by Stefano Contarini was threatening the Caffiotes, bringing 2000 ducats for defence expenses in Tana, to obtain the release of captives, attacking the Genoese ships, and making sure that Alexios, prince of Theodoro, was faithful to the alliance with Venice and still intending to fulfil some yet mysterious commitments (...tam pro faciendo viagium suum bono tempore, quam pro succurrendo loco Tane et pro executione rerum, quas dominus Alexius, dominus Gothie, intendit facere dominio nostro). There is no doubt that these commitments equalled anti-

2788 ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 58, f. 65r-v, 69r-v.
2789 Karpov, Diversorum Filze … PSV 2 (1995). Talyzina, “Ballistarii,” Vizantijskij Vremennik 58 (1999): 65. The reason for this must be that the Venetians did not know the local seaway and were too close to the shore when rounding the cape. The ships were wrecked by the hidden underwater rocky ridge, situated some 200–300 m from the visible coast of Meganom and which were a big danger for ships during storms. Galley captains were not the first to make this mistake, since the archaeologists discovered traces of numerous shipwrecks of different époches in this area. Another mistake – and an unavoidable one for the galleys risking shipwreck – was to land on Cape Meganom, which was devoid of cover, and therefore very visible from any point of the neighbourhood.
Genoese actions. Alexios was regularly kept up to date by the Venetians about the events in Italy, where two maritime republics were at war. It appears that he began preparing for an offensive against the Genoese in advance, gathering all Greek forces that were reluctant to stay under the Caffiote rule, first of all – the local Orthodox population of Cembalo, and preparing them for rebellion, which occurred in 1433.2792

The revolts of the Orientals against Latin domination were by no means a rare even before 1433. The hostile attitude of the local population towards the Italians was easily aggravated:

The problematic relations between the Italians and the local populations were, to some extent, social in origin. While merchants cooperated with the Latins despite their rivalry, the everyday folk... tended to regard them as both heretics and selfish oppressors, a sentiment that sometimes received clerical backing. Local rulers were mainly concerned about their income from taxes levied on Italian traders, and fraudulent or irregular payments could and did create problems, which could escalate into military conflict. This was the case when the... Tatar khans exhorted local citizens to rise up against the Genoese or the Venetians. Wars and clashes tended to conclude in favor of the maritime republics or in a compromise by which the local ruler was obliged to lower duties and pay indemnities.2793

At the same time, we can safely say that no other rebellion was as successful or caused the Genoese so much trouble and losses as this one. The rebellion began in late February 1433, when the local population of Caffa refused obeying the Genoese administration.2794 Prince Alexios came to help the rebels and captured Cembalo.2795 Perhaps he also occupied the...
Captaincy of Gothia, which should not have been a problem, since these territories only had a small Genoese population and minor garrisons in the castles. From the Genoese sources however we only know that the colonizers lost Cembalo, and we cannot be sure whether this meant the castle or the entire consulate (as a part of Gothia was under the jurisdiction of the consul of Cembalo), thus this is just a hypothesis and to prove it we need a deeper investigation of the problem. Nonetheless, in any case Alexios became a serious menace, because owning Cembalo he could threaten Caffa and make obstacles to the Genoese trade, not to mention the shipyards of Cembalo, which were vital for the Caffiotes and which could be used against them by the Theodorites.

The news about the rebellion only reached Genoa in summer 1433. The letter dated July 16 from the Genoese to the Duke of Milan speaks about the loss of Cembalo (Alexio de lo Tedoro tempore noctis, cerca finem mensis febrauri proxime exci... oppidum preciosum hujus civitatis in orientalibus portibus situm, Cimbalum vocatum),2797 same is reflected in the Genoese chronicles.2798 The authorities of Genoa reacted, although not very rapidly. In October 1433, a nobleman Carlo Lomellino was appointed as a head of the fleet sent to Cembalo to reconquer it, suppress the revolt, and re-establish law and order.2799 As winter was approaching, the Genoese did not send the expedition immediately, limiting their anger to blaming Alexios (... rebellum Alexium de Theodoro, qui tum per magnificum comune Janue sive eius officiales in Caffa de stercore [sic] fuerit erectus, asumpto thementatis spiritu Cimbaium oppidam).2800

The fleet of Lomellino comprising twenty vessels – nineteen galleys and one fusta – with 6,000 people finally left Genoa harbour in March 1434 and hired additional mercenaries

and one *fusta* in Chios; after that it directed to the Black Sea and arrived there by May 31, 1434.\textsuperscript{2801} The Genoese secured friendly relations with the ruler of Sinope so as he would not meddle into the Crimean affairs. By June 4, the fleet arrived to Cembalo, but discovered that the entrance to the haven blocked by a chain. Next day, the besiegers embarked on small boats and managed to destroy the chain, after which the galleys entered the haven. The following day the siege from the land using canon began. On the June 8, the Genoese made a final assault and took the Fortress of St George (burg), and then the Fortress of St Nicolas (citadel). This led to plunder and massacre. The victors killed all defenders besides Olobej (Turkic ‘the Grand Prince’), the son of prince Alexios, who commanded the garrison, and some Greek from Candia.\textsuperscript{2802} Next day, on June 9, the Genoese galleys landed troops near Kalamita, the main haven of the Theodorites, and after a trade-off agreed to grant the inhabitants their lives and property if they surrendered. However, the next day when additional troops arrived, they discovered that the city was empty and the fleeing population had taken all their possessions with them. The Genoese troops burnt the city. They certainly did not even think about assaulting the mighty fortress of Mangup, so it looked like they reached final success in the war with Theodoro. Nonetheless, they did not think that their mission was ended.

Instead of sending the army back to Genoa, the authorities of Caffa directed them against the Tatars. First, they tried diplomatic means, but after the Tatars killed the Caffiote truce envoy, it was decided to send Lomellino against Solkhat. This campaign began on June 22, 1434. The Genoese marching army with the banners of Carlo Lomellino, the Commune of Genoa, and the Duke of Milan consisted of 8,000 men. Their formation was two miles long, it was marching slowly, and was therefore very vulnerable. They reached a place called Castadzona where they planned to rest and put on the armour there, but suddenly there appeared mounted Tatars, first several, then around 5,000, who began shooting at the unarmed Italians from their bows. Panic set in and the Genoese soldiers tried to retreat in disarray, while the Tatar warriors came after them. The greater part of the Italian army was massacred, and only few of them escaped to Cembalo. The next day, the Tatars beheaded all


\textsuperscript{2802} On this person see Agosto, “Due lettere inedite sugli eventi dei Cembalo e di Sorgati en Grimee nel 1434,” *ASLSP.NS* 17(91) (1977): 515.
the bodies and made two pyramids of their heads. Another crushing defeat of the Genoese forces. Moreover, as we know from the letter sent by the Venetian bailo of Constantinople to Alexios through Moncastro and dated around 1436 or slightly later, the Theodorites gained Kalamita back and settled there. Another rebellion in Cembalo, probably inspired by the Venetians and Theodorites, occurred in 1439, perhaps due to the bread shortage. The consul of Cembalo was wounded, and once again the Genoese government had to apply the extreme measures, sending a new expedition under Tommaso Campofregoso. The consul, massarii, and council of Caffa sent a certain Antonio Pino, who remained a consul for eleven months and six days and who managed to pacify the rebellious city. He was replaced by a burgensis of Caffa Girolamo d’Allegro, who was appointed for this position in Genoa.

Although Genoese suffered in 1434 a bitter defeat, the ruler of Solkhat (probably Haji Geray) could not take full advantage of his victory and had to retreat in the same year to his patron Sigismund Kęstutaitis to Lithuania because of the approaching troops of Sajid-Äxmät. The Venetians did not benefit much from the temporary Genoese weakness. Moreover, the Republic of St Marco was experiencing continuous hardship with sending the galleys of muda to Tana and funding the fortifications and the garrison there, and these problems seemed to increase with time. Thus, in April 13, 1434, the Venetian Senate voted to order the bailo of Constantinople to pay 2,000 ducats for the defence of Tana, and again faced the problem to spend large sums on the garrison in 1435. In 1435, the Venetians established relations with the Moldovan leaders. In 1435, there was a plague in Caffa, and the population fled to Tana, Moncastro, and other cities. In 1436, the Venetian Senate ordered the galleys of muda to sail immediately to Tana under a threat of a fine of 500 ducats.
for each man disobeyed.\textsuperscript{2813} However, in 1436 the galleys of Tana delayed their departure, which made the Senate apply additional measures and stimuli for the resumption of navigation.\textsuperscript{2814} B. Doumerc considers frequent delays of galleys of up to eight weeks as a symptom of the structural crisis of the Venetian merchant fleet.\textsuperscript{2815} In 1437, the Senate was informed about the plague on the Black Sea, and introduced an isolation period for the galleys sailing from Constantinople and Trebizond (however, Emperor John VIII and the Patriarch arrived to the council in Ferrara on the very same galleys coming back to Venice from Tana).\textsuperscript{2816} In 1438, the Tana galleys again did not set to sea.\textsuperscript{2817} The decree of the Senate dated March 28, 1439 states that the newly-elected consul of Tana was forced to stay in Caffa, because the galleys could not reach the Venetian outpost; it was therefore decided to allocate him half of the due money for his stay in Caffa.\textsuperscript{2818} The political changes in Italy and Genoa did not afflict Caffa a great deal. The sovereignty of the Duke of Milan over Genoa, which lasted from 1421 to 1435, came to an end in 1436,\textsuperscript{2819} the guarantor of its independence being Venice and Florence, and a new doge, Tommaso Campofregoso (1436–1442), was elected.\textsuperscript{2820} However, the administration of the colonies of Gazaria in fact worked in the same way both before and after it happened. At the same time, the agenda of the day in terms of the West’s relations with the Byzantine Empire in the 1430s was the question of the union of the Church. This would allow the West to arrange an ideologically-based anti-Ottoman crusade and to prolong the life of an agonizing Constantinople. John VIII Palaeologus and Patriarch Joseph II of Constantinople stayed for two years first in Ferrara, then in Florence, agreed on most of the terms imposed by the Pope Eugene IV, and signed on July 6, 1439, this union counting on the help from the


\textsuperscript{2814} ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 59, f. 164r-v, 166v.


\textsuperscript{2816} Nicol, Byzantium and Venice: a Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations (Cambridge, CUP, 1988), 375.

\textsuperscript{2817} Karpov, Ways of Medieval Seafaring: The Black Sea navigation of the Venetian Republic in the XIII-XV centuries (Moscow, 1994), 58.

\textsuperscript{2818} ASV, Senato, Misti, reg. 60, f. 133v. The situation where a new consul could not reach Tana, was normal: for example, Arsenio Duodo, Josaphat Barbaro and Niccolò de Varsis were forced to stay in Constantinople in the winter of 1436.

\textsuperscript{2819} de Negri, Storia di Genova (Florence, 2003), 549–558.

\textsuperscript{2820} It worth mentioning that during about one hundred years of the existence of the colonial empire in Gazaria, Genoa lost its sovereignty five times: 1. French rule in 1396–1409; 2. Rule of Theodore II, Marquis of Montferrat, in 1409–1413; 3. Milanese rule of Filippo Maria Visconti 1421–1435 (Ghibelline rule); 4. French rule in 1458–1461; 5. Milanese rule of Francesco I Sforza in 1464–1478.
Western powers. The union was eventually rejected by the greater part of the Orthodox hierarchy, clergy, and population, but became a starting point of a crusade against the Muslim expansion. However, despite the heroic efforts of John Hunyadi, who defeated the Ottomans in 1443, and despite George Kastrioti Skanderbeg launched an anti-Ottoman rebellion in Albania in the same year, the European monarchs were not very enthusiastic about the idea of crusade. The expedition was finally arranged, but it was the last big attempt of the West to come to the aid of Byzantium. The campaign ended with a catastrophe. In the battle of Varna in 1444, the army of crusaders under Władysław III of Poland and of Hungary (1424–1444) was completely defeated by the Ottoman troops. Another expedition of crusaders from Burgundy sent by Duke Philip III the Good under the command of Valerain de Wavrin, entered the Black Sea in 1445 in order to take part in a new anti-Ottoman expedition but also failed to reach its destination; instead of a crusade against the Muslims, they began ravaging the shores of the Black Sea, causing more harm to the Greeks and the Genoese than the Ottomans. John Hunyadi was defeated in 1448 in the Second Battle of Kosovo, failing to free Morea, but perhaps saving the independence of Albania under Skanderbeg. After this point, the world of Latin Christendom did not take any serious joint attempts to withstand the Ottoman threat.

Since the expansion of the Ottoman Empire was increasingly endangering the states of the Black Sea region, by the mid-fifteenth century most of them, including their worst enemies generally stopped the use of military force in their internal conflicts, sticking more to diplomatic tools. For instance, the relations between the Genoese and the Emperor of Trebizond were becoming increasingly bad, and finally in 1446 John IV Grand Komnenos sent a fleet under the command of his brother the despot David against Caffa. This expedition was a big threat for the city, as the fleet consisted of thirteen galleys, and the actions of John IV were supported by Haji Geray Khan, the Prince of Theodoro (who allowed David to use the haven of Kalamita in Crimea, the residence of the heir of the principality), and the rulers of Sinope and Kastamonu. However, this all did not lead to war, as Caffa paid off food stocks

2821 Indeed the rebellion of George Kastrioti Skanderbeg was the most successful anti-Ottoman venture of that time. Skanderbeg was raised in Islam, but rejected it and converted to Christianity. Having begun the rebellion in 1443, he was supported by the local nobility, defeated the Ottomans several times, allied with the King of Hungary, and forced Murad II to retreat from Krujë that he was assaulting. In 1444, he conducted with Venice and the princes of Albania a treaty known as League of Lezhë and began a guerrilla war in Northern Albania, effectively defeating Ottomans in 1449 and 1451. Mehmed II the Conqueror, who cannot be seen as an incapable warrior and politician, preferred to recognize George Kastrioti Skanderbeg as the ruler of Albania.

2822 About the ideological discourse on the Crusades see: Hankins, Renaissance Crusaders Humanist Crusade Literature in the Age of Mehmed II.

2823 Карпов, Регесты, 48.
and a gift of 1413 aspres for David. This was a wise decision, since later in 1447 the Ottomans attacked Trebizond and invaded Crimea for the first time, which made the Emperor and the Genoese make a treaty before the coming danger.

In April 1453, the Ottoman army under Mehmed II began the siege of Constantinople. The Genoese, Venetians, and Catalans took part in the defence, but their forces were too small. Giovanni Giustiniani Longo, a Genoese commander, brought with him only 700 soldiers; the Genoese and the Venetians had only five ships in each group respectively and some soldiers on the city walls. Eventually, after several assaults, Constantinople fell on May 29, 1453. After these tragic events and until the fall of Caffa in 1475, the problems preoccupying the Eastern Latins were the following: “it was impossible to reach the Black Sea, because of the bombardments of the Rumeli Hisary fortress; the Sultan demanded taxes always heavier, in exchange for a peace not always protected; the Turkish navy that periodically came into sight as a sign of the precarious political situation; they called on Western countries for help, trying to avoid a tragedy that then seemed unavoidable.” The Caffiotes had to send their envoys to Mehmed II for the sake of their security. Conquering Crimea was not part of the Sultan’s immediate plans; he only obliged them to pay a yearly tax, and the Genoese of Caffa paid it without much of help from their Ligurian metropolis. Initially this annual tax amounted about 2,000 ducats, then it was increased to 3,000, and then to 4,000 ducats. The few military encounters of the Ottoman ships with the Latin ones between 1453 and 1475 caused to the Muslims some defeats, even despite their numeric superiority. However, going through the straits was not really safe for the Genoese:

After the fall of Constantinople, the Rumeli Hisary fortress became a nearly insuperable obstacle for the Genoese who, unlike the Venetians, had not obtained any treaty from the Sultan that could have secured, at least in theory, the free passage through the Straits. The survival of the colonies of the Republic of Genoa, even the most remote ones, who represented the last survival of Christendom in the sea now completely submitted to Turks and Tartars, was now really precarious and dramatical. For other twenty years, the survival of Caffa and other Genoese territories of the Black Sea depended upon the captains of the fleets of the Bank of San Giorgio and the merchants that accepted, sometimes at the cost of their life, the risk to break through the big Turkish blocking.

---

2825 Байер, История крымских готов, 216.
2827 Olgiati, The Genoese Colonies in Front of the Turkish Advance (1453-1475), 382–383.
2828 Vigna, Codice diplomatico delle colonie Tauro-liguri, Genoa, 1868, 297-301. Babinger, Maometto, 110. These precautions, however, did not save the Genoese from losing Samastro in the immediate wake of the conquest of Constantinople.
On the one hand, the Genoese did not have (apart from Alexandria, where the trade was mainly dominated by the Venetians) any access to the markets of Persia and India, other than through Caffa, Trebizond, and partly Bursa. On the other hand, after 1453, it was becoming increasingly difficult to sail regularly to the Black Sea via Constantinople. The fall of the city was followed by the plague in 1454–1455. The popes Nicholas V (1447–1455) and Callixtus III (1455–1458) called for a crusade against the Ottomans but were unsuccessful. The access from the metropolis to the colonies now almost completely at the mercy of the Ottoman sultan. Sometimes, the Genoese used the River Danube route, but this could not substitute the loss of the straits. On November 15, 1453, the Genoese Senate transferred all the Black Sea colonies of the Commune to the Bank of Saint George, which then ruled Genoese Gazaria until the end of its existence. The first steps were relatively successful: thus in 1454 Caffa resisted an attack of a joint Ottoman and Tatar army. Nevertheless, many of those noblemen, who were elected as consuls by the protectors of the Bank of Saint George, refused to go to Gazaria. The central administration did not control certain parts of the colonies and was often unable to guarantee law and order.

In the context of Ottoman expansion, the Genoese in Crimea had to have peaceful relations with the local rulers of the Khanate. In 1455–1457 there was a war in the Khanate of Crimea, and the Genoese supported their ally Haji Geray, which strengthened the bonds between Caffa and the Khan. At the same time, both Genoese Gazaria and Khanate of Crimea switched under the suzerainty of Casimir IV Jagiellon (Grand Duke of Lithuania 1440–1492, King of Poland 1447–1493). Haji Geray, who obviously tolerated the Genoese or perhaps

---

2831 The diplomats stopped using the route through the Straits by the 1470s. In 1473, Catarino Zeno travelled from Suhumi through Caffa to Poland (Tardy, Régi magyar követjárások Keleten (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1971), 48), and Ambrogio Contarini (a Venetian diplomat and merchant), sent to the Tatar khan went in 1474 first to Poland, then to Kiev (with a help of a Lithuanian guide), and from there to Caffa (Ibid., 58).
2833 ВОЛКОВ, “Четыре года города Кафы (1453, 1454, 1455 и 1456),” ZOOID 8 (1872): 110-114.
2834 Thus, a Genoese castle Batiario (Baziar) on the coastline of the Sea of Azov owned since 1457 by Ilarione Martini, was captured in his absence by a mercenary leader (condottiero d’una compagnia di ventura) Giovanni Bozio, to whom the owner entrusted to guard the castle. While Ilarione Martini was given by the Commune two companies of stipendiarii of Caffa under the command of Jacopo di Capua and Antonio Gentile in order to gain his property back, one of the galleys rebelled and went to Trebizond instead. The castle was, however, finally gained back by the lawful possessor. Л. КОЛЛИ, “Христофоро ди Негро, последний консул Солдайи. Последние годы генуэзской Солдайи (1469-1475 гг.),” ITUAK 38 (1905): 14. М. ВОЛКОВ, “Четыре года города Кафы (1453, 1454, 1455 и 1456),” ZOOID 8 (1872): 128. О местоположении замка см.: Ф. БРУН, “Atlante idrografico del medio evo posseduto dal prof. Tammar-Luxoro, pubblicato a facsimile e annotato dai socci C. Desimoni e L. Belgrano,” ZOOID 8 (1872): 293. The the fact that Martini purchased this castle as late as 1457, already after the fall of Constantinople, shows that notwithstanding all troubles the Genoese were interested in Gazaria and made big investments even such as purchasing landed property.
even favoured them, died in 1466, and a war for succession followed. Nur Devlet Geray, the second son of Haji Geray, took over several times only for interim periods in 1466–1467, then in 1467–1469, and in 1475–1476, but finally lost in 1478 and first lived as a hostage in Caffa, then after an attempt to kill him he was transferred to Soldaia, and finally left Crimea and became a vassal of John III of Moscow, accepting the Principality of Kasimov from him as a fief in 1486. His opponent, Meñli I Geray (1445–1515), the sixth son of Haji Geray and the grandfather of Süleyman the Magnificent, was supported by the Genoese in his claims on the Crimean throne, and therefore his rule was much more favourable to Caffa; in fact, part of his guards in his citadel Qırq Yer (modern Chufut-Kale) was composed of the sociii of Caffa. The situation, however, was becoming increasingly unstable – there were no large rebellions as in 1433; nonetheless, the instructions to the officers of the Genoese Gazaria mention frequent outbursts of violence and robbery.

By the 1470s, the Genoese colonies were doomed. The last year of the Genoese domination in almost all of them was 1475. The Ca Jorge authorities incautiously intervened in the appointment of a new Tatar tudun, which caused the discontent of some Tatars and finally resulted in their call for an Ottoman invasion. The conflict between an alliance of Caffa and Meñli Geray Khan and the tudun Eminech who assaulted Caffa gave Mehmed II a good excuse for intervening, because in spite of the alliance between Meñli Geray and the Genoese, the Crimean Tatar nobility disliked the Genoese presence and was happy to get rid

---

2836 Волков, “Четыре года города Кафы (1453, 1454, 1455 и 1456),” ZOOID 8 (1872): 143.
2837 Cazacu, Kevonian, “La chute,” 495–496.
of it. As soon as Mehmed II was informed about this confrontation (and perhaps he received some secret invitation to intervene from the Crimean Tatars), he postponed the military campaign to the Aegean Archipelago planned for 1475, made peace with Venice, and sent the army led by Gedik Ahmet Pasha to near Caffa where it disembarked on May 31, 1475.2840

Neither Casimir IV Jagiellon, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, nor Vladislaus II, King of Bohemia, who also was an enemy of the Ottomans, sent troops to help Caffa.2841

After the seven day assault, Caffa surrendered to the Ottomans on June 1, 1475,2842 and other Genoese colonies were captured in the following months.2843 Greek sources report that after the troops of Mehmed II captured Caffa, its inhabitants were moved to Constantinople,2844 so do the Genoese ones:

After the conquest, the Sultan appointed a protogerus populi Latini Caffe in the person of Paris de Morde, forcing the populus Caffe to transfer to Constantinople, where they were assigned a

2841 Vladislaus II would probably have liked to do so, but he was bound by a treaty with Venice that was in confrontation with Genoa at that point.
2842 Some sources of both Western and Eastern origin on the fall of Caffa are available in: Kévonian, Cazacu, La chute de Caffa en 1475; for instance a letter written in Persian: Ibid., 506–511; as well as some Armenian sources.
2843 Soon after the Italian colonies, the army of Gedik Ahmet Pasha captured Meñli Geray Khan who tried to resist (he was, however, sent back to Crimea three years later to rule the khanate, having acknowledged his
2844 Some secret invitation to intervene from the Crimean Tatars), he postponed the military
2845 The seven day assault, Caffa surrendered to the Ottomans on June 1, 1475,2842 and other Genoese colonies were captured in the following months.2843 Greek sources report that after the troops of Mehmed II captured Caffa, its inhabitants were moved to Constantinople,2844 so do the Genoese ones:

After the conquest, the Sultan appointed a protogerus populi Latini Caffe in the person of Paris de Morde, forcing the populus Caffe to transfer to Constantinople, where they were assigned a
specific area, the *contrata Caffensium*. The deportees were obliged to build their houses there, and were only allowed to leave their new area on payment of a tax.\textsuperscript{2845}

The main problem that led most Black Sea states to the defeat by the Ottomans may have been the purblindness and short-term perspective of the rulers. The constant interests in their politics occurred rather than existed, while the line between alliance and enmity was unsteady. The politics of resisting the Ottoman threat was never consistent either among the Western European powers, first of all Genoa and Venice, or among the local Christian and Muslim princes. The old rivalry between Genoa and Venice was not minimized by the danger of losing the Black Sea colonies. Since Venice did not have any colonies in this area but only trading stations in Trebizond and Tana, its main concern in the Black Sea politics was a creation of an anti-Genoese league; thus, by the fifteenth century it managed to be involved in some actions against Genoa and its colonies several states: the Empire of Trebizond, the Principality of Moldavia, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Crimean Tatars, the Principality of Theodoro, etc. Thus, not just because of the exploitation of the local population or because of cultural and religious barriers, but also because of the intrigues of the Republic of St Marco the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea were mostly in hostile surroundings and without allies. However, they had an equivalent rival, since the Genoese represented perhaps the most pragmatic, cunning, and cynical force in international relations in Romania. What we should note here is that both Genoese and Venetians followed in their colonial politics the principle *divide et impera*, relying on the diplomatic network of allies among the local rulers and trying to limit the penetration of each other into the region. This was a type of politics to be followed later on by more recent colonisations.

\textsuperscript{2845} Roccatagliata, Notai genovesi Pera e Mitilene 74. Pistorino, “The Genoese in Pera,” 75–76.
CONCLUSION

In the first stage of their history the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea appeared as a result of the commercial interest of the Italians penetrating the area on the one hand and benevolent permission of the Tatar khans to settle there on the other. The *Pax Mongolica* in the thirteenth century opened up prospects of economic, cultural, and intellectual exchange across a vast stretch of Eurasia, made travelling easier and safer, broadened cultural horizons, and even constituted a form of proto-globalization.\(^\text{2846}\) Thanks to the shifts of the routes of trade with the Central and Eastern Asia, the Black Sea area and Crimea in particular gained special importance, which gave rise to the penetration of the Italian merchants into the region followed by establishment of their settlements. Following the Treaty of Nymphaeum in 1261 and the treaties with the Tatar authorities, the Genoese received along with other privileges the rights to conduct trade and settle in Crimea and began establishing there a network of trading stations. Southern and South-Eastern Crimea, a narrow strip of the Crimean Riviera, was an especially favourable zone for the Genoese, who found a naturally limited geographical area strikingly similar to their own Ligurian *patria* and offered both excellent conditions for navigation and easy access to the trade routes leading to the East. The very existence of the new settlements, which we could call trading stations at that early point, depended therefore on the whims of the local Tatar authorities whom the Genoese had to propitiate.\(^\text{2847}\) However, the situation changed in the 1360s–1380s, when the internal dissent and the dynastic wars in the Golden Horde gave the Genoese a chance to occupy the Crimean hinterland, to establish themselves there firmly, gaining control over and then exploiting the local population (known as *canluchi*),\(^\text{2848}\) fortifying these new domains, and then legalizing this state of affairs with the Tatar authorities by the treaties of 1380 and 1381. In the words of Nicola di Cosimo:

...although the relative safety ensured by the Mongols’ control over trade routes was replaced after about 1360 by a climate of greater insecurity and increased risks, trade in the Black Sea did not come to a halt. In fact, an argument could be made that the Genoese were more effective in imposing their conditions over Black Sea trade from around 1360 onwards.


\(^{2848}\) The rebellions of the latter are a clear sign of Genoese colonial exploitation.
exactly because the weakened authority of Mongol rulers and the internecine wars within the Golden Horde made the Mongols concede vast tracts of land and trading rights.\textsuperscript{2849}

The new clashes with the Tatars in the 1380s showed that the Genoese had learnt not only to negotiate favourable conditions for trade, but could to be actors in local politics, applying certain political strategies of securing their hegemony. From this point on, we can speak about the evolution of a commercial network of independent or semi-independent merchant settlements or trading stations loosely linked to each other in a well-consolidated territorial colonial domain, a political and administrative unit called Genoese Gazaria, a colonial empire of the Republic of St. George on the shores of the Black Sea, a maritime empire or, to recycle the words of Jerry Brotton in a different context, ‘an Empire built on water’.\textsuperscript{2850} If we define colonialism as “one people’s control over another people through the economic, political and ideological exploitation of a development gap between the two,”\textsuperscript{2851} we will find all its necessary ingredients in Genoese Gazaria.

The results of the Genoese colonization of the Black Sea are impressive: the mighty walls of Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo are visual reminders of these big cities and of urban growth in Crimea, when the Genoese arrived here. The expansion of the Genoese, however, went far beyond the cities of Crimea. The Genoese penetrated into the hinterland and controlled it, exploiting it as an integral part of their colonies both via taxation of the Orientals and sometimes by direct ownership of land. We should not be deceived by the double suzerainty over Gazaria and by the involvement of the Tatar Khans in Genoese politics. Even in the modern era, as Stearns puts it, “most of the colonies were fairly loosely organized, with lots of dependence on negotiations with local leaders.”\textsuperscript{2852} Gazaria indeed negotiated with local leaders, and the Orientals were to some extent incorporated and integrated into the lowest ranks of the administration, the higher ones were certainly limited exclusively to the colonizers, i.e. Genoese citizens, and the presence of the supplementary and auxiliary contingents formed by the local population – two additional features of early modern and modern colonialism. However, when it comes to ‘loose organization’ this does not seem to be the case. The Genoese possessions in Crimea in the fifteenth century constituted a single territorial unit. The Genoese colonizers became masters and dominators, and then went on to

\textsuperscript{2851} Reinhard, \textit{A Short History of Colonialism}, 1.
establish strong administrative control over the local urban and rural Oriental population; the rebellions of the later are also proof of colonial control and exploitation.

The interaction between the Latin colonizers with the local Oriental population, its incorporation and incorporation into the Genoese colonial structures both on the level of the administration and the garrison and as regards the dynamics of urban growth and the composition of the population of Caffa brings us to another issue: although the Genoese were settling in their overseas colonies with their ‘New Genoa’ (*atra Zenoa* in the words of an unknown medieval poet), like many other colonizers throughout the world before and after them, imposing their way of modelling the organization of administration, law, urban space, commerce, etc., they came into contact with a complex and entangled social, ethnic, and confessional reality of Crimea. The mingling of these two gave rise to what Balard called the Latino-Oriental culture and formed the basis for Genoese Gazaria.

In the fifteenth century, the Genoese Black Sea colonies, i.e. Genoese Gazaria, constituted a consolidated colonial empire with a considerably high degree of administrative and regional cohesion, as well as high level of geographical mobility, i.e. circulation of people such as officers, soldiers, notaries, and artisans within the area. This was a Genoese colony in root and branch, in its foundations, administration, and law; the local Oriental population participated in many levels and dimensions of its life, but this participation was not decisive in shaping and governing it. Caffa was the political and administrative centre of this hierarchical system, and its head was called *caput Gazarie, consul Caffe et totius Gazarie*. Over time the power of the consul grew immensely, along with his salary and his bureaucratic apparatus; indeed, the increase of the number of people in administration was always taken as one of the direct proofs of the steady urban growth of Caffa and the development of its political system. Especially within the Crimea the consuls of Soldaia and Cembalo, not to mention the local heads of smaller places, were completely subject to the authorities of Caffa. In their domains the Genoese exercised both jurisdiction and taxation, the essence of wielding political power, a fully-fledged late medieval/early modern colonial political power with all its strengths, but also with all its vices, such as mismanagement, endemic corruption, and the constant *inopia* of the colonial administration. On the other hand, like many other colonial administrations, Gazaria broadly involved the local Latin community in administration or, more precisely, the Genoese citizens from the colonial population, which provided the magistrates and formed the commissions. This

---

The colonial experience was largely a private undertaking, and the day to day governing of Caffa and Gazaria had to rely largely on private initiative.

The population of Caffa in particular and the Genoese colonies in general was a mixture of different groups with complex entangled identities. Crimea was a crossroads of civilizations even before the first Genoese settlers arrived; the massive Italian and in general Latin immigration to the colonies added a new powerful element to the Oriental substrate. The missionary activity of the Roman Catholic Church arrived in Crimea along with the commerce and capital investments from Western Europe and the conquerors’ sword – these were its three essential features and characteristic elements of later early modern and modern colonial experiences. In the words of Jerry Bentley:

Whether trade followed the flag or the flag followed trade, imperial and business interests have largely converged since the formation of European colonial and commercial concerns… During the eras of the crusades and Mongol empires, Christian European missionaries closely observed Muslim societies in Spain and Palestine and nomadic societies in central Asia as well as Hindu and Buddhist societies in India, China, and other lands, all with an eye toward casting their messages in the most effective terms… The interests of either empire or business or both have commonly travelled in missionaries’ baggage…

For us, however, it is important that together with the direct migration of Latins to the East, it was also the Catholic mission that was changing the ethnicities and the religious landscape of Crimea, by creating ‘new Latins’ and thus adding even more complexity to the local society. Mixed marriages, and other colonial forms of domestic partnership which differed from fully-fledged marriage, reinforced this process. These marriages and other partnerships are just one small part of the story, but they also reflect the story as a whole. On the one hand, as well as in administration or commerce, it was crystal clear that the Latin side was dominating and privileged. On the other hand, it mingled closely with the Oriental side. This led to a phenomenon that Michel Balard calls a ‘Latin-Oriental’ culture – a culture where the subject was the Genoese, or, more broadly, European colonialism, while the object was the local Oriental society; however, we should not underestimate the measure of mutual influence and close interaction.

Speaking about the transformation of the composition of Caffa’s population, we should stress the following points. Both the qualitative analysis of the sources and the application of quantitative methods and mathematic models to the demography of Caffa allowed us to draw some conclusions as to its dynamics. The Latin migration to Caffa underwent a structural change which led to a much greater dispersion that can be best characterised by the word

---

2854 Bentley, “Global History and Historicizing Globalization,” 73.
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‘internationalization.’ Unlike the fourteenth century when immigrants came mainly from Liguria and Piedmont, the fifteenth century brought its own changes: before and especially after 1453 more and more people, mainly mercenary soldiers, were coming from other areas of Italy as well as the rest of Latin Europe, from England, France, Burgundy, the Netherlands, and the German states to Poland and the Czech realms. Contrary to many estimates made in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the Latins constituted the absolute majority among the macrogroups of Caffa. They were followed by Greeks, who were apparently less prestigious and wealthy than the Armenians, but more numerous. The Armenians seemed to be a fairly ‘privileged’ group among the Orientals, but not as numerous as is often thought; however, apparently, they were the most loyal to the Genoese administration, and the most favoured by the Latins. In the fifteenth century the city’s population was slowly decreasing, but the dynamics of this urban decay determined by the Ottoman threat and constricting conditions is interesting: before 1453 the Latin community diminished insignificantly or even grew, the Greeks and Armenians decrease significantly, while the Muslims increase slightly as a relative share of the total population after 1453, mainly thanks to the arrival of Muslim merchants from Asia Minor trading in Caffa.

The Genoese colonies were meant social mobility for many people, as were many colonies afterwards up to the times of the British Empire. This is very probably connected to the profits of trade and the attraction of the ‘golden mirage’ of the Genoese overseas colonies, but it was not just a question of ‘easy’ money. Many people found in the colonies had the prospect of career promotion: those who had escaped the rigours of rural life could become valets, or dockworkers, or sailors; professionals (notaries, lawyers, doctors, artisans etc.) looking for a job; and the offspring of noble families, who could not count on a rapid political or military career in the metropolis, but often easily obtained higher positions and swifter promotion in the colonies. Afterwards, we could either return to the metropolis from the colonies in the elevated status, or opt for colonial life, which was certainly less safe and more challenging, but offered many opportunities lacking in Liguria. Thus, the motives pushing people from the metropolis to the colonies hardly changed from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to the times of the British gentlemen of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The application of statistical tools to the data of Caffa massariae reveal a highly

\[2855\] For many of them, especially for newly-qualified notaries, going to the colonies was a chance to obtain a better position than in Genoa, or indeed just to get a position, taken into account for example competitiveness of the notarial positions in Genoa.
hierarchical oligarchic society with higher levels of prestige and social activity among the Latins over the Orientals, nobles over non-nobles, and office-holders and tax farmers over the lesser urban population.

If in political terms the emergence of Gazaria as a territorial colonial domain was made possible in the 1360s–1380s by the dynastic wars and unrest in the Golden Horde, in economic terms, the imposition of this colonial regime was a response – and indeed perhaps the only possible way to preserve the Genoese presence on the Black Sea – to the crisis of the mid-fourteenth century and its related hardships. As in many later colonial experiences, the Genoese colonialism in the Black Sea was apparently reactive rather than proactive. The Genoese did not initially plan to create a territorial domain and control the hinterland; their main concern was trade. However, adapting to the changing circumstances in the Crimea, they soon developed their trading stations into large urban centres united in a colonial empire. What is more important regarding trade is that according to Herman Van der Wee, one of the main positive outcomes of the crisis in the fourteenth century was that it “generated important shifts in the structure of international trade: it encouraged and stimulated... long-distance maritime trade.”

As we explained in chapter 7, the Italian Black Sea trade largely shifted from the Asian luxury goods towards the goods of local or Eastern European origin such as grain, fish, caviar, leather, and furs which were exported from the Black Sea area and Eastern Europe to Italy and on to Western Europe (in the case of sturgeon and caviar, on to Flanders). This indeed meant that although the role of the goods of local origin increased, this did not mean the decline of long-distance trade. The traffic was no longer determined in the fifteenth century by the re-export of expensive Oriental goods to the West, as was the case under the Pax Mongolica – in the apex of the medieval elite-consumption oriented trade. When the Black Sea ceased to be the gate to Eastern Asia due to the fourteenth century crisis, the change of the commercial interests led to the change of the paradigm and of raison d’être of the Black Sea expansion, which evolved from the transit points for the Chinese and Asian goods to the bulwarks of colonization and capitalistic exploitation of the area. Thus, it was a shift from medieval elite-consumption oriented trade implying the use of the colonies as just a terminal to the capitalistic and colonial exploitation of the entire Black Sea region.

By the fifteenth century, the economic activity of the Genoese in the Black Sea area was an essentially capitalistic early modern one, laying the colonial patterns of trade: the raw materials from the colonies in exchange for the products of European industry. Philippe Beaujard put it in the terms of Wallerstein, it was “the pattern of a core of the system producing manufactured goods and extracting raw materials from a periphery.” The Black Sea colonies of Genoa were therefore among one of the first examples of the essentially colonial pattern of trade, or model of European economic colonialism, that is “the products of industry in exchange for raw materials”. The metropolis imported raw materials from the colonies and exported the products of Western industry (mainly textiles and metalwork in quantities well above the needs of the Latin population of the colonies, and therefore clearly meant for the local market). Yet the long-distance character of trade did not decline. What we can trace is a gradual shift from the export of valuable sottili goods from Central Asia, Iran, and China (spices, silk, and precious stones) towards commodities from the Black Sea region proper (grain, fish, caviar, slaves, and timber) or from the Northern regions, including Russian lands (e.g. furs). The slave trade also flourished. As goods slaves were particularly liquid, marketable, and self-repayable. Most of them were destined for the European markets as domestic servants and as workshop labours; others were sold in the markets of the coastal cities of Asia Minor and Egypt, where they could be recruited into the Mamluk army.

As often emphasized by scholars in the field, the penetration of the Black Sea region by the Italians did not mean the destruction or eradication of local Oriental commerce and of the local merchant class. The alleged ‘destruction’ of the local Oriental (mainly Greek) merchant class has often been challenged in earlier scholarship. At the same time, some authors have often stressed the vitality and longevity of the older trade structures, such as Greek or Armenian business networks; they were not ruined, but only subjected to and incorporated by the larger-scale structure of the Italian capitalism. Given the developmental gap between colonizers and colonized it was an asymmetrical and unequal collaboration. Genoese Gazaria, in the same way as the Byzantine Empire and, broader still, Latin Romania, became a part of “a broader Mediterranean world whose centre of gravity was in Italy, and whose motor was the policies of the great Italian maritime republics. It was an unequal world; the ties that bound Byzantines and Italians did not bind them with equal force.”

2858 Laiou, Italy and the Italians in the Political Geography of the Byzantines, 98.
‘junior partners’ of the Latins, as Karpov put it, and indeed as Braudel noted it is an essential feature of early modern colonialism, the new-coming colonizers had to network into the local environment and use its old structures. They ‘stood on the shoulders’ of the local people, from local guides to local merchants, during their penetration into the land. Economic cooperation with the locals was an essentially early modern colonial phenomenon, pretty much the same way as local influence on the colonizers in their understanding of the spatial terms. On the other hand, the Italians brought completely new mechanisms of commercial exchange and pushed commerce to a new level of large-scale and long-distance financial and commercial capitalism, previously unknown in the area, and integrated the local merchant class in this structure. This level of economic interaction and exchange indeed never existed in this area prior to the Genoese colonisation.

We should not underestimate the role of the locals in the process of Genoese colonisation. Laiou wrote that the massive presence of Italian merchants in the Black Sea area imposed a certain unity on the trade system of the Black Sea, despite the tensions and inefficiencies. In fact, the Westerners brought many more innovations and recently developed structures of capitalism from their homelands. Nonetheless, in their colonization the Genoese followed almost the same sea routes the Greeks had done previously and in many cases settled in old Greek towns and villages, including those founded in Antiquity. Local pilots familiar with prevailing conditions in the Black Sea shared their knowledge of currents and winds, and in turn the Italians carried Greek merchants and merchandise. Economic cooperation was a feature of Italian colonization from the very start. “The Greeks were simultaneously teachers and pupils: indeed, the Greeks (and Armenians) were to become the leading businessmen in the region between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, the period of Ottoman expansion.” The Italians did not even invent new place names, simply modifying the Greek ones to coincide with their pronunciation. Thus Kaphas became Caffa, Symbolon – Cembalo, Amisos – Simisso, Amastris – Samastro, Sougdaia – Soldaia, and Sevastopolis – Sebastopoli. This is in fact not something counterintuitive, since, as again was written by Braudel, the colonizers were not the first ones to arrive on this land – they used the roads previously made by the local people. These patterns were indeed followed both in the Black Sea area by the Genoese and in the Americas by the Hispanic people, and

2860 Karpov, The Black Sea region before and after the IV crusade, 286–287.
this was indeed a quintessential feature of the late medieval and early modern colonialism. Italians exploited the colonies thanks to a development gap, bringing a superstructure previously unknown in the place and integrating into this superstructure the local (more primitive) structures of economy. The Italian domination over the Black Sea did not therefore destroy the older economic structures; instead, as in the case with many other early modern colonial experiences, it relied on them and used them for mutual benefit.

If we take another look at the Genoese possessions in Crimea, we will see once again that these colonies formed a homogeneous unit on the peninsula, a single geographic, historical, economic, and even to a certain extent an ethnic and cultural entity. Geographically, this is a coastal area of the Southern coast of Crimea enjoying the Mediterranean climate and separated by the Crimean Mountains from the steppe part of the peninsula. Historically, this was the zone of Ancient Greek colonization and later became part of the Roman and the Byzantine Empires, which determined the culture of the region for millennia. Economically the two centuries of Genoese domination and, in particular, of the Genoese trade established strong economic connections within the area. Ethnically Gazaria was an area with a great cultural diversity; however, most of the local Oriental population pretty much everywhere consisted of the Greeks (including all kinds of people of Greek Orthodox faith and often also Greek-speaking), Armenians, and Muslims. This diversity can be reduced, conceptualized and defined as follows: Gazaria had an urban and hinterland culture of a frontier land and a contact zone deeply involved in trade exchanges and full of all kinds of diasporas. Thus, we can conceive of Gazaria as of a single unit. It is not surprising that the Ottomans, who kept intact a lot of the establishments they found in the areas they conquered (e.g. the Byzantine system of tolls). They kept Gazaria as a single administrative unit distinct from the rest of Crimea. After the conquest the Genoese colonies became the sancak of Kefe (Kefe sancağı), which remained separate and distinct from the rest of Crimea. The latter is a clear sign both of the pre-existing regional cohesion and of its continuous survival even after the Genoese were pushed out.

---


2862 Right after the conquest Caffa became the sancak of Kefe (Kefe sancağı), which was later transformed into eyalet of Kefe in 1568 (Kefe beylerbeyiliği). The Eyalet of Kefe with a capital in this city was an administrative unit under the direct rule of the Sublime Porte, so not subject to the authority of the Crimean Khans, vassals of the Sultan. The Ottomans formed there first a sanjak and then a beylerbeylik, ruled by the authorities appointed from Constantinople. In the eighteenth century, it included the sanjaqs of Kefe (Paşa Sancağı), Akkerman (Akkerman Sancağı), Atsu (Kal’a-i Açu Sancağı), Bender (Bender Sancağı), Kinburn (Kılburun Sancağı), and Zane (Zane Sancağı). Nejat Göyünç, Osmanlı Devleti’nde Taşra Teşkilâtı (Tanzimat’a Kadar), Osmanlı, and Cilt 6: Teşkilât, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, Ankara, 1999.
In summarizing in the more particular conclusions of my findings and the results of this research, we come back to the original research question: how did the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea and their multicultural colonial society adapt – or failed to adapt – to the hardships of the fifteenth century, and in particular to the Ottoman menace and the changes in the Mediterranean, European, and Black Sea economy? Based on the study of fifteenth century sources, I am inclined to respond in the following way: all the transformations and shifts that made a colonial domain out of a network of trading stations was in itself a reply to the hardships experienced by the trading stations, meaning both political pressure from the outside and the difficulties of trade in the wake of the crisis in the second half of the fourteenth century. In many cases, early modern pre-industrial colonialism - and indeed even the modern colonialism of the industrial era – has acted reactively rather than proactively. Building a colonial empire in the form in which it shaped later was often not in the mind of the colonists: the empire itself appeared as a response to the pressure from outside, chiefly to the pressure of local political actors, who could jeopardize commercial penetration. This was the case of Genoese colonialism, which started as nothing more than commercial penetration. Later on it was exposed to a number of political and economic challenges on the one hand, and the Genoese learned to benefit from the local contradictions and instability on the other. They owe the shaping of their territorial domain in Crimea in the period 1360-1390 to this, as well as to their ability to adapt flexibly to the changing conditions of commerce. Further development and maturing of the colonial politics, landscape, administration, structure of migration, and trade was largely determined by the challenges the Genoese colonialism faced. We can judge posthumously on the success of these transformations and maturing, but we cannot deny a causal connection between the pressures and challenges, both external and internal, political and economic, on the one hand, and the development of the colonial situation in Genoese Gazaria on the other.

In the introduction I mentioned the words of Verlinden about the continuity, or absence of a gap between late medieval and early modern colonialism; that is, between the colonial experience of the Genoese and the Venetians in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and the colonial enterprises of Castile and Portugal in the wake of and during the Age of Discovery, and, later on, also of other Western European countries such as England, France, or the Netherlands. With all the obvious differences among these colonial experiences, we can trace both the continuity and the visible resemblances.
When studying the beginnings of modern colonization, one must always remember that the Spaniards and Portuguese, who occupied the stage almost alone for more than a century, had the opportunity to make use of the experience gathered by the Italians and above all by the Genoese in the technique of commerce in general, as well as especially in the field of colonial economy, as this economy had gradually developed in their possessions in the Levant and on the shores of the Black Sea.2863

What was so special about the colonial experience of Genoa and how did it shape the projects of the Hispanic kingdoms? How can we now interpret the words written over sixty years ago? I hinted above, but did not entirely reveal another issue that makes Genoese Gazaria one of the most unique and interesting cases in world history. I have used the words ‘colonies’ and ‘colonialism’ several times (sometimes referring to Verlinden). Nonetheless, how much were these settlements ‘colonial’ in their nature in the sense of modern European capitalistic colonialism? The conclusions I draw above support the positive answer to this question. However, what kind of colonialism was it? Apart from some brief remarks, little has been written on the colonial nature of the Genoese domains. Karpov wrote that Genoa relied less on the established territorial domain, and more on a constellation of trading stations all over the known world.2864 There has been some debate among scholars on whether it is proper to use the term ‘colony’ applied to the Italian medieval trading settlements in Crimea in the sense of modern colonialism, but neither of the arguments has received more attention. However, the problem remains: when does the modern process of colonisation begin? Were the Canaries, the Azores, the Portuguese penetration of Western Africa and the Indian Ocean or the discovery of the Americas its starting point? Is it a modernization to apply to the Italian medieval colonization the terminology normally applied to the phenomena of the following period of modern history, and if so, how this word use can be justified? Or, perhaps, Verlinden’s intuition is correct and we have to look for the roots of the phenomenon of modern colonization. Indeed we should look at the first experience of the modern European market-oriented colonialism, followed by the Spanish and Portuguese empires that made their first steps in the fifteenth century on the Atlantic islands to continue onwards to America, Africa and Asia somewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea, in the overseas

2864 Карпов, Итальянские морские республики и Южное Причерноморье в XIII–XV вв.: проблемы торговли [The Italian maritime republic and the southern Black Sea coast in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries: The problems of trade]. (Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 1990). 4. Karpov mentioned in this monograph a theoretical problem of applicability of term ‘colonization’ to the realities of the Middle Ages, but did not develop this issue further.
domains of Genoa and Venice, and in particular in Genoese Crimea (alongside Venetian Crete, Cyprus, and other territorial domains)?

Here, however, I am speaking about European early modern capitalistic pre-industrial colonialism, and leave aside many other examples of expansion where the term ‘colonial’ is applied, from the Ancient Greek maritime expansion and the expansion of the Austronesians in the Pacific and Indian Oceans to the big Chinese maritime expansion in the late Middle Ages. Here we have to limit the use of the word ‘colonies’ to the cases where it applies to the early modern and modern colonialism. Otherwise, we can use the term ‘colonisation’ for Phoenician or Greek expansion:

Extremely important for a definition of colonialism are the components of alterity and differential development. To be colonialist, rule must be experienced as alien rule; complete assimilation ends its colonialist character… But not all rule, and not all foreign rule is colonialist, and the notion of the ‘development gap’ enables us to distinguish conceptually between a colonialist and a non-colonialist exercise of power… Yet another important factor contributing into the definition of a colony is its geographical remoteness from the metropolis or otherwise originating polity, especially one overseas… Classical antiquity saw Phoenician, Greek and Roman colonisation, though probably not colonialism to any great extent, since the factor of alterity will have receded very fast due to assimilation.2865

Conversely, the factor of alterity was present in the Italian colonisation. Can we conceive of the Genoese settlements and dominions as the dawn of the modern colonial era? I am tempted to quote again Verlinden’s words that “Italy was the only really colonizing nation during the middle ages.” However, this time I would reformulate the phrase of the great Belgian scholar. I tend to think that Italians were the first colonizing nation in world history and that the terminus post quem for the beginning of the époque of colonization should be reconsidered.

First of all, we should make an important proviso. The wrong perspective, or perhaps it is better to say – the wrong assumptions have led many scholars to deny the colonial nature of the Genoese Gazaria and other overseas domains. A long debated problem whether the Genoese settlements on the Black Sea were colonies or just trading stations was discussed by Michel Balard. Since Caffa only controlled the coastal part with reduced prospects of expansion into the hinterland, he preferred to call them trading stations (comptoirs) and

2865 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 1, 3, 7.
2867 To be more precise, Venetians with their domains in the Eastern Mediterranean and Genoese with the object of the study – Genoese Gazaria.
hesitated about the colonial nature of these settlements.\footnote{Balard, “Les formes militaires,” 67.} He highlighted that the Genoese colonies were similar to the Venetian ones in the sense that they were a source of prosperity for their metropolis, which is the basic function of colonies. This prosperity was based on the economic exploitation of the entire Byzantine (or post-Byzantine) and Black Sea areas. He also agreed that the economic exploitation of the Byzantine Empire was basically colonial (we can add: 'similarly to the European informal colonialism versus China, Iran, etc.'):  

Si la Romanie ne peut être politiquement considérée comme une colonie génoise, au sens moderne du terme, le commerce romaniote de Gênes revêt incontestablement des formes d’exploitation coloniale. Et c’est par là que Byzance paie lourdement le prix de l’alliance qu’elle a recherchée et maintenue avec Gênes.\footnote{Balard, \textit{La Romanie Génoise}, Vol. 2, 889-894.}

Balard, however, remained hesitant about the applicability of the terms ‘colonies’ and ‘colonial’ to Genoese Gazaria. Nonetheless, we should take into account that speaking about the colonialism, many of these scholars looked at the phenomenon of late medieval and early modern colonialism through the lens of nineteenth and twentieth century colonial history.

Apparently, Genoese Gazaria had little in common with the British Raj, and the same applied to Castilian Mexica or Portuguese Brazil of the sixteenth century. Thus, speaking about the Genoese colonialism, we should avoid comparing it with the colonies of the industrial époque. We should treat the late medieval and early modern phenomena in the context specific to their own period, that is, the period of early pre-industrial capitalism. This important consideration when discussing the starting point of modern European colonialism. If we discarded Genoa’s late medieval colonialism, we would also have to discard not only Portuguese colonialism, but also Dutch, British, French, and all early modern European colonial experiences in Western Africa and the Indian Ocean. In other words it is applicable to all pre-industrial colonialisms, claiming instead that up to the nineteenth century and the formation of the British Raj there were no British colonies in India, but only a network of trading stations. Few scholars would dare to go that far.

Following and developing of these provisos, we should underline an important feature of most late medieval and early modern colonial experiences, in fact going beyond continuity between the Italian and the Hispanic colonialisms and encompassing the colonial experiences of England, France, the Netherlands, and other nations. With a greater or lesser degree of state (i.e. Crown) support, many of the colonial enterprises of the époque were in the kernel private initiatives. As I have emphasized several times, Genoa was a weak state, but it had
strong corporations and private interests, which decided on much that went on within the metropolis as well as overseas, and this made the self-reliant Genoese colonizers more flexible. As a result, Genoa could protect its merchants and liberty in a less limited way than Venice. Was this not the case for the later colonial experiences as well?

It is important to underline this difference between the Genoese and the Venetian models of colonisation. Although the Venetian overseas empire was often considered as the only one in the Middle Ages, in my view Genoese politics were as colonial Venetian politics, with only difference in the means of colonization and preserving control. I am convinced that Genoa was generally more successful than Venice in managing the overseas colonial domain in the Black Sea area. This was not only because the Venetians were ‘too late’, but mainly because in general the Genoese administration and management of colonies was more effective. The discrepancy between the Wealth of an individual or corporation and the inopia of the state resources was always a quintessential feature of Genoese politics. The Genoese relied more on private initiative, and therefore acted more flexibly and efficiently than their Venetian counterparts with their strong, but rigid system of colonial administration and their system of incanti. Thus, Genoese Gazaria in the Black Sea area was structurally a cousin of the Romanie vénitienne, the Venetian Aegean colonial empire, but better adapted to the local realities of the distant extreño Oriente.

The Genoese imposed colonial control and exploitation on their overseas domains no less than, for instance, their Venetian rivals, the main difference between the two being that Venetian colonialism relied on the state, while the Genoese colonialism relied on largely private interests. Indeed, the Genoese colonies adopted the system of administration and the legal system copied, or better to say inherited, from the political constitution of their metropolis. Much like the Doge of the Republic of St. George, the consul of Caffa was helped by the council of elders and different commissions. This secured the direct presence of private initiative and private interests in running the colonial administration, which was the key for survival in the Genoese model. The Republic itself was to a certain extent an entanglement of private initiatives of the alberghi, and to a greater extent, of its colonies. The law, or, to put it more precisely, legislation applied in Caffa demonstrates the same continuity

2871 Balard, La Romanie génoise, vol. 2, 889-894.
with its Ligurian metropolis, as does the administrative system. Caffa did not create anything from scratch, unlike, for instance, the crusader states, which developed a new legal system and a newly formulated and more systematic feudal order than those in Europe, less bound by a long development of local traditions and therefore more ‘classical’ and ‘rational’.

The Genoese colonies applied the legislation of their metropolis with little or almost no incorporation of local legal customs. It is here that the linkage between the colonies and the metropolis is most evident.

The urban nature of Genoese colonization and its flexible and private-initiative based character of Genoese colonialism should not prevent us from calling the overseas possessions of Genoa a colonial empire. First, each empire is basically an urban phenomenon. The Athenian thalassocracy, the Roman Empire and many others were first constellations of cities, through which they governed the hinterland. At the same time, the commercial, profit-oriented nature of all the above-mentioned colonial empires looks rather like the grounds to assert the colonial nature of Genoese Gazaria than to deny it. Indeed, this was the case of the Black Sea colonies, but this also applied to European colonialism in the Indian Ocean and Eastern Asia till the times of the Industrial Revolution and its aftermath. “In the context of sixteenth-eighteenth century Asia we can only speak of European colonialism in certain, territorially restricted spheres of European influence... Otherwise, these were not colonialist enterprises but European trading systems in which territorial acquisitions and political rule were always driven by sober calculation in the exclusive service of commerce”. Thus we can infer that in fact, the trade-oriented nature is a feature of all pre-industrial European colonialism where it faced fairly developed Oriental societies separated from the West with not such a great developmental gap between the two.

From 1453 the Genoese colonies on the Black Sea were no longer the possessions of the Republic; instead, they were transferred to the Bank of St. George – indeed a striking similarity with the early modern colonialism. The Bank was a private institution, run Genoese Gazaria during its last twenty-two years, as well as the early modern English, Dutch, and French colonies were managed by such state-authorised private institutions as the British, French, Dutch, Portuguese, Danish, Swedish, and Austrian East India Companies, the British, French, Dutch, Danish, and Swedish West India Companies, the Hudson’s Bay Company, the South Sea Company, the Levant Company, the Russian-American Company, and many
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2875 Compare it to such modern phenomena as the USA Constitution which were also created ex novo.
others in early modern history, and indeed some more recent examples of the private initiative in colonialism already in the age of industrial capitalism, like Cecil Rhodes’ British South Africa Company. Indeed, “because of the limited degree of central planning, the role of specific, individual motivations is particularly significant for colonisation and colonialism” and indeed should be treated as a constitutive structural feature of late medieval and early modern colonialism, as well as, to a more limited extent, of the colonialism after the Industrial Revolution. We should acknowledge that this preponderance of private commercial initiative in the early modern and indeed even in some modern colonial projects is a pattern which all or most colonial empires followed in the early stages of their history and indeed a structural feature common to many colonial experiences from the Genoese Bank of St. George with its Black Sea possessions to the Cecil Rhodes’ South Africa.

Yet structural similarity within a broad framework of the comparative colonial history does not mean continuity. The Genoese colonialism can be discussed and compared to other pre-industrial capitalistic colonial enterprises, and we can indeed find striking similarities, but our main interest is how the Mediterranean and Black Sea experience of the Italians shaped the layout of later colonial projects? As the Genoese colonies in the Eastern Mediterranean were waning, the Ligurians became increasingly interested in the growing Iberian imperium in Africa. “It looks as though Genoese colonization, after the loss of the Levant, continued in the West, but now under foreign sovereignty.” Nonetheless, besides the fact that it is thanks to the Ottoman conquest of Caffa that the Genoese financial capital finally switched to the West and contributed to the colonial enterprises of the crowns of Castile and Portugal, how did the Genoese contribute to the development of the Hispanic colonialism?

Indeed, the Genoese looked for a profitable application of their capital. It is very true that the Genoese commercial and financial system, the commercials skills of Italian merchants, the capital of the Italian banks, their naval maritime experience and the influence of Italian seafaring skills on Spanish and Portuguese navigation all contributed to the Age of Discovery during the period of Iberian expansion. The same can be said for the large number
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2877 Reinhard, A Short History of Colonialism, 6.
2878 “In several instances, the Genoese were present in Northern Africa even before the Portuguese; and how could it have been otherwise for “they had visited the markets of Morocco since the end of the twelfth century. Here there is continuity that has escaped us until now and which we should integrate into the history of Portuguese discovery and colonization.” Verlinden, “Italian Influence,” 205.
of Italians in Seville and Lisbon during and before the times of Henry the Navigator, Columbus and Vasco da Gama.\textsuperscript{2880} It is obvious that the Italian experience in navigation, map-making and shipbuilding greatly influenced the Iberian seafarers;\textsuperscript{2881} for example, Lanzarotto Malocello, who discovered the Canary Islands between 1325 and 1339, was Genoese, and a Venetian Ca de Mosto became one of the most important collaborators of Henry the Navigator during the last years of his career. The models of the organization of capital and the management of colonies were also often borrowed: “The Genoese mahone have, to some extent, been the pattern for the Portuguese achievements.”\textsuperscript{2882} Furthermore, Domenico Giofrè underlined the role of the Genoese in the start of all Atlantic geographical discoveries.\textsuperscript{2883} Many scholars also noted the special role of the Genoese in Mexican commerce in particular, as well as their pivotal role in Spanish colonial trade in general.\textsuperscript{2884} Finally, Columbus was a product of the Genoese seafaring tradition. He summed up the elements of the Mediterranean-Genoese-Portuguese tradition of maritime and commercial expansion. It was people like him who maintained the continuities and transmitted the colonial techniques \textit{shaping the actions of both Portuguese and Spaniards in America}.\textsuperscript{2885}

That a great Iberian explorer should be the son of an obscure weaver in Genoa was not in itself surprising. The Genoese went everywhere in Europe, and had close commercial contacts with Seville and Lisbon. All the major European centres of geographical knowledge at that time were in Italy. Every citizen of Genoa, however humble, depended directly or indirectly upon the city’s maritime connections.\textsuperscript{2886}

Yet did the Spanish and Portuguese also inherit the Italian institutional and mental patterns for their overseas enterprises? Were the beginnings of the Iberian colonial projects rooted in the Genoese Mediterranean and Black Sea colonial experience? How did the Genoese transmit their patterns of colonization to the West and reproduced or helped to reproduce them first on the Atlantic Islands, and later on in the New World? Here yet another caution is


\textsuperscript{2882} Verlinden, “Italian Influence,” 203–205.


\textsuperscript{2885} Lockhart and Schwartz, \textit{Early Latin America: A history of colonial Spanish America and Brazil} (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 29.

\textsuperscript{2886} Parry, \textit{The Spanish Seaborne Empire} (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1990), 43.
essential here as well. Can we also compare the Genoese colonization to the Hispanic colonial experiences? Would this comparison work for the Portuguese West Africa and bulwarks in India as much as for the Castilian Canaries and Mexico or the Portuguese Azores or Brazil? And here we arrive to need to conceptualize two types of models of the early modern colonization – littoral colonialism and territorial colonialism.

The colonial patterns that the Spanish and the Portuguese used on the Atlantic islands, in Western Africa, and the New World can be strongly connected with the patterns established long before and deriving from the Italian colonial experience. Indeed the Portuguese followed the Genoese in their footsteps in their naval expeditions. The Genoese-Portuguese pattern of colonization did not imply control over vast territories. Upon penetration and exploration of a certain area, the adventurers following this pattern did not aim at large-scale conquest: they would normally control several coastal cities and towns, either existing previously, or established by themselves. These settlements would play a role of the bulwarks for the colonizers’ trade. They could also control some hinterland, but not a vast territory; they would be furnished by military power and able to apply pressure on the local rulers, but not intending to conquer their realms completely.

Along this coast (i.e. the coast of West Africa) the Portuguese have avoided, as a rule, any attempt at significant settlement: the native populations were too dense to be easily subdued, the area was ecologically unattractive. Instead they chose to exploit the coast after a pattern adopted from the Italian trading cities of the late medieval Mediterranean. Here the key institution was the factory (feitoria), or fortified trading post. This was defended by the castle garrison headed by a knight and operated by a factor (feitor) or commercial agent who undertook to make purchases from the native merchants and chiefs. The merchandise he secured was stored in the factory and then sold to the Portuguese captains of the trading fleets that periodically visited the factory… The Portuguese crown responded with coast guard patrols to drive off unlicensed ships while juridically it sought and received recognition of its monopoly rights in a series of papal bulls (1437–1481) that formed the models for later assignment of exclusive rights in America to Spain and Portugal.2887

This was the colonial pattern laid down by the Genoese in the Black Sea area. It was inherited by the Portuguese in their expansion over the West African shores and in the Indian Ocean. We find numerous similarities among the Genoese Caffa, Soldaia, and Cembalo on the one hand and the Portuguese Ceuta, Accra, and Goa on the other. An important feature to stress here is that in the case of this Genoese-Portuguese littoral model of colonization the
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colonizers found relatively developed non-Western cultures quite resistant to large-scale conquest, but easy to deal with in commerce.\(^{2888}\)

The *territorial* model of colonialism was a complete novelty born in the Kingdom of Castile. As has been noted, its structural predecessor was the Iberian Reconquista: this model prepared from the colonizers’ side in Andalusia. The patterns of Castilian conquest were therefore produced on Iberian soil, but then exported and projected outside. The first fully-fledged experience and the first trial of this pattern were the Castilian discovery and conquest of the Canary Islands (paralleled by the Portuguese colonization of the Azores, which were previously unpopulated and therefore not part of the discussion). It was perhaps the first time when the Europeans faced a truly pre-historical society which barely passed the line of the Neolithic Revolution. The Guanche were helpless before the newcomers and were easily subjected. Then, this pattern was transmitted to the New World. It implied establishing control over vast territories, as well as the conscious or semi-involuntary extermination of indigenous peoples. Christopher Columbus, a Genoese himself, was initially not part of the Reconquista/Conquista model because of his background. Indeed, the intuition of the American pioneer was to project the scheme that he had in mind since his adolescence to the local reality, namely that of Genoese-Portuguese coastal colonialism:

The basic notion of Columbus, in line with his Genoese and Portuguese background, was to establish forts and factories manned by salaried employees, to trade with the local population for any products of value in Europe, and to continue exploration, in search of stronger and richer trading partners. The instinct of the Spaniards, on the other hand, was to concentrate first on settlement and thorough rule of the well-populated area which had already been found… There was nothing for the Spanish crown to do but to appoint Spanish governors, from 1499 onward.\(^{2889}\)

Nonetheless, the Native Americans were nothing like the Western African kingdoms or the states of the Indian Peninsula; they were easily subjected and absolutely not immune to the newcomers. Therefore, at the end of the day the *territorial* model naturally took over. Lockhart and Schwartz put into a strong juxtaposition the “Portuguese and Genoese” colonial pattern of trade and exploration against the Castilian pattern of Reconquista/Conquista, meaning the full conquest, substantial immigration and permanent rule. This is also my hypothesis. However, I am inclined to think that the preference for the colonial strategies inherent in one model or another was not completely determined only by the background of

\(^{2888}\) The Venetian colonization of larger areas must be interpreted separately and with caution: in general many Venetian colonial experiences could be described as rather following the coastal model of colonization, the places where they controlled bigger territories like Cyprus or Crete can by no means be categorized as belonging to the territorial colonization of the Castilian style.

the colonizers. It is incorrect to claim that the main distinguishing factor between the ‘Genoese-Portuguese’ and the ‘Castilian’ model laid in the fact that the later had a considerable military background of Reconquista, which the former were lacking; it seems that the difference goes much deeper. It is true that the Spaniards “were inclined to view the Caribbean in the light of their own already established tradition of expansion, namely ‘Reconquista.’” Nonetheless, the Portuguese in fact applied the territorial model of colonization in Brazil and in other subsequent cases.

We should therefore underline two important contributing factors shaping the colonial model. The choice of the model, or to put it more correctly, of the colonial strategies forming one model or another, was determined both by the background and the structures of society and mind of the colonizers (who could be more used to conquest or to trade), and the level of cultural development of the local population that the newcomers faced. In case of fairly developed local cultures in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea region as well as the Western African coast and the Indian Ocean, the territorial colonization was not just useless (e.g. for the Genoese), it was impossible. An encounter with cultures such as the Guanche and American Indians offered an absolutely different intensity of resistance to the newcomers and an absolutely different level of opportunities. The same was true for trade: “Before the European discoveries, the Atlantic had seen no intercontinental traffic whatsoever, and it was only the Europeans who created a ‘world system’ there – but on the Indian Ocean and the seas between Australia and Japan the situation was almost the exact reverse... the Asia world system existed from ancient times, a system incomparably more sophisticated than anything accomplished by the Europeans of the time.”

Thus, the colonial enterprises and models established in the late Middle Ages by the Italians in Latin Romania, including those of the Genoese in Caffa, shaped the face of early modern colonialism and were already structurally part of it themselves. The role of the private initiative and non-governmental mechanisms were pivotal in Genoese colonisation. Did not the Bank of Saint George anticipate the birth and even establish a pattern for the ‘company-state’ in modern companies such as the Dutch East India Company and others? And were not the Genoese in fact ahead of their time with their models of overseas trade organisation and colonisation? In many respects Portuguese colonialism is a descendant of
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2892 Now this topic is fruitfully developed by Carlo Taviani, to whom I owe many promising insights.
the Genoese one. Nonetheless, doubts were raised as to whether the Portuguese truly had an empire in any meaningful sense in the early modern period.2893 The Portuguese overseas empire was blamed by Van Leur for being a rigid, state-controlled enterprise, a system more typical of the Middle Ages than of the modern era:

Portuguese power was typically medieval in character, a fact that helps to explain its limited effectiveness. There was not much unity to the scattered territory of port settlements spread out thousands of miles, despite the centralized royal shipping from Goa to Europe. There was no hierarchy of officials with distinction between civil and military administration, but a conglomeration of nobles and condottieri each with his own retinue of henchmen bound to him by a vassal’s loyalty or a lust for gain; often the officials in authority provided their own equipment and carried out exploitation for their own benefit by means of offices bestowed on them, frequently on a short-term basis.2894

According to Van Leur, the Portuguese were led in their colonisation not by economic motives and not for trade profits or territorial authority, limiting themselves to gathering tribute and booty and pursuing the lust for plunder rather than the lust for profit, and “did not introduce a single new economic element into the commerce of southern Asia. The forms of political and economic domination - monopolies, financial exploitation, ‘fiscalization’ of the government - all of them originated in the caliphates and Byzantium, and were transferred to Portugal, and perhaps carried on there, by Jews and Italians.”2895 This is in sharp contrast to the Genoese system of managing their colonies, and – again taken into account that we can to a certain degree identify the Portuguese colonialism as the descendant of the Italian one – leads me to think that the ancestor in this case was more advanced and in the last instance, more modern than the descendant. This issue can be debated further and this takes me far beyond my chronological limits. However, we can certainly say that the Genoese Black Sea colonies starting with Caffa were a ‘bridge’ linking not only the Mediterranean and Western Europe with the East: it was an important experience in the genesis of colonialism, capitalism, and the modern world system, an experience connecting the Middle Ages with modern history.

2893 Subrahmanyam, The Portuguese Empire in Asia, 1500-1700: A Political and Economic History, 1.
2895 Van Leur, Indonesian Trade and Society, 118–119, 170.
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