



Πανεπιστήμιο
Κύπρου

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

*SOCIOECONOMIC ASPECTS OF RURAL LIFE IN VENETIAN
CYPRUS*

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

MARINA ILIA

2021



Πανεπιστήμιο
Κύπρου

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

SOCIOECONOMIC ASPECTS OF RURAL LIFE IN VENETIAN CYPRUS

MARINA ILIA

**A Dissertation Submitted to the University of Cyprus in Partial Fulfilment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

May 2021

MARINA ILIA

VALIDATION PAGE

Doctoral Candidate: Marina Ilia

Doctoral Thesis Title: *Socioeconomic aspects of rural life in Venetian Cyprus*

*The present Doctoral Dissertation was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the Department of History and Archaeology was approved on the May 18th 2021 by the members of the **Examination Committee**.*

Evaluation Committee:

Research Supervisor: Angel Nicolaou-Konnari, Associate Professor

Committee Member: Tassos Papacostas, Senior Lecturer

Committee Member: Anastasia Papadia-Lala, Professor

Committee Member: Dionysios Stathakopoulos, Assistant Professor

Committee Member: Athanasios Vionis, Associate Professor

DECLARATION OF DOCTORAL CANDIDATE

The present doctoral dissertation was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Cyprus. It is a product of original work of my own, unless otherwise mentioned through references, notes, or any other statements.

Marina Ilia

MARINA ILIA

Abstract

Despite its small size, the island of Cyprus in the eastern Mediterranean has a very rich past. In recent decades, a very specific part of Cyprus's history has aroused the interest of scholars. The almost one hundred years of Venetian rule (1474-1571) has attracted their attention, resulting in an ever-increasing number of studies on the subject. Nonetheless, one of the most important parts of the population, the Cypriot inhabitants of rural areas, is still insufficiently examined, even neglected. The very few published documents relating to this, such as 'El Prattico dele Marathasse Real', are not widely studied, while other relevant documents such as the catastici of Aradippo and Kato Koutrafas remain unexplored to this day. One of the main aims of this thesis is to make a comprehensive study of these documents, which may shed light on the life of the rural population. One of the most important aspects of life examined in this thesis is the family as a social and economic unit within the settlement or the relevant geographical area covered. Each one of the documents was initially scrutinised separately. The method followed was to record and investigate families and then to extract information by using statistics. Each individual listed in the censuses, was recorded according to sex, age and family. In an effort to reach more comprehensive conclusions, results from each individual area were compared with one another. This gave important extensive figures concerning the rural population of Venetian Cyprus, which are presented in the first section of part one. Additional important data extracted from the catastici, such as taxation dues, obligations and local production, were compared to other related documents of the Latin period in Cyprus. The results are presented in the second section of Part One. The new edition of 'El Prattico dele Marathasse Real' accompanied by the first publication of the letter that preceded it, and of the two catastici mentioned above made a decisive contribution. These four publications have been included in the second part of this thesis. Lastly, a preliminary comparative study has been made with regard to socio-economic matters between Cyprus and other locations under Venetian rule. This study, along with the results of analysing the documentary sources, has given a new perspective on the local population of Cyprus during the Venetian period and their quality of life.

Περίληψη

Το ιστορικό παρελθόν της Κύπρου, και πιο συγκεκριμένα ο ένας αιώνας Βενετικής διοίκησης ((1474-1571) στο νησί αυτό της Ανατολικής Μεσογείου, προσελκύει όλο και περισσότερο το ενδιαφέρον των ερευνητών τις τελευταίες δεκαετίες. Παρά τον διαρκώς αυξανόμενο αριθμό των ερευνών σχετικά με διάφορα ζητήματα της συγκεκριμένης χρονικής περιόδου, ένα σημαντικό τομέας της έρευνας παραμένει ακόμη παραμελημένος. Ο ντόπιος πληθυσμός της υπαίθρου και οι κοινωνικοοικονομικές συνθήκες της ζωής τους, όπως αυτές παρουσιάζονται μέσα από τα έγγραφα, είναι μέχρι και σήμερα ένα μονοπάτι της έρευνας ως επί το πλείστο ανεξερεύνητο. Ένας από τους βασικούς λόγους για αυτή την έλλειψη πρέπουσας προσοχής από μεριάς των ερευνητών είναι η ανεπάρκεια δημοσιευμένων πηγών, όπως για παράδειγμα τα μέχρι και σήμερα ανέκδοτα κατάστιχα της Αραδίππου και του Κάτω Κουτραφά. Παράλληλα οι ελάχιστες δημοσιευμένες πηγές όπως το Κατάστιχο της Μαραθάσσας του 1549 ('*El Prattico dele Marathasse Real*'), το οποίο εκδόθηκε το 1984, δεν έχουν χρησιμοποιηθεί στο έπακρο ούτως ώστε να προσφέρουν στην έρευνα των κοινωνικών συνθηκών της ζωής των κατοίκων κατά την Βενετική περίοδο. Ένας από τους βασικούς, λοιπόν στόχους της συγκεκριμένης διατριβής είναι η εμπειριστατωμένη έρευνα των πηγών αυτών και η εξαγωγή βασικών συμπερασμάτων όσον αφορά τις κοινωνικές και οικονομικές συνθήκες της ζωής των παροίκων. Για τον σκοπό αυτό, η επανέκδοση του '*El Prattico dele Marathasse Real*' αλλά και η έκδοση της προηγηθείσας της απογραφής επιστολής καθώς επίσης η κριτική έκδοση των αδημοσίευτων προαναφερθέντων καταστίχων της Αραδίππου και του Κάτω Κουτραφά, κατέστησαν απαραίτητες για την έρευνα. Οι κριτικές εκδόσεις των εγγράφων παρουσιάζονται στον δεύτερο τόμο της παρούσας διατριβής. Όσον αφορά την μέθοδο ερεύνης που ακολουθήθηκε, σε αρχικό στάδιο η κάθε πηγή εξετάστηκε ξεχωριστά και τα δεδομένα που προέκυψαν κατατάχθηκαν σε υποομάδες ανάλογα με την σημασία τους. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, τα άτομα που καταγράφονται στα έγγραφα διαχωρίστηκαν ανάλογα με το φύλο, την ηλικία και την οικογένεια. Με τον διαχωρισμό αυτό, κατέστη δυνατή η εξαγωγή βασικών συμπερασμάτων και στατιστικών για κάθε περιοχή. Στη συνέχεια, τα αποτελέσματα αυτά τέθηκαν σε σύγκριση με τα όσα εξήχθησαν από τα υπόλοιπα έγγραφα έχοντας ως βασικό σκοπό την εξαγωγή καθολικών συμπερασμάτων. Τα στοιχεία που προέκυψαν και αφορούν τις κοινωνικές συνθήκες ζωής, όπως οι οικογένειες, ο γάμος και η τεκνοποίηση, παρουσιάζονται στο πρώτο μέρος του πρώτου τόμου. Αντίστοιχα συμπεράσματα σχετικά με τις οικονομικές συνθήκες, όπως για παράδειγμα η φορολόγηση, το εμπόριο και η αγροτική παραγωγή έχουν

καταγραφεί στο δεύτερο μέρος του πρώτου τόμου. Στα δυο αυτά μέρη έπεται μια σύγκριση των συνθηκών ζωής, όπως αυτές παρουσιάζονται μέσα από τα εξεταζόμενα έγγραφα στην Κύπρο σε σχέση με αντίστοιχα πληθυσμιακά στοιχεία σε άλλες περιοχές κάτω από Βενετική διοίκηση. Τα βασικά συμπεράσματα που προέκυψαν από αυτή την διατριβή οδηγούν σε μια ενδιαφέρουσα προσέγγιση όσον αφορά τις συνθήκες ζωής των παροίκων στην Βενετοκρατούμενη Κύπρο.

MARINA ILIA

Acknowledgements

The work presented in this doctoral thesis is the outcome of an endeavour that started four years ago. In this demanding venture, several individuals have guided and supported me, to whom I am eternally grateful.

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Angel Nicolaou-Konnari for her guidance and dedicated support. Her precious counselling and consistent encouragement for the last four years inspired me to undertake further research on the history of Cyprus under Venetian rule, which enhanced the scope of my thesis. Under her supervision and through her efforts I was given the opportunity to travel to Venice and explore the Archivio di Stato, which led to the present edition of three unpublished documents. I am also thankful to her for allowing me to work on the research programme *Medieval Prosopography of Cyprus*; the initial outcomes of the present thesis were included in the programme.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to the members of the evaluation committee for the time they invested in examining my thesis and for their guidance. I am exceptionally grateful to Senior Lecturer Tassos Papacostas, who gave me the opportunity to work on the *Heritage Gazetteer of Cyprus* (<https://www.cyprusgazetteer.org>) as an Erasmus Plus Placement Student at King's College, London, during the second year of my doctoral studies. I am also thankful to Professors Charlotte Roueche and Stuart Dunn for their valuable advice on this project and for sharing their expertise with me.

Finally, I want to thank my parents and brothers, who generously offered their assistance in counting names and creating family trees. Their enthusiasm and endless support kept me always on track. I also extend my thanks to my friends and my Scouts family for being continuously supportive. A final, special thanks to my little star, Stella, who patiently waited for my PhD to be completed.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	6
ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ	7
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	9
ABBREVIATIONS	17
GLOSSARY	17
1 INTRODUCTION	19
1.1 Historical Demography	21
2 THE SOURCES	23
2.1 The Published Documents	26
2.1.1 Marathasa 1 (MR1)	26
2.1.2 Marathasa 2 (MR2)	26
2.1.3 Kato Koutrafas (KK)	32
2.1.4 Aradippou (AR)	33
3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT	35
3.1 Cyprus	35
3.2 <i>Stato da mar</i> – a comparative study	40
3.2.1 The Venetian Expansion	40
3.2.2 Venetian Administration, society and population	43
3.2.3 Rural Space	45
3.2.4 Venetian Providence	47
3.2.5 Conclusions	48
4 THE LOWER SOCIAL STRATUM	51

4.1	Peasants in the Feudal West and Byzantine East	51
4.2	Cypriot Rural Population	56
5	HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY AND TOPOGRAPHY	61
5.1	The Issue	62
5.2	Sources	63
5.3	Casal or Prastio	64
5.4	Locations	65
5.4.1	Aradippou	65
5.4.2	Kato Koutrafas	66
5.4.3	Marathasa	68
5.5	Centrality and social networks	76
5.6	Conclusions	82
6	FAMILY	85
6.1	Aradippou	90
6.1.1	Allupi	91
6.1.2	Chila	92
6.1.3	Colocassi	92
6.1.4	Comerchiari	93
6.1.5	Comodromo	93
6.1.6	Jorgizi	93
6.1.7	Nichiforo	94
6.1.8	Palluri	94
6.1.9	Papa Dimitrano	94
6.1.10	Sclavogianni	95
6.1.11	Thomasi	95
6.1.12	Zangari	95
6.1.13	Zolani	96

6.2	Kato Koutrafas	96
6.3	Marathasa	99
6.4	Conclusions	103
7	MARRIAGE	105
7.1	Aradippou	108
7.2	Kato Koutrafas	109
7.3	Marathasa	111
7.4	Conclusions	114
8	ILLEGITIMATE AND ORPHAN CHILDREN	117
8.1	Aradippou	119
8.2	Kato Koutrafas	120
8.3	Marathasa	121
8.4	Conclusions	122
9	ONOMATOLOGY	125
9.1	Aradippou	127
9.1.1	First Names by Age	127
9.1.2	Surnames	127
9.2	Kato Koutrafas	128
9.2.1	Surnames	129
9.3	Marathasa	129
9.3.1	Popular First Names by Age	129
9.3.2	Popular First Names by Village	132
9.3.3	Surnames	132

9.4	Cypriot Dialect	134
10	MOVEMENT	137
10.1	Marriage	138
10.1.1	Marathasa	138
10.1.2	Aradippou	140
10.1.3	Kato Koutrafas	141
10.2	Landlords	142
10.2.1	Marathasa	142
10.2.2	Aradippou	143
10.3	Work	144
10.4	Fugitives	145
10.5	Conclusions	146
11	REVENUES	147
11.1	Grain and salt – a state monopoly	148
11.2	Commerce	149
11.3	Exploitation of land	150
11.4	Enfranchisement of parici	153
11.5	Conclusions	155
12	OFFICES	157
12.1	Administrative offices	159
12.1.1	Jurato/Omoti	159
12.1.2	Nodaro/Nomico	160
12.1.3	Castellano	160
12.2	Ecclesiastical offices	161

12.2.1 Priests	162
12.3 Conclusions	163
13 TAXES AND DUTIES	165
13.1 Taxes	166
13.2 Forced labour	168
13.3 Taxes in the <i>Stato da mar</i>	169
13.4 Kato Koutrafas	170
13.4.1 Duties paid by males	170
13.4.2 Other duties paid by males	172
13.5 Marathasa	172
13.5.1 Main Taxes	173
13.5.2 Age-related reductions in duty	173
13.5.3 Special Cases and Tax Exemptions	175
13.6 Conclusions	176
14 CROPS AND AGRICULTURE	177
14.1 Occupations	177
14.2 Production and Diet	180
14.3 Leasing contracts in the <i>Stato da mar</i>	182
14.4 Methods of Cultivation	183
14.5 The case of Kato Koutrafas	184
15 CONCLUSIONS	187
16 BIBLIOGRAPHY	203
16.1 Primary sources	203

16.1.1 Archival Manuscript Sources	203
16.1.2 Published Sources	203
16.2 Dictionaries	205
16.3 Secondary sources	205

MARINA ILIA

MARINA ILIA

Abbreviations

ASV	Archivio di Stato di Venezia
MCC	Museo Civico Correr
BNM	Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana
TAESP	Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Project
MR1	The letter of 1534 concerning the <i>parici</i> of Marathasa
MR2	‘El Prattico dele Marathasse Real’ - the <i>pratico</i> of 1549 Marathasa
AR	The <i>pratico</i> of Aradippou
KK	The <i>pratico</i> of Kato Koutrafas

Glossary

Before moving on to the introduction of this thesis, it is essential to provide the reader with explanations of the main terms that will be used. These terms are preserved, as stated, in the manuscripts and are recorded from now on in *italics*.

parico/parica: a man or woman of the lower stratum attached to the land with limited legal rights.¹

francomato: a free man or woman of the lower with more legal rights and freedom of movement.²

casal: a big settlement or village.

prastio: a smaller settlement.

pratico/catastico: a cadaster or census of the local population, and of their fiscal obligations.

contrada: one of the eleven regions in Cyprus during the Venetian period.

bezant: a gold or silver coin in circulation in Cyprus during the Venetian period. It was divided into 26 cerati and 52 carcie. One bezant was equal to ten ducats.³ A sign similar to an 8 is usually used to indicate the unit of the *bezant*.

modio: unit of land equal to 0.08 hectare (ha). It was also a unit of volume equal to 32.02 litres.

¹ For further information see chapter 4 of this part.

² For further information see chapter 4 of this part.

³ F. Bustron, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, R. L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, Mélanges historiques, 5, Paris, 1886; reprint. as ‘Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro’, in G. Grivaud (ed.), *Κυπρολογική Βιβλιοθήκη* 7, Nicosia, 1998, pp. 461-462; S. Birtahas (ed.), *Venetian Cyprus (1489–1571): Reports by the Dominion's Supreme Administrative Officials*, Thessaloniki, Epikentro, 2019, pp. 75 and 354.

MARINA ILIA

1 Introduction

As an undergraduate student at the Department of History and Archaeology of the University of Cyprus, I was fortunate enough to learn from the most widely read scholars in the medieval history and culture of western Europe and in the contemporary Byzantine world in the eastern Mediterranean. I was fascinated by how these cultures had merged and by the consequences of these phenomena for the small island of Cyprus during its Latin rule. This in turn led me to study the topic as a postgraduate student of the Interdepartmental Programme in Byzantine Studies and the Latin East of the University of Cyprus (MA). Studying eastern Europe through the three lenses of History, Archaeology, and Literature, with the guidance of esteemed professors, I came to the conclusion that the Venetian period in Cyprus and, especially, the socio-economic aspect of life at that time deserves further study. Not only is the documentation of that period relatively scarce compared to other Venetian colonies, but the secondary sources of the previous century usually either neglect the lower social class or provide insubstantial information.⁴

A great example is the *catastico* of Marathasa, published by Brunehilde Imhaus in 1984,⁵ a fiscal document and a census of the peasants, known as *parici*, in Marathasa, Cyprus. This well-preserved manuscript has been used by scholars only to ascertain the *parici*'s fiscal obligations, which are shown in a table in the last folios of the document.⁶ The *catastico*, entitled 'El Prattico dele Marathasse Real', which I edited anew in my Master's dissertation, provides us with an abundance of information about the life of the *parici*, their family connections, the geography of the fief and much more, all beneficial to a scholar interested in the social life of the lower stratum. Reconstructing families was the main aim of this author's MA thesis and that preliminary research opened new avenues worth exploring. A more thorough look at this data was therefore the starting point for this endeavour. This new path led me to further research, the conclusions of which will be presented in this PhD thesis. During this research, I had hoped to examine other relevant reports, but my hopes were in vain. Documentation regarding Cyprus, unlike the archives of the duke of Crete, is scattered in different series of the Archivio di Stato di Venezia at the Museo Civico Correr and the

⁴ B. Arbel, 'Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule: A Demographic Study', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I*, Nicosia, Archbishops Makarios III Foundation, 1984, p. 183- 215; reprint. in B. Arbel, *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000, no. V, pp. 183-215.

⁵ B. Imhaus, 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien concernant le Casal du Marathasse 1549', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I*, Nicosia, Ίδρυμα Αρχιεπισκόπου Μακαρίου Γ', 1984, pp. 373-520. In the contents of *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I* there is a typo concerning the date of the document, 1459 instead of 1549.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 379-382; Arbel, 'Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule', p. 193.

Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana in Venice. Nonetheless, I was able to locate three more unpublished documents with information about the *parici* of Cypriot villages, which will be edited in the second part of this thesis together with the new edition of the Marathasa *catastico*.

This study has also profited enormously from Benjamin Arbel's extensive articles, which are based on documents composed in Venetian Cyprus.⁷ The detailed editions of the documents written by the Cypriot administrator and historiographer Florio Bustron, and the studies of the population and villages of Cyprus by Gilles Grivaud, have provided essential information,⁸ while, the four-volume edition of documents from the ASV compiled by Ekaterini Aristeidou, was central to this study.⁹ Moreover, drawing from the 1542 Leonida Attar map,¹⁰ which I analysed during my Erasmus+ Placement in King's College London as well as from a class on Historical Archaeology at the University of Cyprus, I decided that it would be of interest to understand the social life of the lower classes using both documentary and archaeological evidence. The outcomes of the research of the team of the Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Project and especially those concerned Kato Koutrafas were thus considered vital.

This PhD thesis will be divided into two parts. Following the preface, the first part will be split into three distinct sections. The introductory section will present the primary administrative sources of the Latin period in Cyprus, alongside the three *catastici* and the letter examined in this thesis. It follows a summary of the history of Cyprus from the Byzantine until the Venetian period and a brief comparison with the *Stato da Mar*. Same parallels have been drawn between the peasant population in feudal west and the byzantine east. This comparison brought about similarities when it comes to practices, allowing a few conclusions concerning the continuity of some institutions. The introductory part concludes with a brief examination of the topography in each area. The main section of this part focuses on the documents examined and the information extracted. Based on data provided by the four documents, an attempt has been made to describe distinctive aspects of everyday life. There are two main centres of attention in this study. The first is the social life of *parici* including family ties,

⁷ B. Arbel, *Studies on Venetian Cyprus*, Collected Studies, III, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2017; B. Arbel, *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000.

⁸ G. Grivaud, 'Villages désertés à Chypre (fin XIIe-fin XIXe siècle)', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα III*, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1998.

⁹ E. Aristeidou (ed.), *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα της Κυπριακής Ιστορίας από το Κρατικό Αρχείο της Βενετίας*, 4 volumes, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1990-2003; E. Aristeidou, 'Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στη Βενετοκρατούμενη Κύπρο', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 373-386.

¹⁰ F. Cavazzana-Romanelli and G. Grivaud, *Cyprus 1542: The Great Map of the Island by Leonida Attar*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2006.

important life events such as marriage and birth, onomatology, movement etc. The second focuses more on the economic aspects of life including agriculture production, commerce, employment and most importantly the fiscal obligations. In the last section of this part will be given some conclusions. The second part of this thesis will present the new edition of 'El Pratico dele Marathasse Real' and the first edition of its preceding letter along with the *catastici* from Aradippou and Kato Koutrafas. The editions will be followed by some pictures from the manuscripts but also by some images related to the areas of interest. In addition, there are important tables and charts as well as the family trees, supporting the information given in part one of this thesis.

1.1 Historical Demography

Several questions arose during the writing of this thesis, especially concerning the identification of its genre and its categorization within a specific area of historical study. Since the main aims and goals of the research related to a particular social group in Venetian Cyprus, the thesis could be described as a case study of the social history of Cyprus. On the other hand, since the main tools of research were the four manuscripts described above, i.e., censuses of the population and fiscal documents for each area, the thesis could also be seen as a demographic study. However, given that the main focus of my research, in examining and discussing these primary administrative sources, was everyday life under the Venetians, this thesis is best viewed as a study of Venetian Cyprus's historical demography.

Some overall comparison with similar studies relating to medieval Europe is therefore essential. The genre of historical demography began in France in 1662. The first specialists in this field studied and compared numerous documents from both small and large parishes.¹¹ They then made estimates of the population's numbers based on specific events in an individual's life.¹² As mentioned by Louis Henry, the first publications of this kind were monographs concerning the populations of individual parishes and the researchers' main concern in each case was to compose entries containing a person's name, dates of birth, marriage, and death etc. Fortunately, in medieval and early modern western Europe, especially after 1539, the recording of such events in registers, now kept in archives, was compulsory.¹³ Therefore, the main stages in an individual's life were well recorded and lent themselves to a

¹¹ L. Henry, 'Historical Demography', *Daedalus*, vol. 97, Historical Population Studies, 1968, p. 387, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20023818>, (Accessed 21/10/2018).

¹² M. Anderson, 'Historical Demography after The Population History of England', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 15, *Population and Economy: From the Traditional to the Modern World*, 1985, pp. 595-597, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/204272>, (Accessed 21/10/2018).

¹³ Henry, 'Historical Demography', p. 386.

demographic study. As Marianne Jonker and Aad van der Vaart state, missing data and incomplete records were undeniably common; nevertheless, researchers were able to build and use modules from which they could reconstruct a family.¹⁴ These statistical modules, together with a good deal of archaeological data, are still being used today by scholars interested in mortality and fertility rates, conditions of life, etc.¹⁵

Unfortunately, the information recorded in each of the four documents examined here is not consistent. As will be shown below, the main purpose of each of the manuscripts varied. For example, MR2 is a census of the population who lived in a specific area at a specific time and belonged to Audet's heirs; while AR is a list of people who had left the settlement. They, therefore, offer limited information on individual *parici*. Most importantly, the task of researching and cataloguing individuals in sixteenth-century Cyprus was far more difficult than it would have been for seventeenth-century France or England. Florio Bustron, the author of the Marathasa census and the scribes of the AR and KK manuscripts, took on the demanding job of finding and recording data for each one of the *parici* listed, whether they were present in the settlement at that time or not. Furthermore, by comparison French parish records were particularly well recorded and updated. Since scribes could only record events no more than a few days after their occurrence, the information is likely to be cohesive and accurate. French historical demographers were also able to find and collate data from a number of different documents. For example, a person's birth could be recorded in one parish, while their marriage and the births of their children might be in another. Collating numerous different entries led to more conclusions being drawn about an individual's life. Similar figures in documents regarding the population of Venetian Cyprus are extremely rare. Concerning the populations in Marathasa, Aradippou and Kato Koutrafas in particular, the documents provide only the name and the age of a *parico/parica* along with his or her close relatives. As a result, modules described and used for medieval France are not pertinent to the sixteenth-century Cypriot population. Therefore, for the needs of the present study new modules have been created using data from the documents examined. Family tables and trees were the main feature of the enquiry, and their data will be presented below.

¹⁴ M. A. Jonker and A. W. van der Vaart, 'Correcting Missing-Data Bias in Historical Demography missing data', *Population Studies*, vol. 61, The Population Investigation Committee, 2007, pp. 99-113, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27643398>, (Accessed 21/10/2018).

¹⁵ *Methods of Estimating Basic Demographic Measures from Incomplete Data*, Manual IV, The United Nations, New York, 1967; M. Kelly and C. O Grada, 'Living standards and mortality since the middle ages', *The Economic History Review*, vol. 67, Wiley on behalf of the Economic History Society, 2014, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42921737>, (Accessed 24/10/2018).

2 The Sources

Narrative documentation of Cyprus's history during the Latin period is a vital resource for anyone researching Cypriot society. Unfortunately, the abundance of narrative sources concerning the Frankish period, such as the chronicles by Leontios Makhairas and George Bustron, mainly focus on the life of the nobility rather than the *parici*. In fact, *parici* are rarely even alluded to. These sources thus proved redundant for the present study. However, one of the narrative sources of the Venetian period, 'Chorograffia' by Estienne de Lusignan and its improved French version 'Description' provide the researcher with some information regarding the *parici*'s obligations and agriculture production.¹⁶

By contrast, administrative documents drawn up during the Latin period in Cyprus have been vitally important to this thesis. They can be considered an accumulation of data, the gathering of which was commissioned by the lord, the king or the government for their records. The main purpose of collecting this data is to aid the administration of a location. Thus, these primary sources were intended to provide information for specific functions such as taxation, revenues or day-to-day business. However, besides these important statistics, the administrative documents could shed light not only on the relationship between the various members of the population but also between the society and the government of each place. Although the quality of data processed might not be excellent, the auditor's point of view is to a large degree objective. To get a better understanding of the living conditions of the lower stratum during the Venetian period, it is important to begin with the Frankish period. To a great extent, the living conditions of the *parici*, including their main obligations, activities and daily routine, remained unaltered throughout this period.

In an effort to identify this continuity or any changes made by the Venetians, it is very important to search earlier documents. The research will focus on four specific documents. The first one is a treatise on taxation followed by an explanatory note. Both documents have been published by Alexander Beihammer as part of the Greek texts collection from the manuscript Vaticanus Palaticus Graecus 367.¹⁷ The agreement, document no. 7, was drafted in 1231 and

¹⁶ Estienne de Lusignan, *Chorograffia et brevis historia universale dell'Isola de Cipro principiando al tempo di Noè per in sino al 1572*, Bologna, per Alessandro Benaccio, 1573; reprint. in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), 'Chorograffia', *Κυπριολογική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 10A, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2004; Estienne de Lusignan, *Description de toute l'isle de Cypre*, Paris, 1580; reprint. in G. Grivaud (introd.) 'Description de toute l'isle de Cypre', *Κυπριολογική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 10B, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2004, folios 80 and 84a.

¹⁷ A. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit: die Formularsammlung eines königlichen Sekretärs im Vaticanus Palatinus Graecus 367*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2007, pp. 155- 156 and 213-214.

it is related to the division of estates and payment obligations in mountain settlements. The purpose of the second document, no. 84, is to give instructions on how to register the population and manage payments. Both have been considered very important sources for this thesis in regard to the categorisation of areas of land and the corresponding amount of money they raised.

The second administrative source which will be examined is the document from Psimolofos dated to 1317-1318. The document, which was published by Jean Richard in 1947, offers rare documentation of the living conditions of the rural population in the fourteenth century.¹⁸ It focuses on the revenues and the expenses of a specific village, Psimolofos, an estate that belonged to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Apart from the valuable information about payments, there are also mentions of agricultural production, the animals owned by the inhabitants and of some officials assisting in the administration. In addition, there are references to obligations owed by the *parici* to the landlord and vice versa, information of great significance for this thesis. Most importantly, the auditor mentions the wages paid to the local population, a practice that appears to have been followed in Marathasa as well. Last but not least, Psimolofos is a very good example of settlement, since the local population mentioned consisted of circa 300 individuals, as was the case in Prodromo and probably Aradippou too.¹⁹

The third administrative document is similar to the one mentioned above. It is an account of the revenues and expenditure of an estate owned by Walter of Brienne, which was published by Edouard Poncelet.²⁰ With Walter away, his property, including three settlements, Knodara, Morfittes and Dichoria, was supervised by a local administrator. According to the document the first administrator, between 1354 and 1356, was a Greek called Cosmas from Athens, who was replaced by an Italian called Rahul de Monteron.²¹ Both stewards were obliged to keep detailed accounts on expenditure and revenues. As is the case in Psimolofos, the document provides important information on agricultural production and population.

The last administrative source examined is a collection of manuscripts published by Richard. *Le Livre des Remembrances de la Secrète* (1468-1469) could be considered as one of the most important administrative sources for the last years of the Lusignan reign. As is implied in its name, it is a book kept by the *Secrète*, the main office in charge of administering revenues

¹⁸ J. Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolofos et la vie rurale en Chypre au XIV^e siècle', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome*, 59, 1947, pp. 121-153.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137.

²⁰ E. Poncelet, 'Compte du domaine de Gautier de Brienne au royaume de Chypre', *Bulletin de la Commission royale d'histoire*, Académie royale de Belgique, 98, 1934. pp. 1-28.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

and registering landowners and taxes.²² The officers of the *Secrète*, on a yearly basis, collated into one book all the relevant requests, orders made by the king and actions performed. This specific collection has a number of important documents related to *parici* and more specifically to their enfranchisement, their obligations as well as their relationship with individual lords. In addition, there are some references to names, which was valuable for the examination of onomatology, as well as references to specific locations.

Living conditions in the Venetian period were also scrutinised through some administrative sources. In particular, two main documents were examined, *Ordine della Secreta* by Florio Bustron, and the report written by Leonardo Donà. Bustron had, among his other duties, been ordered to conduct a census of Marathasa.²³ As Gilles Grivaud states in his edition, *Ordine della Secreta* consists of three distinct chapters: the introduction and historical context, the recording of production and information regarding the *pratici/catastici*.²⁴ The other documents are a collection of manuscripts written by Leonardo Donà. The author, who held many offices in Venice including that of Doge, was a member of the Venetian nobility and the son of Giovanni Battista Donà, *luogotenente* of Cyprus (1556-1558).²⁵ Leonardo accompanied his father on a visit to Cyprus in 1556. Throughout his stay he travelled around the island gathering information regarding the history of Cyprus and its people. His closeness to the Governor of Cyprus enabled him to study the island's official documentation.²⁶ His detailed report, held in the MCC, consists of three books.²⁷

Both authors give key information on the organisation of government, the fiscal obligations of the population, and guidelines and rules governing agricultural production, all of which is central to this thesis. Critical to these two documents are the statistics of the population surveys conducted in Cyprus during the Venetian period, and the estimations of population numbers made by the governors, as reported by Benjamin Arbel in his article 'Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule: A Demographic Study'. Of the same importance are

²² A. Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', in A. Nicolaou-Konnari, and C. Schabel eds., *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2005, p. 29.

²³ Florio Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, in G. Grivaud, 'Ordine della secreta di Cipro. Florio Bustron et les institutions Franco-Byzantines afférentes au régime agricole de Chypre à l'époque vénitienne', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα II*, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1989, p. 539; B. Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, p. 467.

²⁴ Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, p. 548.

²⁵ N. Patapiou, 'Leonardo Donà, *Memorie per le cose di Cipro*: From the City of Shoal Waters to Outermost Karpasia', in J. Chrysostomides and Ch. Dendrinis (eds.), *'Sweet Land...'* *Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus*, Porphyrogenitus, Camberley, 2006, pp. 209-210.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

²⁷ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, nos. 45, 46 and 215.

also the Venetian Documents edited by Ekaterini Aristeidou and the recently edited reports by Stathis Birtahas, ‘Venetian Cyprus (1489–1571): Reports by the Dominion’s Supreme Administrative Officials’.²⁸ Even though some of the numbers may have been copied from previous official reports,²⁹ they provide information crucial to establishing a comprehensive picture of the population and its expansion.

2.1 The Published Documents

2.1.1 Marathasa 1 (MR1)

This document is actually a letter, written on 27th August 1534, and consisting of two folios, one recto-verso and the other only recto. It is located in the *Procuratori di S. Marco* series, Misti in Busta number 132, in the inner folder entitled *Procuratori di S. Marco de Citra Commissaria Audet Antonio da Cipro*. This specific collection of documents is, as the title implies, an assemblage of manuscripts concerning Antonio Audet and his property. Aside from his will, the file includes several other letters, such as one from his widow, Zaca Audet, and two from Giacomo de Nores reporting an instance of land usurpation. The MR1 manuscript, 32cm long and 22cm wide, is an unedited letter. It can be divided into two parts, first the apology of Jacomo and Simon Frasenge to the State, covering almost the whole first folio (figure 1), and secondly, two different population tables on the remaining folios, one referring to the male *parici* owned by Venice who had moved to Marathasa, and the second to those belonging to Audet’s heirs, who had left their settlements after marrying female *parice* belonging to the *Real*. Unlike the next document (Marathasa 2 (MR2) 2.1.2), this signed letter is not very legible, as it has been virtually destroyed in the middle, probably as a result of water damage. Despite this, and despite its small size, the document contains much useful information regarding certain *parici* of Marathasa and the owners of the fief. In black ink and slightly right-leaning cursive letters, the author records data with almost no spelling or grammar mistakes. Abbreviations are rare, mainly used for common names.

2.1.2 Marathasa 2 (MR2)

The new edition of ‘El Prattico dele Marathasse Real’ formed the bulk of this author’s MA dissertation. The *catastico* is kept, as mentioned earlier, in the Venice State Archive, part

²⁸ Arbel, ‘Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule’, pp. 183- 215 and tables V: The Servile Population, VI: The Free Tenants (Francomati) Population and VII: Cypriot Population in the Venetian Period; Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, 4 volumes; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*.

²⁹ For a detailed analysis of these problematic sources see Arbel, ‘Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule’, pp 193-196.

of the same *Procuratori di S. Marco* series, Misti in Busta number 132. The *pratico*, the final document in this series, is a census of the people who worked for the heirs of Audet. It was published by Brunehilde Imhaus in 1984.³⁰ Imhaus has also published a table of surnames in alphabetical order by the same author in 1986.³¹ The document consists of 76 folios 32cm long and 22cm wide, bound together as a book. Thirteen of the folios were intentionally left blank, along with folio 38^r, which has been indicated by the conductor as an error. Except for light water damage from folio 40^r onwards, it is a very well-preserved document and easy to read.

The manuscript may be divided into four parts:

Part I. The introduction by the writer, Florio Bustron, explaining that he has conducted this census on the orders of Audet's heirs Angelo Chadit, Galeazo Cercasso and Marchio Frasenge, and the Procuratori of Venice. Folio 3r, the first sheet of the document, gives the title, 'El Pratico dele Marathasse Real' (figure 2).

Part II. The actual census of the population ff 4^r–67^v. The census lists the area's families in tables for each village. Data is given, from left to right, regarding first males, then wives or fiancées and then children. The first column gives the *parico*'s name, and also the names of his ancestors (usually up to two generations) next to his family name; then his age and sometimes place of origin. If the *parico* is dead, the word 'morto' is used accompanied by the symbol /0/, notifying that the *parico* in question was not paying taxes. Finally, this column describes the *parico*'s ability to work, which is also linked to his taxation. The next column, entitled 'moglier' (wife) concerns the female *parica* and gives identical information: name followed by her ancestors' names, surname, origin, age, etc (figure 3). For males who married more than once, both their first and subsequent wives are recorded here. If a *parico* was unmarried, this section is left empty, or the symbol /0/ is entered, meaning again that the male had zero taxes to pay for his family. For those females whose husband died during the completion of the census, the word *vidua* (widow) is written under her name. The third column gives the names and ages of the family's children, mostly from the oldest to the youngest. Several times the writer has recorded under their names the total number of children for whom the *parico* had to pay taxes.³² The final column gives complementary information concerning these children, such as the name of their spouse, their place of residence, or any disabilities. For 90% of boys

³⁰ Imhaus, 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien'.

³¹ B. Imhaus, 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien concernant le Casal du Marathasse 1549. Index des parèque', *Κυπριακά Σπουδαί*, 50, 1986, pp. 497-509.

³² ASV, *Procuratori di S. Marco*, Misti, Busta 132, 'El Pratico dele Marathasse Real', f. 20^v *parico* (no. 145) had 2 children 18 and 16 years old while f. 26^v *parico* (no. 195) had 5 daughters but he only had to pay for 3 (21, 19 and 17 years old) since 2 of them were married.

over the age of fifteen the word *avanti* comes next to their name, meaning they will appear again in the *pratico*. For children who had died the writer enters *morto/a piccolo/a*, or *morto/a putto/a*.

Part III. A list of the orphans and illegitimate children of the area (ff 68^r-72^r). The writer catalogues the children based on the place of origin of the legitimate parent, most often the mother. If known, the name of the father was also given, and then the age of every child plus other important information. For males over 15, the word *avanti* is written next to their name, indicating that this person appears in another folio of the document. Finally, for females who were either married or engaged, the name of their husband or fiancé appears next to theirs.

Part IV. The last four folios of the document concern duties and taxes. These pages may be divided into two smaller sections: the parts concerning the general rules which regulated the servile obligations (number of days of forced labour and taxes in money and kind) of every male *parico*, the head of a family, sorted by age; and the parts referring to distinct groups such as widows, priests and *xenotelis*, who most of the time were exempt from paying taxes. The last paragraph of the document vouches for the accuracy of the information and gives the signature of the writer and census conductor, Florio Bustron (figure 4). On the last folio, there are two extra entries: the family of *parico* Giacomo tis Zarlus Piru, mistakenly repeated, and the signature of the copyist, Peratis (figure 5).

In discoloured brown ink, the document is written in Italian, enriched with elements of the Greek-Cypriot dialect, an example of the high quality of Cypriot bureaucracy. More precisely, the names of the *parici* and of places are written in their local Greek form transliterated into the Latin alphabet; all other information, such as people's duties or their marital status, is written in Italian with some Venetian idioms. Although Imhaus mentions that the document in the Venice State Archive is a copy of the original,³³ she omits from her edition the last page of the *catastico*, where the name of the copyist is recorded, as stated above. The copyist is also implicitly mentioned by Florio in the last paragraph: "ho fatto copiar p(er) ma(n) de altri" ('another hand has copied for me'). The two different types of handwriting constitute further evidence of the existence of the copyist. Peratis' handwriting appears on most of the folios, such as the introduction, the population lists, or entries regarding illegitimate children and duties. His handwriting is clear and straight, unlike Florio's, whose letters are thin, curved and lean to the right. The executor of the survey and original writer Florio may have added the last four families listed, and the wife of *parico* Saphira Thomasi tu Parascheuga (no. 393), after

³³ Imhaus, 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien', 1984, p. 379.

the completion of the census. Finally, as mentioned, he also wrote the last paragraph, proving his authorship and verifying the document.

The peculiarity of Florio's handwriting, especially his 'i's, along with the copyist's limited grammar and vocabulary, led Peratis to make several mistakes. As an example, he writes many words in various forms, such as *anni*, *ani* and *annj*. Additionally, names of *parici* and places are frequently uncapitalised, in contrast to Florio's entries, where all names are capitalised. Another distinctive feature of Peratis' writing is how he tries to keep all the information concerning a person on just one line. To this end, he uses many abbreviations, especially for common names like Vassilis, Michalis and Nicolis, and common words like *maridato/a* (married). Where he makes a mistake, he either corrects or deletes the words in question or even the whole folio. In cases where he has missed letters, Peratis corrects the text by adding the missing letters above the word between the lines. However, some errors escaped his attention. For instance, there are three cases, all concerning a word appearing twice: the surname of *parico* Limbiti Vassili Limbiti Spatharj Spatharj (no. 76), the word *anni* repeated in two different forms for *parica* Anna papa Iacovo Piru (no. 394) and the word 'dicto' on folio 74^r. Lastly, mistakes in Italian, such as *de annj 1* instead of *de anno 1*, or *fradelo* instead of *fratello*, imply that Peratis was most probably an indigenous Cypriot writer, with limited knowledge of the Italian language.

Undeniably, both Florio and Peratis took on a very important task, i.e., to list all the *parici* of this specific fief. It is still not known just how they managed to gather all the relevant data within the year of the census. They probably used a local archive and the knowledge of the eldest *parici*. One of the difficulties that would have emerged was the identification of each person and the documentation supplying the correct data for each one of them. Especially as it appears to be the case that a great number of the local *parici* had left their villages and little was known about them. For that reason, there are several cases where the age of a *parico/parica* was omitted. In other cases, an individual was recorded with divergent information concerning his/her age. In an effort to reach safer conclusions for this thesis, the age of such *parici* was read together with the age of their siblings and/or their parents. For example, *parica* Safira Foti papa Lasaru (no. 297) appeared to be 36 years old but when listed next to her father, she was 63 years old (no. 235). The age of 63 years old should be considered the correct one, since she was the second child, recorded immediately after her brother Vassilis who was 64 years old and before her brother Limbiti who was 60. The age of the third child of the family, Mariu has not been recorded either here or in the entry for her husband Liasis Janj Liassi papa Stefano (no. 217). Based on the age of Liasis (who was 67 years old), Jannis (her son who was 24 years

old) and her siblings, she must have been between 60 and 64 years old. Apart from the ages, the copyist has also provided incorrect data with regard to names. As an example, Paulos Argiru Limbiti Pangallu (no. 504 and no. 432. in his father's record) was recorded as Polis in his wife's record (no. 255). The most important error by the copyist emerged in numbers 426 and 427 where two brothers, Chiriacos and Argiros, appeared to have been married to the same woman, Annussa Michali Calopodaru. In reality both were married to an Annussa from the Calopodaru family. Chiriacos' second wife was Annussa Michali Iorgi papa Lasaru Calopodaru (no. 294) while Argiros's wife was Annussa Gianni Jorgi Limbiti tu Calopodaru (no. 296). Lastly, another issue arose concerning the names, which was related to several permutations of a surname. For example, a branch of the Spathari family might have been named Sfinari (no. 211 Maria Loys Limbiti Spathari is recorded as Sfinari in no. 86) while some members of the Nomicu family were named Monomachu. No. 193 Safira Petru Jannj Nomicu in her father's entry, has a different surname, Monomachu, in her husband's entry no. 446. Similarly, Argiri Janni papa Vassili Nomicu in her father's entry no. 338 is mentioned as Monomachu in no. 483. That led to some difficulties concerning the family trees created. Despite all this, Peratis and Florio did an extraordinary job in researching this information and producing very precise documentation, given that they had to handle such a volume of data.

In addition, the study of the second Marathasa document by this author in preparing her Master's thesis revealed many omissions and misunderstandings committed on the part of its first editor. For instance, *parico* Costantis Michali Limbiti Protopapa Caziamu (no. 261) was totally excluded from the edition. On that account the total number of entries recorded by Imhaus is five 510, whereas the actual total listed in the document is 511. Along with Constantis, the first editor also omitted Annussa and Loy, children of Argiros Limbiti Iorgi tu Petru (no. 134).³⁴ In another case, Imhaus failed to include part of a *parico*'s name. Sava Iani Athipatu, who was the husband of Anasta, daughter of Michalis papa Jannj tu Condu tu Dipotatu (no. 1). According to the first edition Anasta was married to Ianni Athipatu,³⁵ who was actually her father-in-law. As well as names, the first editor has omitted important data such as ages, as in the case of *parico* Vassilis Argiro Vassili Spatharj (no. 72), who was 18 years old in the year of the survey.³⁶ Another important exclusion was the term *sposato/sposata*, which was placed by the scribe above the names of the female *parice*. Despite this being explicitly stated in the manuscript, Imhaus has negligently left this detail out of her

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 448 and 417.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 384.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 403.

edition. Moreover, numerous inconsistencies have been detected regarding names, locations and numbers. For example, Giacomo (no. 509), son of Zarla papa Giacomo Piru (no. 508) was called Iarlas in his mother's entry.³⁷ Similarly, the fifth child of Nicolis papa Chiriacu Iorgi Calognomu (no. 377), was named Alena according to the editor whereas her name was Elena according to the document and the fourth child of Vassilis Lasaru tu Athipatu (no. 491) was called Iossimi by Imhaus, while Peratis called her Zossimi.³⁸ In addition, two *parice* appear to have been given the names of their children instead of their own. The first one is Safira Janni Iorgi Calopodaru, wife of Jannis Michali papa Janni Condu Dipotatu (no. 3), who was recorded as Michali, the name of her first-born son, Calopodaru. The second was Porfira papa Iorgi Demesticu, wife of Jorgis Michali papa Ianni Condu Dipotatu (no. 4), who was recorded as Mariu, the name of her first daughter.³⁹ Besides names, there are several errors concerning the ages of parici. For instance, according to the edition Maria Vassili Andronicu (no. 48) was 38 years old but according to the manuscript she was 10 years younger.⁴⁰ Similarly Michalis Jannj tu Leuresi (no. 51) was 76 years old according to Imhaus, whereas he was recorded as 75 years old in the manuscript and Annussa, daughter of Paulos Argiru Limbiti Pangallu (no. 504), was recorded as being 10 years old in the edition but she was actually 18 years old in the manuscript.⁴¹ Other than that, there are incorrect data concerning the locations and their names. For example, the editor the place recorded in no. 17 as 'a Caminaria' (in the village of Caminaria) and records it as Acaminaria.⁴² In a similar way, the village Cato Milo was recorded as Catomilo.⁴³ Last but not least, in some cases the first editor omits to mention the total number of children as was the case with Perris Nicoli Piru (no. 355) who, the manuscript tells us, was obliged to pay for his seven children.⁴⁴ In fact, the information recorded by Imhaus concerning the total number of children is rather misleading. As mentioned above, in an effort to keep track of the taxes paid by each parico, beneath the name of the last child listed Paratis has drawn a line and recorded the total number of children. In contrast the first editor has transcribed this number as a fraction, interpreting it as referring to the age of the last child. As a result of all this misleading data, the first edition proved to be inadequate. As a consequence, a new more meticulous edition of this document was needed.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 507 entry no. 507.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 477 entry no. 376 and 503 entry no. 490.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 385.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 397.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 398 and 506 entry no. 503.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 389.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 477 entry no. 377.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 471 entry no. 354.

2.1.3 *Kato Koutrafas (KK)*

Also at the ASV, *Capi del Consiglio di Dieci*, Lettere di Rettori e di Altre Cariche series, Busta 288, what is recorded as documents 79 and 80 are actually one document, which mostly concerns the village of Kato Koutrafas.⁴⁵ Document 79 is a two-folio recto-verso manuscript. On the first folio, the date of composition, the names of the people who requested the record and their reasons for doing so are written down. Three people have signed under the first paragraph to vouch for the document's accuracy and authenticity: Protopapa Charito, head priest of the village; papa Chiriacho Chattopardierj, the second priest; and Chiriaco Petriti the *portaro*, possibly one of the settlement's older residents. The opening paragraph is followed by a description of the village's borders, and on the left of this folio the land is categorised according to its condition (irrigable, barren, rocky...). The two sides of the second folio include a census of the *parici* of Kato Koutrafas with information about their age and sex, ending with the final paragraph, the total revenue from the village. The second document, number 80, consists of two folios. Folio 1 recto-verso gives records in tabular form, listing the names of several male inhabitants of Kato Koutrafas and the amount they had to pay in taxes. On the left, there is a summary of the amount paid for different taxes. There is also a description of the buildings in the area and the villages in the vicinity. Folio 2 recto-verso records the outcome of the census of Kato Koutrafas inhabitants. While these well-preserved folios have a very clear structure, an exemplar of a *pratico*, the current order of the folios is rather confusing. After confirmation of my suspicions by the archivists of Venice's State Archive, the documents have been rearranged as follows:

1r: Blank folio used as cover page

1v: Blank folio

2r: Opening paragraph along with a description of the boundaries of the village (79)

2v: Summary of the land (in *modia*) (79)

3r: Names of male *parici* and their taxes (80)

3v: List of fees and description of buildings (80)

4r: Census organised by family (80)

4v: Census organised by family (80)

5r: Census organised by family (79)

5v: Summary (79)

⁴⁵ ASV, *Consiglio Capi del Consiglio di Dieci*, Lettere di Rettori e di Altre Cariche, Busta 288, Documents 79-80.

6r: Signatures of noblemen and of the author of the census

6v: Blank folio

The way this census records the population is different from the one used for the Marathasa census but very similar to the 1698 census of Tripolizza.⁴⁶ Every entry starts with the name of the male *parico*, followed by his age; then the name and age of his wife. If they have children, they are listed only by their first name and their age, one under the other. For female descendants, the writer used the letter D (for *domina* or *donna*, Italian for ‘woman’), most probably to make sure the sex was clearly understood (figure 6). Unlike the Marathasa document, there are no entries for deceased male inhabitants. The word *chira*, which has been read as a transliteration of a «χήρα», was used intentionally in relation to the widowed *parice* Madalena (no. 8) and Mangu (no. 21) only.

As explained earlier, the last folio contains three different signatures: those of the nobles supervising the census at the top of the page (figure 7), and the signature of the writer Francesco Zacharia (figure 8) at bottom right. In light brown ink, Francesco manages to record all of the aforementioned information in just a few folios by using frequent abbreviations. The great number of abbreviations combined with the peculiar script made transcribing the document very difficult. Moreover, repeated use of the Greek-Cypriot dialect and several grammatical mistakes indicate that, like Peratis, the author of this *pratico* was also a native Cypriot.⁴⁷ These documents are undeniably another fine example of Cypriot bureaucracy.

2.1.4 *Aradippou (AR)*

The final document edited in this thesis is another *pratico* held in the ASV, in the *Capi del Consiglio di Dieci*, *Lettere di Rettori e di Altre Cariche* series, Busta 289, Documents 112-118, and concerns the ‘Parici di Aradippo’. It comprises sixteen folios, joined together, folded into four and inserted into the previous document (number 111). Except for four folios (1^v, 15^v, 16^r and 16^v), the pages are all recto-verso, comprising 140 short paragraphs, which record names listed in alphabetical order (figure 9). Every *parico/parica* name is followed by information such as marital status, descendants, birthplace, place of residence and the name of their lord. The date 20 April 1536 appears on the first and last folios, most probably

⁴⁶ Archivio *Grimani dai Servi*, busta 30/79, ff. 530-542 published in K. Ntokos et al., ‘Οι Πελοποννησιακές πόλεις και η μεταστοιχείωσή του πληθυσμού τους κατά τη Β΄ Βενετοκρατία, το παράδειγμα της Τριπολιτσάς’, *Eoa kai Esperia*, 5, 2003, pp. 116-145.

⁴⁷ A Francesco Zacharia is mentioned by Mas Latr e in R., L. Mas Latr e, *Histoire de l’ile de Chypre: sous le r egne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, vol. III, Paris, A l’Imprimerie imp eriale, 1861, p. 501 and by Aristeidou in E. Aristeidou, ‘Κτηματολογική πρακτική στην Κύπρο για τον καθορισμό συνόρων των χωραφιών κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας’, *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XIX, 1992, pp. 263-279.

representing the date of the completion of the survey. Despite its small size, this hitherto neglected and unedited document is rich in information on Cypriot society; notably, information regarding other fiefs in the area, where *parici* of Aradippou had been relocated, and their new lords. It offers a clearer picture of this region in the mid-sixteenth century. Though the *pratico* is unsigned, a different hand on f. 6^r indicates that the document might have been created by two different individuals. The small size of the document, together with the amount of data assembled concerning every person in the area, led the writers to use frequent abbreviations. Several lexical errors, especially in the second part, suggest that the scribes were most probably Cypriots.

MARINA ILLIA

3 Historical Context

3.1 Cyprus

Situated in the Eastern Mediterranean, linking Europe to Asia, Cyprus was once considered a politically and economically significant island. In the late twelfth century, with one foot in the Byzantine Empire to the east, and the other in the western medieval world of the crusaders, the island found itself governed by what would be the first of a series of foreign rulers.

The Byzantine period in Cyprus commenced in the fourth century. Little is known about its early centuries as a province of the Byzantine Empire, since any allusion to specific events was made in terms of the empire's history as a whole. According to David Metcalf the population of the island had a distinctive social and economic lifestyle, but they always shared a common political background with other provinces.⁴⁸ The profound lack of historical documentation about the first centuries of this period has led researchers to turn their attention to the various non-written sources such as the material evidence. Between the fourth and sixth centuries Cyprus enjoyed a long period of peace and prosperity. The island was divided into fifteen districts, which were administered by local bishops and imperial officers as governors.⁴⁹ During that period the capital of the island, Constantia, evolved into a great centre of activity. The living standards for both urban and rural populations appeared to be very high owing to the strong economic growth. This period of comfort must have been brought to an end by the plague of the sixth century. The population in Cyprus presumably suffered this plague owing to the island's proximity to and frequent commercial activity with Alexandria, where the disease broke out. Moving onto the next period (seventh to tenth centuries) the island proved to be a strategic area in the Empire. During the reign of Heraclius Constantia was attacked by the Persians, while a few years later, in 649 and in 653, the Arabs led by Muawiya invaded the island.⁵⁰ According to narrative sources, bad living conditions resulting from the Arab raids forced people to abandon the island; however, this information is not verified by archaeological evidence. As was to be expected, a considerable number of locals were taken prisoner, but the decline in the population of Constantia might also have been the result of their moving to higher ground.⁵¹ After the re-conquest of the island in 965, by General Chalkoutzes, Cyprus became

⁴⁸ D., M. Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus 491-1191*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, Texts and Studies in the History of Cyprus LXII, 2009, p. 18.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 355-359.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 379-380 and 395-418.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 422 and 474-478.

a ‘theme’ of the Empire but there was no noteworthy improvement or prosperity. During the reign of Alexius I Comnenus the island’s defences were greatly improved by the construction of castles and the establishment of night guards.⁵² What is worth mentioning for that period is the presence of the first Venetian merchants in Cyprus. As a result of the new commercial networks established by the Crusader States in the Latin East the Venetians profited greatly from their mercantile activity. Enjoying the trading privileges given by John II Comnenus and his son Manuel I (in 1126 and 1147), they used Cyprus and more specifically the port of Limassol as their *emporium*. Fortunately, as regards the local population of that period, there is lots of evidence relating to their lives, such as the division of the island’s lands and estates,⁵³ peasant rebellions due to heavy taxation⁵⁴ and the development of monasteries as landowners.⁵⁵ As witnessed by Saint Neophytos, in addition to the raids, some natural disasters brought hardship to the local population. The island’s political isolation and its social and economic crisis induced Isaac Comnenus to successfully usurp power in Cyprus in 1184.⁵⁶

Isaac’s unlawful rule in Cyprus was brought to an end by the expedition of the king of England, Richard the Lionheart, during the Third Crusade.⁵⁷ After using the island’s supplies and wealth, Richard sold it to the Knights Templar.⁵⁸ This is when the order’s presence on the island began, and it continued until their trial and the confiscation of their assets in 1311.⁵⁹ However, their stay as governors of Cyprus lasted less than a year. A sudden rebellion by the locals of Nicosia broke out over Easter in 1192, caused by heavy taxes on food products; this impelled the Knights Templar to give the island back to Richard in May of 1192.⁶⁰ Thereafter, the agreement between the king of England and the ousted king of Jerusalem Guy de Lusignan heralded the start of the Lusignan era in Cypriot history. In his new realm, Guy allocated lands to members of noble families from France and the Latin East in order to ensure the support he

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 565.

⁵³ P. Gounaridis, ‘Η Βυζαντινή Κύπρος’, in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Κύπρος: Σταυροδρόμι της Μεσογείου*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2001, p. 22.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁵⁵ D. Papanicola-Bakirtzis, ‘Βυζαντινή Μεσαιωνική Κύπρος. Πρόσωπο και χαρακτήρας’, in D. Papanicola-Bakirtzis and M. Iacovou (eds.), *Βυζαντινή Μεσαιωνική Κύπρος: βασίλισσα στην Ανατολή & Ρήγαινα στη Δύση*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 1997, p. 14.

⁵⁶ A. Nicolaou-Konnari, ‘The Conquest of Cyprus by Richard the Lionheart and its aftermath: a study of sources and legend, politics and attitudes in the year 1191-1192’, *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXVI, 2000, p. 33.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 64-65.

⁵⁹ On the presence of the Templars in Cyprus see M. Barber, *The Military Orders*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 1994, pp. 189-219; A. Lutrell, ‘Τα στρατιωτικά Τάγματα’, in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 733-757.

⁶⁰ J. Richard, ‘Η Σύσταση και οι βάσεις του Μεσαιωνικού βασιλείου (1192-1205)’, in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, p. 2; Nicolaou-Konnari, ‘The Conquest of Cyprus’, p. 67.

needed.⁶¹ With the support of the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry VI of Hohenstaufen, Guy's brother and successor Aimery was crowned King of Cyprus in 1197. At the same time, the Latin Church was established on the island.⁶² The next period, up until 1489, which is termed the Frankish period, can be divided into two distinct times. During the first one hundred years (1191 - 1291) Cyprus was very closely connected to the Crusader States, participating in military activity, such as the Fifth Crusade of 1217 - 1221 but also being involved in significant political issues such as the succession to the throne of Jerusalem, which was finally given to the kings of Cyprus. The fall of Acre in 1291 commenced a new phase in the history of the island. Due to its geographic position, as the last Christian stronghold in the East, Cyprus profited mainly from the commercial activity. In addition, new settlers, mainly refugees, were coming to the island, amongst them nobles and merchants leaving a new footprint on the social history. At that time, the Venetian presence intensified. Besides the shops and houses in the ports of Limassol and Paphos, Venetians owned property in the capital and estates in the hinterland. Enjoying the privileges of trade, some of these Venetian families took the advantage of the opportunity to settle permanently on the island. For example, the well-known Cornaro family, who, as creditors to the king, were rewarded with the prosperous fief of Episkopi and the revenues from the salt-tax.⁶³ The continuous and intense rivalry between the Venetians and the Genoese over trade and the privileges given by the monarchs became more apparent in the fourteenth century. The obvious inclination of Peter I towards the Venetians exacerbated this conflict and resulted in several incidents initiated by the Genoese over the next few years. The event which triggered the final invasion by the Genoese occurred during the coronation of Peter II as King of Jerusalem in October 1372. A year later, the Genoese succeeded in annexing the strategically important port of Famagusta and the surrounding area.⁶⁴ The occupation of

⁶¹ H. Rudt de Collenberg, 'Les Lusignan de Chypre', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, X, 1979-1980, pp. 85-319; B. Arbel, 'The Cypriot Nobility from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century: A New Interpretation', in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, London, Totowa, N.J. Cass, 1989; reprint. in Arbel, B., *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000, no.VI, pp. 175-177; P., W. Edbury, *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191-1374*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991; *Το βασίλειο της Κύπρου και οι σταυροφορίες 1191-1374*, trans. Angel Nicolaou-Konnari, Athens, Papademas Publishers, 2002; Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, p. 564.

⁶² G. Fedalto, 'Η Λατινική Εκκλησία στο Μεσαιωνικό Βασίλειο', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, p. 671; N. Coureas and C. Schabel (eds.), *The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1997; N. Coureas, *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1997; C. Schabel, 'Religion', in A. Nicolaou-Konnari and C. Schabel (eds.), *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden - Boston, Brill, 2005, pp. 157-218.

⁶³ On the presence of the Venetians during the Lusignan period see E. Papadopoulou, 'Οι πρώτες εγκαταστάσεις Βενετών στην Κύπρο', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 5, 1983, pp. 303-332; T. Papacostas, 'Secular Landholdings and Venetians in 12th-century Cyprus', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. 92, is. 2, 1999, pp. 479-501.

⁶⁴ A. Nicolaou-Konnari and C. Schabel (eds.), *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2005, pp. 1-4.

Famagusta as consequence of this war resulted in a decline for Cyprus as a whole. The dominance of the Genoese had a great impact on the Venetians as well. In subsequent years, several envoys were sent by Venice, in an attempt to get back the privileges they had lost. In the meantime, economic issues, the defeat by the Mamluks in Chirokoitia and the subsequent capture of King Janus (in 1426) would bring about further difficulties for the kingdom. A great opportunity for Venice to gradually take control emerged during the civil war between James II and his sister Charlotte. The ascendancy of James II and the reoccupation of Famagusta in 1464 opened the way to a new era. James II agreed to marry a Venetian bride and Caterina, a member of the important Cornaro family, was offered as his wife. Their engagement was celebrated in Venice in 1468 but it was not until 1472 that Caterina eventually came to Cyprus for the wedding. To accompany her, the Doge sent Antonio Bragadino and several other ambassadors as counsellors.⁶⁵ This marriage was short-lived, since the king and his legitimate son by Caterina, James III, died unexpectedly in 1473 and 1474 respectively.⁶⁶

The period that followed the death of the king was a great opportunity for Venice to oversee the governance of the island by its 'daughter' Caterina Cornaro, the heir to the throne. To aid her in her task, Venice sent a number of officials, for instance a *provveditore*, *sindici*, and *stradiotti*.⁶⁷ A few years later, in 1489, *La Serenissima* used its excellent diplomatic skills to persuade the last queen of Cyprus to abdicate her throne⁶⁸ and thus acquire the island officially. The new administration adopted very wisely the island's status quo. Their previous experience in Crete, where they had abolished the preceding institutions, in an effort to exclude the 'archontes' by introducing a new administrative system, was an egregious example of mismanagement. In Cyprus, the administrative system, based on the feudal tradition introduced in the twelfth century by the first Lusignans, was still working well. For that reason the new government was happy to accept the existing situation and showed itself highly adaptive to the local institutions. The new colony had roughly the same administrative system as other Venetian territories: a *luogotenente* and two *rettori* constituting the *Reggimento*, the island's government; the *camerarii*, officers charged with the administration of the treasury; the *capitano di Famagusta* as commander of the city and head of the island's military forces; and

⁶⁵ G. Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1940-1952, pp. 632-635 and 640 – 641; P., W. Edbury, 'Οι τελευταίοι Λουζινιανοί (1432-1489)', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt.1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 177-258; Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, pp. 20-22.

⁶⁶ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, pp. 23-26.

⁶⁷ B. Arbel, 'The Reign of Caterina Corner (1473-1489) as a Family Affair', *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 26, 1993, pp.67-87; Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', pp. 456-457.

⁶⁸ Arbel, 'The Reign of Caterina Corner', pp. 69-74.

many other officers.⁶⁹ The local nobility, an ethnically diverse group of people, kept all their previous privileges and benefits with regard to their estates and were still obliged to support the government with military forces. Many public positions were open to them, while some of them took over specific honorific titles and offices such as that of Admiral.⁷⁰ The only significant change was the abolishing of the High Court, the administrative council of nobles, an institution which was already in decline.⁷¹ As regards property, the previous royal estates were transferred to the control of the new administration and as public lands made up the *Real*. Some of these fiefs were directly exploited by the Venetian government while others were rented out or sold. Besides the public and the private property owned by the nobility, there were also estates which belonged to the Church. All of these lands were cultivated and worked by the locals.

The population of the island was divided into four groups: the nobility, the *cittadini*, the *popolo* in the cities and the rural population. The local nobility was a very miscellaneous group of people. As regards their origins some of them came from old French families whose members had been permanently settled on Cyprus since the twelfth century while others were presumably of Greek origin. Others were Venetians, Catalans or Syrians who settled on the island after the loss of the Crusader States. Their noble status was usually linked to titles they had inherited or been awarded personally, but it was not an indication of their wealth. Some members of the nobility were rich landowners, but there were also poor nobles, descendants of old families who had lost their estates or second sons who were not entitled to any land. The nobles were given the opportunity to participate in the administration of the island through local assemblies (such as the *Università* of Nicosia). The Venetians were still in charge of the government, but the local nobility was able to discuss with them any important matters. The second group of people residing in the cities were the *cittadini*, usually the free Greek population. The majority of them were government officials and merchants. Some of the *cittadini* managed to increase their wealth by trading activities which gave them the opportunity to rise higher in this social group. As for the third group, the *popolo*, they were mainly traders with smaller businesses and workers in the local manufacturing trades.

⁶⁹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', pp. 456-458; E. Skoufari, *Cipro veneziana (1473-1571). Istituzioni e culture nel regno della Serenissima*, Rome, Viella, 2011; E. Skoufari (ed.), *La Serenissima a Cipro. Incontri di culture nel Cinquecento*, Rome, Viella, 2013; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*.

⁷⁰ A. Papadia-Lala, *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων στον ελληνικό χώρο κατά την περίοδο της βενετοκρατίας, 13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.: μια συνθετική προσέγγιση*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2004, p. 145.

⁷¹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', pp. 460-461; Papadia-Lala, *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων*, pp. 134-135.

Nonetheless, they could still have the right to assemble and promote their interests. The last social group, which had fewer rights than the others, consisted of the rural population, the *parici* and *francomati*, and this will be examined in more detail below.⁷²

As the documents show, many improvements were made in the Venetian period. During the century of Venice's rule several communal buildings were commissioned, and the Venetians encouraged the fortification of the main cities and the building of coastal defences. Nevertheless, as was the case for other Venetian colonies and the Eastern Mediterranean world in general in the sixteenth century, Venice had to confront the rapid rise of the Ottomans. Cyprus would not escape the war between these two worlds. The Ottomans invaded Cyprus in 1570 and later seized Nicosia. The final battle was in Famagusta, which was eventually surrendered by its Venetian Captain Marc'Antonio Bragadino (1571). This event marked the end of an era, not only for Cyprus but for the entire region.⁷³

3.2 *Stato da mar* – a comparative study

3.2.1 The Venetian Expansion

In order to get a better understanding of the Venetian occupation of the island of Cyprus, it is necessary to turn our attention to other areas ruled by *la Serenissima*. A comparative study of the history and administration of the *Stato da mar* (Maritime State) will shed light on another aspect of Venetian policies and procedures. Even though they were geographically scattered, the Venetian possessions of the *Stato da mar* shared a common faith. Whether they were islands in the Mediterranean or coastal cities with a small hinterland on mainland Greece, all of the above-mentioned territories had a common history as part of the Byzantine Empire. Thus they had been subject to a central administrative system, the same institutions and laws and therefore, apart from a few dissimilarities, they had enjoyed much the same living standards. These similarities in living conditions continued during the Venetian period too.

Surrounded by the sea, Venice consists of over one hundred islands, and its territory is located between the rivers Piave and Po in north-eastern Italy. During the early sixth century, these islands were populated by a small number of fishermen and boatmen, travelling along

⁷² A. Papadia-Lala, 'Κοινωνική συγκρότηση στις πόλεις', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 106-107.

⁷³ Hill, *A History of Cyprus*, pp. 948-1040; P. Valderio, *La guerra di Cipro*, G. Grivaud (ed.), N. Patapiou (trans.), Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1996, pp. 127-128; G. Grivaud, 'Η κατάκτηση της Κύπρου από τους Οθωμανούς', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 6, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 2011, pp. 93, 95, and 98.

the narrow canals between Venice and its hinterland. Relying on maritime activities, the local population was living in poverty. This was the period when social and economic relations as well as cultural interaction began between Venice and the Byzantine east. This complex of islands in the north-east of Italy was a battlefield during the Gothic war (535-554). After achieving great victories, Justinian's general, Narses, finally conquered Venice in 556 and the Byzantine period officially started for this group of islands. Venice remained under the control of Byzantium and the local administration of the exarchate of Ravenna.⁷⁴ In 812 Charlemagne officially conquered the Istrian peninsula but he never succeeded in capturing Venice.⁷⁵ *La Serenissima* remained under Byzantine control.

During the twelfth century Venice rose one of the most important financial and maritime powers in the region. Despite several conflicts between them and other Italian cities such as Pisa and Genoa, Venice managed to gain vital commercial privileges from the Byzantine Empire. Basing its income mainly on commerce, the city gradually developed. Several communities moved from the mainland, establishing local parishes which resulted in the creation of sixty neighbourhoods. The city, which was one of the biggest in Europe in that period.⁷⁶ Great palazzi and communal buildings were constructed next to smaller houses, warehouses known as *fontaci*, shops, taverns and quays. Owing to this development and economic success, Venice began to stand out as a place of some importance, while a few local families gained wealth and power. By joining forces with the Crusaders at the beginning of the thirteenth century, Venice managed to play a role of great consequence. Following the conquest of Constantinople in 1204 and the ratification of the treaty between the victors (*Partitio Terrarum Imperii Romanie*), a new era was inaugurated.⁷⁷

The acquisition of former Byzantine locations in the Aegean and mainland Greece along with the expansion of the *Stato da mar*, started with the island of Crete to the south and the cities of Coron and Modon, 'the two eyes of the Republic', on the south-eastern shores of the Peloponnese in 1209. Over the following five centuries, several other locations were seized by the *Serenissima* and the *Stato da mar's* borders were extended. Besides Crete, Coron and

⁷⁴ F. C. Lane, *Βενετία η θαλασσοκράτειρα, Ναυτιλία – Εμπόριο – Οικονομία*, D. Pagkratis and N. Kioseoglou (eds.), K. Kouremenos (trans.), Athens, Alexandria, 2007, pp. 22-25.

⁷⁵ G. Ravegnani, 'Βυζαντινή Βενετία', in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Οι Ναυτικές Πολιτείες της Ιταλίας Αμόλφη, Πίζα, Γένοβα, Βενετία και η Ανατολική Μεσόγειος*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 180-193.

⁷⁶ Lane, *Βενετία η θαλασσοκράτειρα*, pp. 35-36.

⁷⁷ A. Papadia-Lala, 'Ο Ελληνοβενετικός κόσμος (1204-1797), θεσμοί, πολιτισμός, ιδεολογία', in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Οι Ναυτικές Πολιτείες της Ιταλίας Αμόλφη, Πίζα, Γένοβα, Βενετία και η Ανατολική Μεσόγειος*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 195-197.

Modon, some of the most important colonies acquired by Venice were Kythira in 1363,⁷⁸ Nauplia and Argos in 1388/1394,⁷⁹ Negreponte, Tinos and Mykonos in 1390, Monemvasia in 1463 and the Ionian islands including Corfu and Paxoi in 1386,⁸⁰ Zakynthos or Zante in 1484,⁸¹ Kefalonia and Ithaca in 1500⁸² and Lefkada in 1684.⁸³ The vast majority of the above-mentioned locations were under Venetian rule for over a century. The Venetian period ended for each of them after one of seven wars and the ratification of the relevant treaties between Venice and the Ottomans. Nonetheless a few colonies in the *Stato da mar*, such as Kythira, Corfu, Zakynthos, Kefalonia, Ithaca, Leukada and Parga remained under Venetian control up until 1797, when Venice lost its independence to Napoleon Bonaparte who conquered the city.⁸⁴

New accessions were added in various circumstances. For example, Nauplia and Cyprus were conceded to Venice by two women married to local nobles, Maria d' Enghien⁸⁵ and Caterina Cornaro respectively. Modon and Coron were acquired after the treaty of Sapienza between Venice and their former Frankish owners,⁸⁶ while the islands of Corfu (1386) and Skyros, Skiathos and Skopelos (1453) were added to the *Stato da Mar* after a formal request sent by the locals to the Venetian authorities.⁸⁷ Despite the dissimilarities in the way these regions were acquired, the motive behind that action was clear. The new colonies in *Stato da mar* had something in common, immediate access to the sea. Being islands or ports accessing the Aegean or the Ionian Sea or even the wider area of the Mediterranean east, each one of

⁷⁸ For more information about Kythira see Ch. Maltezos, *Βενετική παρουσία στα Κύθηρα. Αρχαιακές μαρτυρίες*, Athens, Etairia Kithiraikon Meleton, 1992; Ch. Maltezos, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2008.

⁷⁹ For more information about Nauplia and Argos see R. Cessi, 'Venezia e l'aquisto di Nauplia ed Argo', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, 30, 1915, pp. 147-173; T. Kondylis, *Το Ναύπλιο και η Βενετία (1388-1540), Μια αναγεννησιακή πόλη στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή*, Athens, Iamvos, 2016.

⁸⁰ For more information about Corfu see N. Karapidakis, *Civis fidelis: L'avènement et l'affirmation de la citoyenneté corfiote (XVIème-XVIIème siècles)*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1992.

⁸¹ For more information about Zakynthos see D. Arvanitakis, *Οι αναφορές των Βενετών Προβλεπτών της Ζακύνθου (16^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2000; D. Arvanitakis (ed.), *Κοινωνικές αντιθέσεις στην πόλη της Ζακύνθου: το ρεμπελιό των ποπολάρων (1628)*, Athens, Benaki Museum, 2001.

⁸² For more information about Kefalonia see S. Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571: η συγκρότηση της κοινωνίας του νησιού*, Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, 1999; K. Tsiknakis (ed.), *Οι εκθέσεις των Βενετών Προνοητών της Κεφαλλονιάς (16^{ος} αιώνας)*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1951 (reprint 2008).

⁸³ For more information about Lefkada see K.G. Machairas, *Η Λευκάς επί Ενετοκρατίας 1684-1797*, Athens, Poreia, 2008.

⁸⁴ K. G. Tsiknakis, 'Ο ελληνικός χώρος στη διάρκεια της βενετοκρατίας', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 22-24; Papadia-Lala, *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων*, passim.

⁸⁵ Kondylis, *Το Ναύπλιο και η Βενετία*, pp. 25-27.

⁸⁶ C. A. Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron under the Venetian Administration, 1204-1400*, PhD thesis, London, 1974, pp. 30-36.

⁸⁷ Karapidakis, *Civis fidelis*, pp. 47-82; Papadia-Lala, *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων*, p. 237.

them gave Venice the opportunity to expand its naval and commercial network. In fact, the *Stato da mar* was economically vital to the metropolis, and so its loss constituted a ruinous blow to the *Serenissima's* finances.

3.2.2 *Venetian Administration, society and population*

Administering each location was not easy for Venice. In order to achieve this, the Council of Ten treated each area on a case-by-case basis, taking into account its geographic location, the size of the colony and its population. Over the centuries of the *Stato da mar*, Venice gained the knowledge and experience needed to govern each location in the most suitable way. The approach to each matter and the proceedings followed differ according to the period concerned, the geographical area, the way of life and mainly the local population. For example, the acquisition of Crete saw the immature colonial government of Venice confront unfamiliar local customs and practices, linked to the Byzantine tradition and the powerful Cretan *archontes*. As a consequence, the administration of the island was a very difficult task and the officers dispatched to the island made some erroneous decisions. During the centuries of their administration, local authorities abused their power over important matters for the local population such as the Orthodox Church, tradition and jurisdiction. Local *archontes* were deprived of their lands which were eventually given to Venetians. That led to several issues and Venetian officials had to deal with numerous rebellions by the locals.

By contrast, the experienced government of *la Serenissima*, handled the acquisition of Cyprus very differently. The knowledge gained in the past as well as the different local administrative system. Bequeathed by the Lusignans and linked to the western feudal tradition, gave Venice the opportunity to adopt a different approach. Now more accepting of local policies and procedures, the officials adopted the previous form of administration, incorporating only the important new offices. This approach towards the old nobility and the local population led to an easy transition from the old regime to the new.

Moreover, this benevolent attitude to the administration of the island of Cyprus was similar to the process followed in the administration of the Ionian islands. As the last colonies left in the *Stato da mar* after the loss of Cyprus and then Crete, the islands were extremely valuable to *La Serenissima*. Owing to their smaller size and their geographical position, their administration appeared to be much easier.

Notwithstanding the different approaches to each area, *La Serenissima* managed to have a mainly common remote administrative system, engaging both Venetians and natives in the

local government. a Venetian for smaller territories or, for the larger districts, even a leading body, the *reggimento*, was always appointed to head the administration. For example, the Duke and his two counsellors commanded Crete, the *lugotenente* and his two *rettori* were in charge of Cyprus while two *castellani* governed Coron and Modon, a *bailus* and two counsellors in Corfu and the *provveditore* was the head of the administration in Kefalonia.⁸⁸ The *reggimenti* had direct control for a specific period of time, usually two years and they had to follow the official instructions, the *commisiones*, given by the metropolis. To assist them in governing the colonies other notable Venetians were sent to hold the higher offices. Throughout the centuries of Venetian occupation, a significant number of Venetian nobles were appointed to important administrative positions such as *consiglieri* (counsellors) or members of the *reggimenti*, the *capitani* (commanders) and the *camerarii* (treasurers). Occasionally, to deal with unexpected incidents, Venice dispatched other officers such as the *sindici* and the *auditori*.⁸⁹ Besides the Venetian officers, several locals, members of the indigenous nobility or the *cittadini*, i.e. the inhabitants of the cities, managed to hold office. Depending on the location, some of these administrative positions of a higher – or mainly of a lower – level, were already in place, while a few others were introduced by the new government. As members of the administration, officers had to deal with different functions and procedures such as legislation, finances, properties, commerce etc. The majority of them were of a certain age and a specific social status (nobles or *cittadini*). A few were employed and therefore paid for their services while others had only honorary posts. Gradually more and more *cittadini* managed to be awarded an office. At the same time, several members of the lower stratum were allowed to be employed in less important administrative offices.⁹⁰

Depending on each location, the Venetians were usually at the top of the social pyramid, along with members of noble families and the *cittadini*. Some of them were landowners in the countryside but they were mainly resident in the cities. Being at the top of the social pyramid was not always linked to wealth. As a matter of fact, there were many nobles mentioned in the

⁸⁸ Ch. Gasparis, 'Μητροπολιτική εξουσία και αξιωματούχοι των αποικιών. Ο καπιτάνος της Κρήτης (14^{ος}-15^{ος} αι.)', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 12, 1998, pp. 171-214; M. Dal Borgo, 'Ανώτεροι αξιωματούχοι στη βενετική Ρωμανία', A. Kolonia (trans.), in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 73-75; Papadia-Lala, 'Ο Ελληνοβενετικός κόσμος (1204-1797)', pp. 198-199.

⁸⁹ Dal Borgo, 'Ανώτεροι αξιωματούχοι στη βενετική Ρωμανία', pp. 76.

⁹⁰ A. Papadaki, 'Τοπικοί αξιωματούχοι και υπάλληλοι', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 83-86.

documents who lost their estates and became 'poor'.⁹¹ The *cittadini/civili* also lived in the cities. The majority of them were engaged in the administration as officials. The next group of people in the pyramid were the *popolo*, the workers in the main urban industries. Some were better off than others, since they were also involved in commercial activities.⁹²

The last social group concerned consists of the rural communities. This group of people constituted the majority of the local population in every Venetian colony of the *Stato da mar*. Their major contribution to the production and economy was vital not only to the local community but also to *la Serenissima* itself. They can be divided into three subgroups according to their status and holdings: the free tenants, the *francomati* in Cyprus or the *franchi* in Crete,⁹³ the tenant farmers, the *parici*, *villani* or *rustici* and those without land, the *mistargi* in Cyprus or *vilici* in Coron and Modon or *gonikarii* in Crete.⁹⁴ The group of the *parici*, which includes both locals and other ethnic groups such as gypsies, could also be classified according to their lord. Depending on the location there were the private *parici* whose lord was one of the noble landowners, the *parici* of the State who worked on public land and those bound to the lands of the Church. Despite these differences, it has been suggested by scholars that both free tenants and the land labourers shared a common faith. They are usually described by the local authorities as the poor, *poveri*, while there are several reports referring to the hardships they faced. Nonetheless, amongst them there were a few who managed to gain lands and become richer than others.⁹⁵

3.2.3 Rural Space

The majority of the lowest social group, which appears to have been the largest section of the population in every Venetian overseas colony, lived in the countryside. Besides the locals, who were mainly Greek Orthodox, the rural population was also comprised of other, minority groups such as the gypsies in Cyprus and Corfu.⁹⁶ The ethnic and social composition

⁹¹ Ch. Gasparis, '«Φτωχοί» φεουδάρχες και «πλούσιοι» αγρότες. Η διαστρωμάτωση των τάξεων στη Μεσαιωνική Κρήτη', in Ch. Maltezos, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 295-296.

⁹² Papadia-Lala, *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων*, passim.

⁹³ Ch. Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη, 13^{ος}-14^{ος} αι.*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1997, pp. 63-69.

⁹⁴ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, pp. 297-298.

⁹⁵ A. Papadia-Lala, 'Οι φτωχοί στις βενετοκρατούμενες ελληνικές περιοχές. Ορολογία, αντιλήψεις, πραγματικότητες', in Ch. Maltezos, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 91-99.

⁹⁶ S. Asdrachas and A. Asdracha, 'Στη φαιουδαλική Κέρκυρα: από τους παροίκους στους vassali angararii', in S. Asdrachas (ed.), *Οικονομία και νοοτροπίες*, Athens, Ermis, 1988, pp. 79-80; A. Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική της βενετικής διοίκησης στην Κύπρο', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019, p. 66.

of this group remains almost unchanged throughout the Venetian period. Nonetheless, as a consequence of the wars against the Ottoman Empire and the loss of several Venetian overseas possessions, especially after the loss of Crete in 1669, a significant number of refugees was added to the groups of the local rural population in the remaining lands.⁹⁷ *Parici* or *villani* and the free tenants, along with the foreigners in each location, were living in small hamlets or larger settlements, the *casali* or villages, located mostly in the rural areas. The definition of a village in the Venetian period appears to have been rather problematic. According to the *catastica*, the official records of each location, a village was made up of various parts, including the communal buildings, such as a mill, and the surrounding lands which might or might not be cultivated, gardens, pastures and forests. Depending on its geographical position but also on current economic, historical and social factors, the boundaries of a village could change accordingly.⁹⁸ A village could sometimes also include smaller hamlets located in the vicinity. A distinct example of such a case is the *metochion* recorded in the *castica* of Crete. In addition to the above, a village was also an economic unit based on the local production.⁹⁹

What differs in regard to these settlements in Venetian Cyprus is the terminology concerning the smaller hamlets. The term *metochion*, the form in which it appears in Crete, is occasionally used in Cyprus as well, identifying a location owned by an ecclesiastical institution. By contrast, the term *prastio* which is mainly used for the smaller settlements, a term inherited from the previous Byzantine tradition, is encountered mainly in the Veneto-Cypriot documents. Nonetheless, the organisation of a settlement in a rural area and the activities within it, appears to be almost identical in every part of the *Venetia Stato da mar*.

Despite the well organised administration and social provisions, there were still rural populations with several issues. The most important matters were bad working conditions, taxes and in general the constant unjust treatment of the populace by the lords. As a result, led by local chiefs, peasants rebelled against the Venetian authorities, requesting better living conditions and free legal status. One of the most important popular revolts occurred in Crete in the sixteenth century. Much like the peasant revolts in western Europe, which happened during the same period, peasants in Crete raided settlements in the vicinity. Their main demands were the suspension of forced labour, a decrease in rents and other personal liberties. The Venetian

⁹⁷ For example, see Maltezos, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, pp. 104.

⁹⁸ Ch. Gasparis, *Φυσικό και αγροτικό τοπίο στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη 13^{ος} 14^{ος} αι.*, Athens, Goulandri-Horn Foundation, 1994, pp. 9-11; Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη*, pp. 55-56.

⁹⁹ N. Karapidakis, 'Από τις αδελφότητες των καλλιεργητών στο χωρίον', in *Ζ' Πανιώνιο Συνέδριο: Λευκάδα, 26-30 Μαΐου 2002: Πρακτικά*, vol. 2, Athens, Etairia Leukadikon Meleton, 2004, 420-422.

administration suppressed the revolt and banished the rebels to other locations in the area, a number of which were in Cyprus.¹⁰⁰

Despite their efforts, even a century later living conditions had not changed for the local rural population. Apart from the cases in Crete, there were no major rebellions by the rural population under Venetian rule. In Cyprus, there are mentions of attempted rebellions against the local lord by sending delegations to the king of Savoy or the Ottomans. One of the best-known ventures was attempted by the peasants in Kolossi. According to some sources, the local *parici* were subject to *angaria* (forced labour) and heavy taxes, which is a slightly different picture from that provided in the documents examined for this thesis. Requesting their liberation from this through the Ottomans they sent a representative to Constantinople to meet the Sultan, who sent him to the local Venetian ambassador.¹⁰¹ Despite their positive attitude towards the Ottomans, that case and a few others should only be considered a protest by a group of people against the local lord, not an ethnic revolt against the Venetian authorities. In fact, the majority of the rural population willingly helped in the wars against the Ottomans during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.¹⁰²

3.2.4 *Venetian Providence*

There are several mentions of bad behaviour on the part of the Venetian authorities, nonetheless the central government of each location was also protective of the local population. In an effort to ensure the health and safety of the lower social groups, Venetian high officials approved the establishment of many foundations and public services. The concept of philanthropy was very important for them because of their Christian values. *Eleimon* and *eleimosini* were frequently mentioned in documents, while in some cases, including in Cyprus, there was a specific tax paid by the wealthier population to benefit the poor (see the case in MR2). In terms of public health and care, there were several hospitals and guest houses for travellers and impoverished locals when they were sick. The *hospitali* were maintained by

¹⁰⁰ A. Papadia-Lala, *Αγροτικές ταραχές και εξεγέρσεις στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη, 1509-1528: η "επανάσταση" του Γεωργίου Γαδανολέου-Αυσογιώργη*, PhD. thesis, University of Athens, Athens, 1983, pp. 129-152.

¹⁰¹ Ch. Apostolopoulos, 'Μια απόπειρα προσέγγισης των παροίκων της βενετοκρατούμενης Κύπρου με την Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία (1551)', in G. K. Ioannides, S. A. Hadjistillis, A. Papageorgiou and I. Theocharides (ed.), *Πρακτικά του τρίτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 16-20 Απριλίου 1996)*, vol. 2: Μεσαιωνικό Τμήμα. Nicosia, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 2000-2001, pp. 669-689; E. Aristeidou, 'Άγνωστες απόπειρες για την οργάνωση στάσεων ή εξεγέρσεων κατά την διάρκεια της Βενετοκρατίας', in G. K. Ioannides, S. A. Hadjistillis, A. Papageorgiou and I. Theocharides (ed.), *Πρακτικά του τρίτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 16-20 Απριλίου 1996)*, vol. 2: Μεσαιωνικό Τμήμα. Nicosia, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 2000-2001, pp. 581-598; S. Birtahas, *Κοινωνία, πολιτισμός & διακυβέρνηση στο βενετικό κράτος της θάλασσας. Το παράδειγμα της Κύπρου*, Thessaloniki, Vanias, 2011, pp. 115-127.

¹⁰² Maltezu, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, p. 67.

fraternities and local communities in the cities. In addition, military hospitals were available to care for the sick and injured mercenaries. Authorities were also concerned about infectious diseases and especially plague. An isolation hospital (*lazzaretto*) for those infected was established in almost every possession. If a virus spread within a location, the government would isolate the settlement, quarantining the population for forty days.¹⁰³ Apart from medical institutions, there were orphanages for abandoned infants and children. In addition, the Venetian administration ordered the construction and maintenance of several public structures and facilities such as wells for clean water and public granaries.¹⁰⁴

3.2.5 *Conclusions*

Using an almost identical form of administration throughout the *Stato del Mar*, with government officials dispatched by the metropolis and some local officers, Venice achieved an acceptable form of governance in each location while also managing to create links between the various colonies. In addition, the adoption of a significant number of the previous institutions led to a secure state of continuity. Nonetheless, as already mentioned, the Venetian approach to each location and to local government was not the same throughout the six centuries of the *Stato da mar*. With the experience gained in remote administration from its first possessions, *la Serenissima* gradually changed its approach, allowing more local practices to continue with little or no changes. During its first years as a colonial power Venice acquired a number of important lands including Crete. Without the relevant knowledge and experience, the Duke in Crete and his advisory council pitted themselves against the local aristocracy who had ruled the island in previous centuries. By not including them in the administration, taking away all of their privileges and wealth, they caused unrest, which eventually led to organised resistance and rebellions.

Three centuries later, while dealing with several losses in wars against the Ottomans, Venice acquired Cyprus. Due to their fear of the Ottomans, but also based on the tolerance of the Venetian authorities, many locals welcomed the new rulers. With the example of Crete in

¹⁰³ M. Patramani, 'Λιμοί και λοιμοί στα Κύθηρα. Η στάση των βενετικών αρχόν και του πληθυσμού (16^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)', *Ανθη Χαρίτων*, 1968, pp. 584-591; A. Papadia-Lala, *Εναγή και νοσοκομειακά ιδρύματα στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies of Venice and the Vikelea Municipal Library of Iraklio-Crete, Venice, 1996; A. Papadia-Lala, 'Θεσμοί κοινωνικής μέριμνας στο βενετοκρατούμενο Ρέθυμνο', in Ch. Maltezou and A. Papadaki, *Της Βενετίας το Ρέθυμνο, Πρακτικά Συμποσίου, Ρέθυμνο, 1-2 Νοεμβρίου 2002*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2003, pp. 64-68.

¹⁰⁴ Patramani, 'Λιμοί και λοιμοί στα Κύθηρα', pp. 571-574; K. Konstantinidou, «Το κακό οδεύει έρποντας...». *Οι λοιμοί της πανώλης στα Ιόνια Νησιά (17^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies of Venice, Venice, 2007; K. Konstantinidou, *Νοσοκομειακοί θεσμοί στη βενετική Κέρκυρα (17^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*. *Για τους Στρατιώτες, του φτωχούς και τα αθώα βρέφη*, Eurasia, Athens, 2012.

mind and mainly due to the earlier Lusignan administration of the island, Venice adopted a new approach to remote governance. The local mentality which led to tolerance and cooperation between the population and the government, gave the opportunity for the *reggimento* to handle any issues that occurred. After the loss of Cyprus and Crete, the *Stato da mar* and the Venetian administration thereof, was on the brink of collapse. Alongside the Ottoman threat in the east, Venice had to deal with internal issues. In losing its possessions, *la Serenissima* also lost revenues coming mainly from trade and taxes. On that account, the remaining holdings in the Ionian Sea were precious in many ways. During the last centuries of Venetian rule, the local administration adopted a new policy, one in which they made themselves more approachable vis-à-vis the local population. By dealing effectively with local reactions and by allowing local communities to thrive, Venice managed to maintain control.

MARINA ILIA

4 The Lower Social Stratum

4.1 Peasants in the Feudal West and Byzantine East

One of the main aims of this thesis is to describe the living conditions of people belonging to the lower social stratum in Venetian Cyprus. To achieve this, these people must be divided into smaller groups reflecting their legal status, personal freedom and obligations. As Benjamin Arbel states: “Most evidence relating to the rural population of Venetian Cyprus distinguishes between *parici*, or serfs, and the *francomati*, or free tenants”.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, despite the existence of other smaller groups, such as gypsies and slaves,¹⁰⁶ the two aforementioned sections of society will be the main subjects of this research.

The study of rural populations or the peasantry is a field of research that has only relatively recently attracted the interest of scholars. For researchers in European medieval history peasants, as they are usually called in the sources, were mainly inhabitants of the countryside. The term derives from the French word *paisent*, which originates from the French *pais* (country).¹⁰⁷ In broad terms peasants can be divided into three groups: free tenants, dependent serfs and slaves. In early medieval sources a serf is referred to as a ‘*colonus*’, a term designating a semi-free person attached to a specific estate. Other terms were adopted from the Roman period in order to define these groups, for instance *liberus*, *litus* and *ingenuus* for the free peasants and *servus* or *ancilla* for the dependent population. Later on, the term *rusticus* was in use along with *villein* to differentiate the free agricultural labourer from the serf.¹⁰⁸ Despite the use of these terms, the legal status of a peasant was not always clear, since it was related to time and space. Unlike the Roman period, when a slave was clearly distinct from the other social groups, in the early medieval period serfdom was comparable to slavery in legal terms. Due to the rise of Christianity the slavery of the late Roman period was gradually abolished and slaves became dependant serfs. These people were still the property of a master and they were economically and socially dependent on their lord, but they had some legal rights. The new homogenous population of serfs was given a parcel of land to work as tenants,

¹⁰⁵ Arbel, ‘Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule’, p. 205.

¹⁰⁶ G. Grivaud, ‘Les minorités orientales à Chypre (époques médiévale et moderne)’, in Y. Ioannou, F. Métral and M. Yon (eds.), *Chypre et la Méditerranée orientale. Formations identitaires, perspectives historiques et enjeux contemporains*, Actes du colloque tenu à Lyon, 1997, Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Université de Chypre, Lyons, Maison de l’Orient méditerranéen, 2000, pp. 43-70.

¹⁰⁷ T. Scott (ed.), *The Peasantries of Europe: From the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, London and New York, Longman, 1998, p. 5.

¹⁰⁸ P. Freedman, *Images of the Medieval Peasant*, Stanford University Press, 1999, p. 10.

while individuals could be legally married.¹⁰⁹ Slavery still existed for a number of them, but they were non-Christians usually captured and traded in slave markets. This delineation is not that clear in the sources since the term *servus* could imply either a free or an unfree person depending on the context.¹¹⁰

As far as the higher ranks of society were concerned, what all the peasants had in common was their subordination.¹¹¹ As many scholars note, in order to justify this subordination, medieval writers and artists described this huge section of society in most unpleasant terms.¹¹² For them, peasants were alien beings, similar to animals. Their physical characteristics, particularly their dark skin, were repulsive. They were also seen as dishonest, savage and were usually ill-received.¹¹³ However, peasants constituted the majority of Europe's population. For example, 90% of the population in fifteenth century France were peasants.¹¹⁴ A few dissimilarities aside, Europe's grass roots had much in common. Hence, researchers tend to homogenise peasants from different European countries, mainly on account of their economic status.¹¹⁵ The agricultural labourers were considered, together with clerics and knights, to be the "Three Orders". The peasants' support was very important since they were what a knight or a cleric could not be.¹¹⁶

Their main obligation involved the fact that they were attached to a piece of land on which they and their family were born, worked and lived. This land belonged most of the time to a noble, to whom the peasant was subordinate. More precisely, as Tom Scott says, a peasant in the medieval period in Europe could be considered a poor country dweller who "holds but not necessarily owns land."¹¹⁷ These parcels of land, whether owned or rented or held by permission of the lord, surrounded a main settlement, the village. The peasant cultivated these fields and grazed animals in common meadows. The free tenants were obligated to pay rent and taxes both in goods and money while they also had to work for the landlord.¹¹⁸ Many of

¹⁰⁹ R. Blackburn, 'The Old World Background to European Colonial Slavery', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 54, Constructing Race, 1997, pp. 67-70; J. P. Devroey, 'Men and Women in Early Medieval Serfdom: The Ninth-Century North Frankish Evidence', *Past & Present*, No. 166, 2000, pp. 6-7.

¹¹⁰ Devroey, 'Men and Women in Early Medieval Serfdom', pp. 12-14.

¹¹¹ Scott, *The Peasantries of Europe*, p. 5.

¹¹² Freedman, *Images of the Medieval Peasants*, p. 3.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-6.

¹¹⁴ J. Dewald and L. Vardi, 'The Peasantries of France, 1400-1789', in T. Scott (ed.), *The Peasantries of Europe: From the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, London and New York, Longman, 1998, pp. 21-48.

¹¹⁵ J. A. Raftis, *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981, p.3; F. Ellis, *Peasants Economics Farm Households and agrarian development*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, p. 4.

¹¹⁶ Freedman, *Images of the Medieval Peasants*, p. 16.

¹¹⁷ Scott, *The Peasantries of Europe*, p. 4.

¹¹⁸ G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Village, Manor and Monastery*, New York, Harper, 1960, pp. 16-17; Ellis, *Peasants Economics Farm Households and agrarian development*, p. 13.

them had restricted access to personal rights, including the right to free movement from one place to another.¹¹⁹

Before discussing the peasantry of Venetian Cyprus, a portrayal of the peasants of the Byzantine world more generally is essential. Compared to the peasant in western medieval Europe, the Byzantine peasant is designated using various different terms that were often difficult to interpret. During the early Byzantine period, agricultural labourers were labelled the *coloni* or *enapographoi georgoi*. According to historians, both of these categories were legally free tenants who were nevertheless not able to leave the lord's estate.¹²⁰ The term *misthotoi* is also found in the sources, used to mean tenants.¹²¹ In the tenth century, new terms emerge in the documents concerning the rural population: *paroikoi*, *douloparoikoi* and *enapographoi paroikoi*,¹²² while in the mid-eleventh century, this group of people were referred to as *paroikoi* or *eleutheroi paroikoi*.¹²³ Nikolaos Oikonomides discusses the term *douloparoikoi*, which appears only in documents relating to Macedonia,¹²⁴ such as for example, the *pratici* of the rural population in the twelfth century, which were the main source for Angeliki Laiou-Thomadaki's research.¹²⁵ *Douloparoikoi* might have been used as the equivalent of *enapographoi paroikoi* to distinguish them and therefore their status from the *paroikoi*.¹²⁶ As implied by the term *doulo*, the Greek word for slave, they were dependant tenants, bound to the estate. Part of the lower stratum of society during the Byzantine period were also the *eleutheroi*, a small group of free tenants. As Laiou-Thomadaki states in her book, there is disagreement among scholars concerning the *eleutheroi*, since the status and the fiscal and other obligations of many of them were to a large extent the same as those of the *paroikoi*.¹²⁷ There were also the foreigners, who were not mentioned in treasury documents. Ostrogorsky says that these were probably either free or dependant tenants, who

¹¹⁹ R. Hilton, 'Reasons for inequality among medieval peasants', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 5, is. 13, 1978, pp. 271 – 284, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066157808438049> (Accessed 15/10/2018).

¹²⁰ G. Ostrogorsky, 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages', in M. M. Postan (ed.), *Cambridge Economic History from the Decline of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1: Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, p. 206; P. Sarris, 'Large Estates and the Peasantry in Byzantium c. 600-1100', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, vol. 90, 2012, p. 442, <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2012.8332>, (Accessed 18/04/2018).

¹²¹ Sarris, 'Large Estates and the Peasantry in Byzantium', p. 444.

¹²² N. Oikonomides, 'Οι Βυζαντινοί δουλοπάροικοι', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 5, 1983, pp. 295-296.

¹²³ Ostrogorsky, 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire', p. 226; A. Laiou-Thomadaki, *Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή*, A. Kasdagli (trans.), Athens, Cultural Foundation of the National Bank, 2001, p. 24; Sarris, 'Large Estates and the Peasantry in Byzantium', p. 444.

¹²⁴ Oikonomides, 'Οι Βυζαντινοί δουλοπάροικοι', p. 297.

¹²⁵ Laiou-Thomadaki, *Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή*.

¹²⁶ Oikonomides, 'Οι Βυζαντινοί δουλοπάροικοι', p. 297.

¹²⁷ Laiou-Thomadaki, *Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή*, pp. 192-194.

fled their settlements due to invasions. By moving into a new village and permanently settling there this group of people became *paroikoi*.¹²⁸

In fact, as was the case in the medieval west, the status of the rural population was not always clear. A *paroiko* could be the property of the state, *demosionarios*, or of a lord, but their legal status was almost the same in both cases, that of a semi-free person who was able to move only if he was not indebted or had appealed for justice to his lord. Much like the medieval peasant, the Byzantine *paroiko* was attached to the land granted by the lord.¹²⁹ From the early twelfth century, the transfer of *paroikoi* from one lord to another was inextricably linked to the institution of *pronoia*. This institution, which is referred to in several treatises, is still quite obscure to those researching Byzantine economic history and should be considered a technical fiscal term. The *pronoia* or *pronoiatika*, as it is called in some twelfth-century references, was a type of grant, including lands, rights and revenues produced, which was conferred by the Byzantine emperor. The first to give such grants was Alexios I Komnenos, and he gave them to soldiers. Hence *pronoia* was mainly deemed to be an allowance held by soldiers. However, several documents related to *pronoia* and fiscal treatises, such as the *typika* of some well-known monasteries that have been thoroughly examined and presented by Mark Bartusis, have overturned this assumption. In these sources, *paroikoi* living in a *proasteio*, were granted in *pronoia*. Soldiers, laymen or even institutions holding land in *pronoia* for a lifetime were in reality benefiting from the revenues produced from this plot of land, the village and the population within it, who were mainly *paroikoi*.¹³⁰ In the early thirteen century, a new term introduced by the historian Niketas Choniates emerged in relation to the *parikoi*. ‘The gift of *paroikoi*’ appears to have been used by Choniates in relation to *pronoia*, where the grant holder benefited from the revenues and the work done by the *paroikoi*. In some cases, where the holder, especially monastic institutions were given fiscal exemptions, the *exkoussesai*, the ‘gift of some *paroikoi*’ was given and the landholder was made exempt from paying taxes to the state.¹³¹ The institution of *pronoia* is last documented in a fourteenth-century *praktiko* of the Iviron monastery. Surprisingly, the latest examples of this institution survived only in Macedonia.¹³²

¹²⁸ Ostrogorsky, ‘Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire’, pp. 232-233.

¹²⁹ Ostrogorsky, ‘Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire’, p. 277.

¹³⁰ M. C. Bartusis, *Land and Privilege in Byzantium, The institution of Pronoia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, pp. 14-31.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-71

¹³² *Ibid.*, pp. 551-552.

In terms of the living conditions and liabilities of *paroikoi*, they were almost the same throughout this period. They were usually settlers in villages or smaller estates, the hamlets called *proasteia*. These villages were situated between flat and mountain lands, surrounded by arable plots, vineyards, gardens and woods.¹³³ *Paroikoi* were mainly peasants, working on land surrounding the *proasteio*. These strips of land were held or rented by a peasant by contract, sometimes for a definite period of twenty-five to twenty-nine years. The land was scattered around the village and the fields could be inherited by their descendants.¹³⁴ The size and quality of land the *paroikoi* leased was proportionate to the number of animals they possessed and determined by the availability of land in the settlement. Ostrogorsky mentions an average of 100 to 200 *modia* for every household (1250 to 2500 hectares).¹³⁵ The plots of land were not always side by side, whilst sometimes the *paroikoi* owned small parcels of fields scattered around. In addition, there were also *paroikoi* who owned neither land nor animals. These were the *aktemones*. Of course, there were also others occupied in local industry, such as the craftsmen.

Paroikoi were obliged to pay a number of fiscal burdens. The majority of them were related to rented land and the personal immovable property of the *paroiko*. The fundamental property taxes were the *katepanagion* paid to the lord, and the *dimosion* to the state. These taxes were paid by all and were based on their property, irrespective of their occupation. Another group of taxes were those paid for the cultivation of land and the pasturing of animals. For example, they paid the *kapnikon*, the hearth tax, for each household. Other than that, there were other supplementary taxes. *Paroikoi* can be further divided into smaller groups according to their movable property, the *stasin* (animals), which most of the time amounted to one or two oxen (*zeugaratoi* or *boidatoi*). Based on this, they paid the *paroikoiatikon*, the *pakton* and the *zeugaratikon*. Some *paroikoi*, the majority were the poorest and landless ones, were called *ateleis*, meaning they were not liable to pay taxes. Other main tax obligations were the *oikoumenon* paid by members of a village.¹³⁶ In addition to the taxes they paid, *paroikoi* also owed some days of forced labour to the landlord. The *angaria/corvee* mentioned in the documents was levied on all the *paroikoi* or a specific category of the population. It was owed either to the state (*leitourgia*) or to a private lord. When the land was given in *excoussiai*, the

¹³³ A. Kazhdan, 'State, Feudal, and Private Economy in Byzantium', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 47, 1993, p. 86.

¹³⁴ Ostrogorsky, 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire', pp. 277-278.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 230-232.

¹³⁶ Ostrogorsky, 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire', p. 232; Laiou-Thomadaki, *Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή*, pp. 235-246; Bartusis, *Land and Privilege in Byzantium*, pp. 69-71.

private lord benefited greatly from this type of fiscal obligation. The number of days owed was not fixed. Alexander Kazhdan mentions twelve to twenty-four days per year labour.¹³⁷ Other than forced labour in the fields, *paroikoi* were also in some cases obliged to work on fortifications and the building of boats.¹³⁸ In several cases, the *paroikoi* were exempted from some of these secondary taxes and fiscal burdens owed to the state. In reality, that was more beneficial to the private landowner, since they could enjoy the full profit from the estate, rather than the *paroiko* himself.¹³⁹

4.2 Cypriot Rural Population

The local population and their living conditions in the Byzantine period in Cyprus remain an unexplored field of research. Despite the efforts of archaeologists in excavations and surveys, evidence concerning rural life cannot be supported by corresponding written sources and demographic data. What scholars do know is that the rural population residing in the countryside was rather homogenous, but there were a few villages settled by minorities such as Armenians and Maronites.¹⁴⁰ Whether living in the mountains or in settlements by the sea, individuals depended on the local agricultural production. Therefore, a water supply and cultivable land were the main factors in establishing a settlement. The population was mainly involved with agriculture and pastoralism, while a few were employed in local crafts. Trade was another important aspect of life. According to research, peasants were able to trade and exchange their products mainly in local markets at village fairs.¹⁴¹ As regards their mobility, due to several difficulties and geographic barriers, individuals tended to stay in their settlement of origin or somewhere in the vicinity.¹⁴²

Moving on to the period of Latin rule in Cyprus, the Byzantine social structure of the peasantry was maintained despite the introduction of the feudal system and, thus, a change in the concept of the lord and some small changes in their legal status and fiscal obligations. Settlements were still homogenous, and people might still identify as *Romaioi*.¹⁴³ They lived in the countryside, either in the mountains or by the sea and were mainly cultivating the land. Rural populations can roughly be divided into three categories: the *francomati*, the *parici* and the slaves. Following the division of the island into fiefs, Guy de Lusignan and his heirs, feudal

¹³⁷ Kazhdan, 'State, Feudal, and Private Economy in Byzantium', p. 91.

¹³⁸ Bartusis, *Land and Privilege in Byzantium*, pp. 70-71.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 79- 85.

¹⁴⁰ Metcalf, *Byzantine Cyprus*, pp. 486-490.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 67-68 and 552-555.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 494-495.

¹⁴³ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', pp. 13-17.

lords, became owners of rural estates containing villages and the peasants that inhabited them. Even though these fiefs and their inhabitants 'changed hands', the status of the rural population remained unchanged. What mostly changed for the *parici*, despite assurances from Guy de Lusignan, was their legal status and therefore some of their liberties. *Parici* were not free people; they had to pay taxes and work on the lord's estates, and they could not move and marry freely. *Francomati* on the other hand were legally free, they were able to lease land, but they also had to pay taxes.¹⁴⁴

An extremely valuable source with regard to life on a rural estate during the Frankish period is the document of Psimolofos. The owner of the village, along with the three hamlets in the vicinity, Deftera, Tripi and Dispilia, was the patriarch of Jerusalem. The source, which was published and analysed by Jean Richard, is a complete inventory made by George Panaguri, the scrivener of the village, who worked under the supervision of George Capadocas, a scrivener of the royal *Secrète*. According to this, the local population of the village was 300 individuals residing in sixty-nine households. Around 100 appear to have been the *parici*, while one fourth or one fifth of the population were the *francomati*. Amongst them were also four slaves. The population of the village did not remain unaltered. In fact, only a few decades after this census, in 1367 almost one third of the *parici* had left while only one *francomato* was still residing on the estate. The main activities were related to agricultural production. The *parici* were obliged to pay taxes and to hand over part of their production. The account provides specific information about the type of grains cultivated and the level of production acquired. Both *parici* and *francomati* were obliged to give part of their production to their lord. Other than that, there were also several taxes paid either in money or in kind, such as the one on the animals and the *catepanagium*. *Parici* were also forced to work some days in the fields of the lord.¹⁴⁵ Several of these taxes were also applicable during the Byzantine period. Thus, it can be assumed that there was continuity to some extent with regard to rural living conditions. The Lusignan wisely chose to maintain several of the already existing institutions, in an effort to achieve a *modus vivendi*.¹⁴⁶

Lastly slaves, who were mainly foreigners, appear to have been another distinct group based on the liberties they enjoyed. As was the case with the *parici*, they were not free and could not move around freely. It can be presumed that they did not have land of their own, since they were working on the fields of the local lord. In contrast to the *parici*, slaves were

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-35.

¹⁴⁵ Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolofos', pp. 132-134.

¹⁴⁶ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', p. 53.

not bound to a settlement. They could be sold and transferred at will by their lord. Nonetheless, according to Angel Nicolaou-Konnari, they were assimilated to the local Greek population.¹⁴⁷ A very good example with regard to this group, is the account of Walter of Brienne. On his estate, there were nineteen individuals, thirteen adults and six children. Unfortunately, there is no mention of their race. Two of them, who according to Edouard Poncelet were sold for a small amount of money, could have been Egyptians. In 1356, four more slaves were acquired. They were all Turks who had travelled from Naples to Cyprus. Based on the records, their travel expenses along with their food for eighteen days were paid from the revenues of the estate. The slaves must have worked in the fields, cultivating grain, while the harvest was given to their lord. It could be suggested that there were also some *parici* and/or *farncomati*, a few of them are already mentioned in the document, residing in the villages as well.¹⁴⁸

The Venetian authorities, after Cyprus became a Venetian dominion at the end of the fifteenth century, maintained the same social structure for the rural population.¹⁴⁹ As many official Venetian reports of the period inform us, the rural population represented over 80% of the total population of the island.¹⁵⁰ With the exception of some minority groups, such as the Maronites and the gypsies, this peasantry was overwhelmingly Greek, divided into *parici* and *francomati*. They lived in villages, smaller ones, the *prastii* (up to 100 persons) or larger ones, the *casali*. These villages were the property of the state (the majority), the Church (bishoprics or monasteries) or of a landlord. The state's fiefs were sometimes rented to nobles or *cittadini*, who usually lived in the cities, and therefore peasants were under the control of the lord's officials. The peasants' main occupation was the cultivation of land and husbandry. They were not able to own land as property, therefore they either worked on the *despotica*, the estates of the landlord, or they rented some other fields in the village.¹⁵¹ The rented property was passed on to the peasants' descendants. The lands of the estate, apart from the arable and cultivated fields which were usually lands of the owner, included meadows and forests within or near its boundaries. Unlike the situation in western Europe and Byzantium, the social categories of the Cypriot peasantry are clearly demarcated. The terms *parico* and *francomato* are used in the documents in order to identify the peasant attached to the land and the free tenant.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁴⁸ Poncelet, 'Compte du domaine de Gautier de Brienne', pp. 7-8.

¹⁴⁹ B. Arbel, 'Roots of Poverty and Sources of Richness in Cyprus under Venetian Rule', in Ch. Maltezos, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, p. 352.

¹⁵⁰ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', p. 508; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*.

¹⁵¹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', p. 510.

Francomato, was a term used only in Lusignan and Venetian Cyprus. It derives from the French words *franc* and *homme* with the addition of the Greek ending *-atos*.¹⁵² Several official documents as well as Donà record the term.¹⁵³ Francesco Attar explains the meaning of the term by providing alternatives: “lefteroi cioè liberi, altri li chiamano Francomati”.¹⁵⁴ This group of the lower stratum of society was larger than that of the *parici*. The first mention of their numbers was in a 1523 report, according to which there were 78,532 of them. Over subsequent years their numbers decreased by 15,000, but in a census conducted in 1569 they were again up to 70,000.¹⁵⁵ Surprisingly the term *francomato* is not recorded in the documents of Marathasa. The few free tenants mentioned are designated as *libero/libera* (table 17). It appears that the settlements were mainly settled by *parici* throughout this period. According to another *pratico* of 1565, the population of *francomati* was still low, 69 individuals. In Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon there were only seven, in Cato Platis four, in Ano Plati three, in Milo de Chicho one, in San Zorzi thirty, in Agro nine, in Gatani ten and in Tris Eglies five. The term *francomato* is used in both KK and AR documents. Two of them are mentioned in Kato Koutrafas, a male called Lois in and the father of an illegitimate child (no. 34). The third was recorded in Aradippo census. He was a priest to whom a *parico* was given (no. 127). It is widely acknowledged that *francomati* enjoyed better conditions than the *parici*. For example they could move wherever they wanted without the permission of a lord.¹⁵⁶ As Arbel states “apparently, at least in the eyes of the elites, poverty and misery were not associated with the status of *francomato*”.¹⁵⁷ Still, *francomati* had to pay taxes to the state, such as the one for salt, give a portion of their production to their lord, and were forced to either work ten days a year unpaid or pay five *bezants*.¹⁵⁸

The other group of the lower social stratum were the *parici* or *parichi*, mentioned in several documents.¹⁵⁹ Florio Bustron explains the term in his ‘Historia’:

¹⁵² Nicolaou-Konnari, ‘Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική’, footnote 13, p. 55.

¹⁵³ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46. f. 29^r; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 511.

¹⁵⁴ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46. f. 29^r.

¹⁵⁵ D. Jacoby, ‘Phénomènes de Démographie Rurale à Byzance aux XIIIe, XIVE et XVe siècles’, *Études rurales*, n. 5-6, 1962, pp. 165-166; Arbel, ‘Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule’, table VI: The Free Tenants (Francomati) Population.

¹⁵⁶ Arbel states that they could not move around freely, but this is probably a hypothesis based on one document. Arbel, ‘Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία’, p. 516.

¹⁵⁷ Arbel, ‘Roots of Poverty and Sources of Richness in Cyprus’, p. 353.

¹⁵⁸ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, p. 93.

¹⁵⁹ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, pp. 517-518.

“Il Parico è vocabolo greco, tratto da παρα του οίκου, che vuol dire huomo obligato star appresso la casa, che non si può partir da quella casa, ovvero casale, senza licentia de patron di quel casale.”¹⁶⁰

Attar also referred to the term:

“Parici, che viene a dire forestieri habitatori.”¹⁶¹

The majority of the *parici* belonged to the *Real*, i.e. they were the property of the state. Therefore, the government was instructed to conduct censuses in order to check their numbers. The first mention of their numbers may be found in an official report from the year 1516, when the *parici* numbered 27,000. Their numbers continued to increase throughout the sixteenth century, but never exceeded that of the *francomati*. The *parici* were supposed to be recorded in the village's *catastico* as the estate's property.¹⁶² Consequently, since two of the documents examined (MR2, KK) are *pratici*, it is clear that the population they record were *parici*. They were attached to the land of their birth and residence. They lived in villages, which were either inhabited by *parici* only or by *parici and francomati*. A number of official reports to the Venetian authorities emphasise the bad conditions they lived in and the harshness of their fiscal obligations. Up to their sixties, *parici* had to pay several taxes to the State as well as to the landlord in addition to doing forced labour on the lord's land and for military purposes. Since they made up the majority of the population, the rural population and their obligations to the state were economically vital to Venice. Throughout the sixteenth century the Venetian authorities tried to protect them from the abusive behaviour of the lords. Some *parici* were able to buy their freedom by paying a fixed sum. Moreover, the Council of Ten reduced some taxes as well as the days of the *angaria*, the forced labour. Amongst the *parici* there were a few landless ones, the *mistarkoi* or *mistargoï*. *Parici* were subject to the justice of their lord and they could not leave the fief without the permission of their master. The examination of the documents studied in this thesis has provided the researcher with further information about this section of the medieval Cypriot society.

¹⁶⁰ ‘Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro’, p. 461.

¹⁶¹ F. Attar, ‘Mémoire sur l'île de Chypre’, in L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire de l'île de Chypre: sous le regne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, vol. III, Paris, A l'Imprimerie imperial, 1861, p. 520.

¹⁶² Arbel, ‘Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία’, p. 512.

5 Historical Geography and Topography

A thorough examination of the local rural population cannot be carried out based only on the historical sources. Human beings live in a complex environment, both natural and cultural. This environment, has a direct impact on human life over time, shaping choices and leading to changes, always based on social values. These values are inherited from previous generations, but they are also determined by current circumstances. People are inclined to adapt to the landscape of the location in which they live and make changes based on their needs. They shape the natural landscape by building their houses, setting up markets and constructing trade routes, to make their living conditions more convenient. Despite that, the natural environment, as a dominant force has also always had a very important impact on shaping people's lives. Thus, this interaction between the local population and the landscape in which they live can provide a researcher with a good deal of new information and could possibly lead to a more comprehensive study of their lives.

The main focus of this thesis is on the socioeconomic aspects of rural life based on data extracted from the documents. Aside from the KK manuscript, which provides a few additional details about the settlement and the surrounding land, both the MR and AR documents focus on the population. In my investigation of the social networks established between the locations, based on the movement of *parici* from one settlement to another, several questions arose. One of my most important concerns was to examine the actual interaction between the settlements in each area. Were there other links between the nine villages of Marathasa besides the social networks? Which, if any, of these settlements was the primary one? Was there any interaction between the area under examination and the settlements in the vicinity? Similar issues of uncertainty emerged in respect of the area of Aradippou. Was this village the chief settlement in the area? Were there any links with other locations in the surrounding district? How might these links have affected the development of these settlements? And most importantly how did the physical environment affect the *parici*'s decisions and living conditions? In trying to answer some of the above questions it is important to make a comparative study of all the factors that led to the relative importance of each settlement. Focusing on the documents examined, these questions could be answered to some extent by looking into population numbers and the communities' interrelations due to family ties. Nonetheless, owing to a substantial lack of archaeological evidence, the majority of the conclusions would be purely assumptions; ergo another complementary approach is required.

5.1 The Issue

Examining a variety of documents, such as those of Marathasa, Kato Koutrafas and Aradippou, was rewarding in every way. Thanks to the abundance of information regarding settlements located either in the area with which each document deals or generally on the island, several theories may be established. Furthermore, despite their dissimilarities in context, a comparison of these three documents, all created in the same period, may lead to valuable conclusions. Combined with a possible archaeological study of the area, the evidence of the documents may shed light on hitherto unknown aspects of life in Venetian Cyprus.

However, for the purposes of attempting to identify settlements, the documents are not particularly clear, especially concerning exact locations. Being censuses, the MR2 and AR manuscripts are by their nature more focused on the population than on describing places. The settlements that are mentioned are mostly just a *parico*'s birthplace or current place of residence; aside from the name of the lord, who is the owner of the land, no further information is given. Moreover, though most of the villages mentioned in the documents are known, there are a few unidentified settlements.¹⁶³ In addition, since settlements often developed and changed over time, some of the locations noted in MR2 and AR are separate settlements that later merged to become one village. As will be explained below, two or three different settlements of the Venetian period may well have merged into one village that still exists today.

On the other hand, the KK document says a lot about the area. As mentioned above, the first part of the manuscript is a description of the village boundaries, including cultivated land and the small nearby settlement of Mandres. Even though the settlement's borders were defined in relation to movable objects or ones that are difficult to identify now, like rocks or trees, the team of TAESP archaeologists who surveyed the Troodos mountains managed to identify the Venetian village of Kato Koutrafas.¹⁶⁴ The team drew on the valuable study by Gilles Grivaud on deserted villages in Cyprus.¹⁶⁵ Grivaud actually referred to data recorded in the KK document, then unpublished. So the TAESP team was able to combine all this data to draw some valuable conclusions regarding the size of the settlement and the surrounding land,¹⁶⁶ information recorded in the survey's outcomes. Unfortunately, these conclusions were not combined with other relevant information provided by the written source, such as the

¹⁶³ For a complete analysis of Cypriot settlements: M. Christodoulou and K. Konstantinidis (ed.), *A complete gazetteer of Cyprus*, Nicosia, Cyprus Permanent Committee for the Standardization of Geographical Names, 1987, <http://www.geonoma.gov.cy/myfiles/ekdoseis/cygazetteer> (Accessed 15/10/2018).

¹⁶⁴ M. Given et al., *Landscape and interaction: the Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Survey Project, Cyprus*, with contributions by Hugh Corley, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2013, pp 338-339.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 338.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 338-339.

composition of the population of the area, including the family networks that will be presented below. In addition, several other details, such as descriptions of the buildings and especially the two churches, the *chanuta* (tavern) and the mill were not used. On the other hand, information about the land, whether cultivated or not, was given in the form of a table.¹⁶⁷ Through a comparative study of all the *parici* of an area and the people who profited from it, a possible model can be created. I shall attempt to do this by combining the outcomes of the census, the data on land and the relevant information on agriculture mentioned by Florio Bustron in his *Ordine della Secreta*.

5.2 Sources

Since the information regarding the settlements is rather scattered, sources must be reviewed if reliable conclusions are to be drawn. Nonetheless, narrative historical texts on Latin Cyprus only allude vaguely to some of the settlements under examination here, such as Marathasa. Information concerning locations often appears in relation to a historical event, such as a battle, or to the owner of the land. Other than that, only a few insignificant descriptions concerning settlements during the Lusignan period can be found. One exception is Florio Bustron's *Historia*, which includes information on some villages and their lords from 1464 to 1468. Several of the locations mentioned stayed in the hands of the same family during the Venetian period.¹⁶⁸ The collection of manuscripts written by Leonardo Donà, mentioned above, is another source. Leonardo travelled all around the island collecting information, copied several other manuscripts from the state's *Secreto* and recorded a large number of villages throughout the eleven *Contrade*. Unfortunately, this type of document, more akin to a *Relazione*, provides only the names. Similarly, reports sent to Venice by the *luogotenente* often mention the regions and their villages, as stated above. Nevertheless, these reports do not provide specific information on the locations and their size apart from general references to cultivated land and the population of each region.

To fill in the blanks, these sources must be cross-referenced with contemporary maps of the island, particularly those of the Venetians Matheo Pagano and Camocio. The two almost identical maps, known as 'Isola de Cipro' (1538) and 'Cyprus Insula Nobilissima' (1566) respectively,¹⁶⁹ feature many locations on the island, written either in their Byzantine or Italian form. The editors of 'The History of the Cartography of Cyprus' Andrea and Judith Stylianou,

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 338.

¹⁶⁸ 'Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro', pp. 417 - 424.

¹⁶⁹ A. Stylianou and J. Stylianou, *The History of the Cartography of Cyprus*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1980, p. 16.

claim Pagano's was the most concise map of the island until 1570;¹⁷⁰ this would be true if their study had not omitted the map of Leonida Attar (figure 10). This extremely accurate map, completed in 1542, contains over 721 locations, including 656 settlements and nearly all the *prastii* and *casale* of the MR, KK and AR manuscripts. Attar, who probably had access to the island's archives, was able to meander around Cyprus like Leonardo Donà, gathering important data in situ, i.e. in the settlements themselves. In fact, he placed every one of them relatively accurately on his map (figure 11). For greater precision, he chose to represent the *prastii* and *casale* with five different types of sketches depending on the settlement's size.¹⁷¹ The map, along with notes and information regarding Attar himself, was published by Francesca Cavazzana-Romanelli and Grivaud in 2004. As the most up-to-date and accurate, the map of Leonida Attar was the only one used for this thesis.

In addition to Attar's map, Grivaud examined almost all the other sources concerning this period. In his large-scale study of the villages and localities of Cyprus from the twelfth to the nineteenth century, Grivaud collated all the aforementioned documents, including KK, as mentioned above, in order to trace the history of all the known settlements in Cyprus. Villages are recorded according to region and a number of other criteria, such as whether they were deserted, or are still inhabited today, villages with two names such as Pano and Kato Koutrafas, etc. Grivaud primarily refers to a manuscript, which was also used by the TAESP team of archaeologists to support the results of their survey. He also includes descriptions of buildings.

5.3 Casal or Prastio

Before moving on to a description of the settlements examined, some terminology must be clarified. As Grivaud has demonstrated at length, terms indicating the size of a settlement go back to the island's Byzantine period. Several expressions were used at that time: *kome/κώμη*; *chorion/χωριόν*, words used to describe a large settlement or a village; and *prasteio/πραστειό* meaning a small hamlet with a few families living in it. The above terms were inherited by the new owners of Cyprus, the Lusignans, and afterwards the Venetians; during the Latin period a *chorion* was known as a *casal*, also meaning a large settlement, and *prasteio* became *prastio*, a smaller one.¹⁷² The same distinction is made by Florio Bustron, the author of the Marathasa census. In his list of frequently used terms in his *Historia*, he notes:

“*Casale*, chiamato le ville di fuora.”

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁷¹ Cavazzana-Romanelli and Grivaud, *Cyprus 1542: The Great Map of the Island*, p. 134.

¹⁷² Grivaud, ‘Villages désertés à Chypre’, pp. 38-41.

“*Prastii* sono alcuni casaletti piccolo, quali sono pertinentie de casali grandi.”¹⁷³

Though the distinction seems clear, the two terms were widely misused by sixteenth-century writers and copyists. For instance, in the ca. 1523 report most recently published by Ekaterini Aristeidou, the scribe lists all settlements as *casali*. Among the four documents examined here, MR1 and MR2 are the only ones that employ this terminology. Given that Florio Bustron, one of the *Secreto*'s chief officers, was the supervisor of this project, we may safely assume that the correct terms are used for the description of these settlements. Moreover, information concerning the size and other details about the locations in these documents agree with those given on contemporary maps, specifically the one by Leonida Attar.

5.4 Locations

In order to identify the villages and place them on a map, one of the main goals of this thesis, a comparison of all of the above sources is indispensable (figures 12 and 13).

5.4.1 Aradippou

The municipality of Aradippou is located in the province of Larnaca, in southern Cyprus (figure 14). Its name derives most probably from the first settler, Radippos. Today, almost 20,000 people live in the area and Aradippou is the second largest municipality of the island in terms of land area. It borders on the city of Larnaca to the south, Kellia and Livadia to the east, Avdelero and Troulloi to the north-east and Kalo Chorio Larnacas to the west. The settlement was built in a valley next to some small hills to the north and the sea to the south. Today, the majority of the settlement's land to the south is an urban zone but land on the slopes, mainly on the north side, is used for cultivation and animal husbandry. The main entry point to the area, the well-known roundabout of *Rizoelia*, is on this side of Aradippou. According to locals, due to the higher altitude, their ancestors used to live on this side, where they could observe the bay to the south. In fact, this is the only location in the area with a clear view of the Larnaca Bay to the south, Dekelia Bay to the east and even the harbour of Kition to the west. Just to the west of the Rizoelia roundabout there is a small forest, the only area in Aradippou with dense vegetation.

A village may have existed in this area as long ago as the Iron Age as part of the administrative district of Kition, but the first official reference to the settlement was recorded in the Lusignan period. Aradippou became the property of Margarita Lusignan, wife of Emanuel Kantakouzinou, Lord of Morea, probably after 1353.¹⁷⁴ Throughout that time,

¹⁷³ 'Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro', p. 462.

¹⁷⁴ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 4, p. 17.

Aradippou was a summer resort for the royal family, since a palace or a mansion was built there. According to the archaeologists, the estate was built in a central location, on a small hilltop. Excavation and construction work in the area of the primary school brought to light new evidence of this. As recorded in the narrative sources, a battle between the king's army and the Saracens took place in the area in 1425.¹⁷⁵ While only a few people died in this battle, the palace was completely destroyed.

During the Venetian period, due to its size and position, Aradippou became one of the most important settlements on the island. In fact, as reported in a document published by Aristeidou, in 1521 it was one of the most expensive villages to acquire (10,673 ducats).¹⁷⁶ This information comes from a document concerning Eugenio, one of the most prominent members of the Synglitico family, and his request to buy the settlement.¹⁷⁷ As mentioned in a letter sent in February 1521, the Council of Ten reconsidered his offer. Eugenio must have paid this amount, since, as noted in the document preceding the *catastico*, Aradippou belonged to the Count of Roucha, a title that Eugenio had also purchased. The settlement is cited in the 1523 report as an *embalio*, an administrative district, consisting of Aradippo, Gieguaiois, Tridiatos, S. Zorzi, Chitti, Menevu, Larnacha, Vromolaxia, Vudas and Agrinu.¹⁷⁸ Leonida Attar's map also mentions Aradippou, placing it in the *Contrada* Saline (figure 15). The cartographer depicted the settlement as a house with a tower attached on the left, a symbol that indicates a village.

5.4.2 *Kato Koutrafas*

The village of Kato Koutrafas is situated in the Nicosia district, 38 km, from the capital (figure 16). The name of the settlement, formerly Koutrafas, is believed by some to come from the surname of the first settler, named *κουτρούβιν*, another name for a caper plant.¹⁷⁹ A second, completely incorrect, theory says the name comes from the Latin word *scutra* (the forehead), which could have been the surname of the village's owners during the Frankish period. A third theory proposes the Greek word *κούτρα*, i.e. head or forehead. If this is true, then a settlement

¹⁷⁵ 'Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro', pp. 357-358.

¹⁷⁶ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 4, p. 17.

¹⁷⁷ On the Synglitico family see Ch. Maltezos, 'Νέες ειδήσεις περί Ευγενίου Συγκλητικού εκ των Κρατικών Αρχείων της Βενετίας', in T. Papadopoulos and M. Christodoulou (eds.), *Πρακτικά του Πρώτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 14-19 Απριλίου 1969)*, vol. 3: Νεώτερον Τμήμα. Ιστορία-Γεωγραφία, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 1973, pp. 227-244; B. Arbel, 'Greek Magnates in Venetian Cyprus: The Case of the Synglitico Family', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 49, Symposium on Byzantium and the Italians, 13th-15th Centuries, 1995, pp. 325-337.

¹⁷⁸ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 510; Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 4, p. 288.

¹⁷⁹ N. Klirides, *Χωριά και πολιτείες της Κύπρου: για να γνωρίσουμε την Κύπρο μας*, Nicosia, (n.p.), 1961, p. 119.

with this particular name had existed since the Byzantine period.¹⁸⁰ The division between *kato* (lower) and *ano* (upper) Koutrafas, suggests that the village was probably once united (figure 17). However, the location is listed as Kato Koutrafas in both the MR2 and KK manuscripts, as well as in reports and maps of the Venetian era.¹⁸¹ Over time the settlement of Mandres, mentioned in the documents examined here, was attached to Kato Koutrafas. In between these two locations there is a lot of uncultivated land, divided in two by the Elias river and its tributaries. Throughout most of its history, Mandres was uninhabited for most of the year, since it was used mainly at harvest-time by the locals. Today, only a small part of Kato Koutrafas is inhabited, while Ano Koutrafas, abandoned since 1964, is located within the buffer zone between the Republic of Cyprus and the area occupied by Turkey.¹⁸²

The area surrounding Kato Koutrafas is definitely not agriculturally rich or fertile. However, in medieval times inhabitants did grow grapes, olive trees, citrus fruits and grain. The settlement appears to have been the property of several landlords. Florio Bustron records that *Cutrafas* was one of the villages that King James II gave to Gioan Tafure¹⁸³ between 1464 and 1468, while *Cutrafades*, later to become Ano Koutrafas, was given to Ser de Naves.¹⁸⁴ During the early Venetian period the settlement belonged to the Count of Edessa/Rochas, Morf de Grenier.¹⁸⁵ When he died with no male heirs in 1501 his property was inherited by the state. A few years later the *Regimento* requested an account of the inherited land, buildings and population; this census was conducted by Francesco Zacharia. The results were verified by Piero Urri, Jacomo de Negron and Hugo Lusignan who signed the document published in this thesis. A document sent by the Council of Ten on 9 September 1513 refers to the settlement and its possible acquisition by Philippo Flatro. As Aristeidou notes, the Council decided not to accept Flatro's offer. In the aforementioned letter, they ordered the government of Cyprus to inform Philippo of their decision. This decision was unexpected, since, as stated in the same letter, Venice was in need of money. This shortfall would be addressed in the next two years by emancipating some *parici*. During the same period, many other nobles sought to purchase villages for extremely large amounts of money, as was the case for Aradippou. This decision of the Council of Ten not to sell the village to Flatro was very unexpected. Despite being in need of funds at the time, they preferred to reduce the manpower on some estates by

¹⁸⁰ A. Pavlides (ed.), *Μεγάλη Κυπριακή Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, vol. 9, Nicosia, Φιλόκυπρος, 1988, pp. 302-303.

¹⁸¹ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 506.

¹⁸² Pavlides, *Μεγάλη Κυπριακή Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, vol. 9, p. 302.

¹⁸³ The others were villages in the surrounding area, Chio, Lassa and Claudia. 'Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro', p. 417 and p. 422.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 417-418.

¹⁸⁵ He already possessed other settlements in the vicinity, such as Lurichina, Arlanda and Agridia, *Ibid.*, p. 422.

emancipating *parici* rather than sell Kato Koutrafas. This reaction tells us something about the production and the income provided by the village, which may have been more beneficial and valuable in the long term.

Louis de Mas Latrie states that the settlement belonged to the Count of Rochas in 1523, the year of the Venetian report edited by Aristidou.¹⁸⁶ This may seem confusing, since the Count of Rochas at that time was Eugenio Synglitico, as previously noted. There is no other documentation confirming who owned the settlement. The village is also mentioned in MR2 as the birthplace of the wife of Chiriaco (no. 414), a *xenotelis* of Peristerona who moved to *Cato Cutrafas*. Since there is no other reference to a lord, it may be assumed that Kato Koutrafas was still the property of Venice in 1549.

5.4.3 *Marathasa*

The extremely rich Marathasa valley is located in the Troodos mountains. It consists of fourteen villages; nowadays eight belong to the district of Nicosia and six to the district of Limassol.¹⁸⁷ Its name derives from *marathos* (fennel), an indigenous Mediterranean perennial herb which flourished in the area,¹⁸⁸ and the tributary of the Setrachos River that runs close to the valley.¹⁸⁹

The area is mentioned in several medieval Cypriot chronicles, which refer either to *Μαραθάσα*¹⁹⁰ or *Μαραθάσες*.¹⁹¹ As Mas Latrie states, during the Venetian period, part of the valley was the private property of the Count of Edessa (*Baliazzo delle Marathasse del Conte*), and another part belonged to the royal estate (*Baliazzo delle Marathasse Real*)¹⁹², or simply *Marathassa Real*. The location was named Marathasa, (with various spellings e.g. Marathassa or Marathasse) and situated in the *Contrada* of Pendaya. The division into *Marathasse Real* and *Marathasse del Conte* still existed during the Venetian period; however, the settlements belonged to or were rented by several different nobles. The manuscript examined here speaks of a section of Marathasa that belonged to Antonio Audet and his heirs, members of the Chadit

¹⁸⁶ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 511; Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 4, p. 288.

¹⁸⁷ Pavlides (ed.), *Μεγάλη Κυπριακή Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, p. 305.

¹⁸⁸ N. G. Kyriazis, 'Παραδόσεις περί Τρουλλινού και Μαράθου', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, XI, I, 1935, p. 133.

¹⁸⁹ S. Menardou, 'Περί των τοπικών επιθέτων της νεωτέρας Ελληνικής', *Επετηρίς Εταιρίας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, V, 1928, p. 285.

¹⁹⁰ Λεοντίου Μαχαιρά, *Χρονικό της Κύπρου: παράλληλη διπλωματική έκδοση των χειρογράφων*, M. Pieris and A. Nicolaou-Konnari (eds.), Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2003, p. 86.

¹⁹¹ Τζώρτζης, (Μ)Πούστρους (Γεώργιος, Βο(σ)στρ(υ)ηνός ή Βουστρώνιος), *Διήγησις Κρονίκας Κύπρου*, G., Kechagioglou, (ed.), Texts and studies in the history of Cyprus 27, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1997, pp. 110 and 224.

¹⁹² Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, pp. 505-506.

and Cerchasso families.¹⁹³ As Jean Richard says, the Audets or Audeths were a family from Syria. Their wealth and their Arabic-Greek bilingualism earned several members of the family a place in the higher echelons of society, and some, including Antonio, were rewarded with Venetian citizenship.¹⁹⁴ During the reign of King Janus (1375- 1432), Antonio and his nephew John lent money to the king. In exchange, they received a share of *Marathassa Real*,¹⁹⁵ the part that had belonged to Marco Cornaro. The lands were not given as a fief, therefore the Audets were not the king's vassals. In 1443 another part of the fief was transferred to Thomas Mansel.¹⁹⁶ The king authorised the new owners to ordain priests and granted them several tax exemptions.

John Audet died in 1451, and bequeathed his property, together with usufruct of the settlements Knodara and Aglangia, to his widow, Antonio's adopted daughter.¹⁹⁷ Zaca Audet, Antonio's wife, inherited the area's remaining settlements. During the civil war between Carlotta and James, both widows were deprived of their legitimate endowments. As a result, Zaca sent a letter to the Venetian Authorities requesting compensation for the settlements, which were the family's only income.¹⁹⁸

The MR2 document states that the following eight *prastii* and one *casal* belonged to Chadit Chadit who was one of John and Antonio Audet's heir (the spelling of the manuscript is maintained):

Casal San Zuan de Ramo – Prodromo

Prastio Cato Plati

Prastio Ano Plati

Prastio Milo de Chicho

Prastio Milicuri

Prastio San Zorzi de Josifi

Prastio Agro

Prastio Gatani

Prastio Tris Eglies

¹⁹³ J. Richard, 'Une famille de 'Vénitiens blancs' dans le royaume de Chypre au milieu du XVème siècle: les Audet et la seigneurie du Marethasse', *Rivista di studi Bizantini e Slavi I*, Miscellanea Agostino Pertusi I, 1981, p. 95, footnote number 24.

¹⁹⁴ Lusignano, *Chorografia et brevis historia universale dell'Isola de Cipro*, p. 83.

¹⁹⁵ Richard, 'Une famille de 'Vénitiens blancs' dans le royaume de Chypre', p. 91.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

¹⁹⁷ J. Richard (ed.), *Le Livre des Remembrances de la Secrete du Royaume de Chypre, 1468- 1469*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1983, p. 208.

¹⁹⁸ D. Baglioni, *La scritta italo-romanza del regno di Cipro*, Edizione di testi di scrittori ciprioti del Quattrocento, Roma, Aracne, 2006, pp. 60-61.

Almost 70% of the recorded *parici* are listed under one of these nine settlements, even though they may not have lived there during the census. According to the scribal note on folio 47^r, the other 30% of the population were located in the *casali estranei* (outside villages, table 1 and figure 18). These settlements were in the same area, in the northern part of the valley, but did not belong to the Audet estate. Fortunately, Florio also sometimes gives the names of their owners, other noblemen.

Information regarding these nine settlements, the *casali estranei*, is fragmentary. Most of them are described as a *casal*, a term denoting a large settlement with many families. Apart from Galates, in which over fifty families originating from Audet's settlements are recorded, none of these villages have such a large number of families. A perfect example is the village of Lefcomiati, listed as a *casal* but with only one entry, Galinos Costi Gatani (no. 507) and his family. The information about the last settlement listed in the manuscript, Vasiglia, also seems peculiar. Four *parici* are recorded in this settlement, members of the Piru family: Zarla papa Jacomo Piru (no. 508), her son Jacomo (no. 509) and her brother Symeos (no. 511) along with a distant relative Fluri Philippu Piru (no. 510) all living in the house of their lord Marco Chadit in San Demeti.¹⁹⁹ Therefore, it can be assumed that the census of the *casali estranei* was not comprehensive. If he was only interested in the *parici* belonging to the heirs of Audet, the conductor of the census might have omitted the other inhabitants.

Another question which arose during the examination of MR1 and MR2 was whether the nine settlements, apparently the inheritance of Chadit and Cerchasso, were the only villages that Audet possessed in this area or not (table 2 and figure 19). Since purchasing or renting a settlement was common practice during the Venetian period, it may be presumed that Chadit and Cerchasso also owned other locations. Bearing in mind that several of the above 'outside' or 'external' settlements recorded in the documents were part of both *Marathasse Real* and *Marathasse del Conte*, this distinction seems problematic. Marathasa, as it existed in 1523, may have changed in the course of the census and settlements may have changed hands. Nevertheless, the sources were still using these terms to define the area.

5.4.3.1 *San Zuan de Ramon – Prodromo*

The first settlement mentioned in the manuscript is the *casal* San Zuan de Ramon (figure 20) or, as recorded elsewhere in the manuscript, Prodromo. The village, which still exists today with the same name, is located in the Troodos mountains, in the district of Limassol. Prodromos sits 1,380 m. above sea-level, the only village on the island built at such

¹⁹⁹ ASV, *Procuratori di S. Marco*, Misti, Busta 132, 'El Prattico dele Marathasse Real', f. 67^v.

a high altitude. It gets its name from the church in the older part of the settlement dedicated to Saint John the Baptist/Forerunner (*Prodromos*). Situated on the slopes of Mount Olympos, surrounded by the pine forests and mountain vegetation of the Troodos range, Prodromos is a very popular tourist destination. Since the early twentieth century, the village's main attraction has been the Veregaria hotel. Besides this local legend, visitors are also attracted by the amazing views over the green valleys on the west and north sides as well as the blue bays to the south.

The village can be divided into two; the older part located around the church of Ayios Ioannis Prodromos, and the newer settlement on the north side. According to Neokles Kyriazis, the church must have been built in 1773.²⁰⁰ The vast majority of the stone-built houses are placed amphitheatrically on the slopes, facing south. The small roads and paths within the village are extremely narrow, following the direction of the hillsides. Today, about a hundred people live in the area but, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the population was of a considerable size (over 500 inhabitants). Locals have always worked on their land, vineyards and orchards. Others were employed in small-scale local industries, while a number of them worked in the local mine.

People living in this area in 1500 were in awe beholding the impressive mountain to the east and the green valleys on the south and west, including the nearby villages of Treis Elies and Lemithou. The number of *parici* recorded in this settlement as well as the fact that it is the only one described as a *casal* suggest that Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon was the biggest village in the area. In view of that, the village was undoubtedly the administrative centre for the Audet family and its heirs.

5.4.3.2 *Cato and Ano Plati*

These two settlements were possibly one village, Platis, that no longer exists. As Grivaud notes, Cato (lower) Platis was a settlement recorded in documents written between 1521 and 1565, relating to the village of Mylikouri (figure 21).²⁰¹ According to a local tradition there were seven different villages in this area which eventually merged into one or possibly two. The villages were deserted not later than 1800.²⁰² Kyriazes refers to three churches and one monastery located in the area as an indication that Platis was a large settlement. Unfortunately, we do not know when these were built, but it could be assumed that there were

²⁰⁰ N. G. Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας*Πρόδρομος', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, ΙΑ, 1935, pp. 316-317.

²⁰¹ Grivaud, 'Villages désertés à Chypre', p. 201.

²⁰² N. G. Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Λεμίθου', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, ΙΑ, 1935, pp. 75-77; K. Kokkinoftas, *Χωριά και Μοναστήρια της Νότιας Μαραθάσας*, Nicosia, (n.p.), 1995, pp. 199-202.

at least one or two churches in the area. Following the road from the Paphos forest and Agios Nikolaos to the north through the Platis valley, a traveller will come across two of the most important medieval bridges in Cyprus. The stone-built, single-arched bridges of Tzelefos and Elia were placed over the river Diarizos. They were both constructed in the Venetian period connecting the settlements on the west to those on the east, as well as to the main Paphos road. These Venetian bridges, which are a very popular attraction today, appear to have been very important to the population of the area. As a matter of fact, there are waiting points on each side of the Tzelefos bridge, which could have served as toll booths. Thus a small settlement could have developed near the bridges and that settlement could have been Platis, Ano and Kato.

Both locations, Apano, another word for Ano, and Cato Platis, are mentioned in the 1523 report as part of *Marathasse Real*, but no further information concerning their size is given.²⁰³ Leonida Attar's map omits the two settlements, since they are located in the mountains. However there are a few small symbols with unknown names that could refer to Ano and Cato Plati. The locality still exists today as the Platis Valley.

5.4.3.3 *Milo de Chico*

Milo de Chico, perhaps, given its name, a settlement connected to a mill near the monastery of Kykkos, is one of the smallest villages in the *catastico*. Most of the families living in Milo de Chico were descendants of Stefano Monacho. Unfortunately, neither the 1523 report nor Attar's map include this settlement. Grivaud suggests that Milo de Chico was a village in the vicinity of Mylikouri (figure 22).²⁰⁴ As appears to have been the case for Platis, Milo de Chico was probably abandoned, and the population moved to the nearest village. The village was also mentioned as the property of the Kykkos monastery in 1553.²⁰⁵

5.4.3.4 *Millicuri*

Mylikouri (or Millicuri as mentioned in the examined documents) is another settlement which still exists today (figure 23). As previously noted, several other abandoned settlements were linked to this village. Nearchos Klirides and after him Grivaud suggest that its name derives either from a plant, or from combining the names of two other settlements, Mylon and Kourion.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 506; Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 4, p. 4.

²⁰⁴ Grivaud, 'Villages désertés à Chypre', pp. 143, 203, 212, 216 and 470.

²⁰⁵ G. Grivaud, 'Le monastère de Kykkos et ses revenus en 1553', *Studi Veneziani* n. s. 16, 1990, p. 225-254.

²⁰⁶ Klirides, *Χωριά και πολιτείες της Κύπρου*, p. 172.

The village is located at 800 m. above sea level and belongs to the district of Nicosia. The settlement has always been related to the Kykkos Monastery which is about 4 km. to the north. On that account, some inhabitants of Mylikouri worked on the monastery's lands while others entered the monastery as monks. The settlement was built on the slopes next to the Platis Valley. Due to its location, the village is surrounded by rich vegetation and streams. The traditional stone houses were arranged in the form of an amphitheatre and there is an ancient plane tree right in the middle of the settlement. There are two churches in the village, the first dedicated to Saint George and the second to Saints Andronicos and Athanasia. Other than in the Platis Valley the landscape is quite mountainous. Much like other settlements in the area, there is a limited amount of cultivated land. The inhabitants worked in vineyards and gardens as well as producing some traditional local products.

During the Venetian period it is recorded as Milicuri or Millicuri. The author of the 1523 report states that Milichuri was part of *Marathasse Real*.²⁰⁷ Despite its being one of the biggest settlements in the area, Leonida Attar does not include it in his map. He shows some settlements in the same location, probably Mylikouri and the surrounding hamlets, but he omits to mention their names. That may have been a chance omission. Nonetheless, given the cartographer's usual accuracy and his efforts to include as many settlements as possible, not putting these villages in is peculiar. A rational explanation could be their location and accessibility in the Venetian period. Attar might have been unaware of some details about this specific area because he was not able to visit it. Thus, he did not include any description on his map.

5.4.3.5 *San Zorzi de Josifi*

Another large settlement recorded in the manuscript is San Zorzi de Josifi. The location might have taken its name from a church dedicated to Saint George (figure 24). A location named San Zorzi in *Marathasse Real* appears in the 1523 report,²⁰⁸ but there is no further information on the village in either Attar's map or in the other documents examined. Grivaud suggests that it may have been deserted during this period. It is the only village mentioned in the MR manuscripts that cannot be linked to a wider area or a present locality. There are two possible locations. The first is situated to the west of Lemithou and north of Treis Elies. Today a small church dedicated to Saint George exists in the area. A Venetian settlement could have been situated there, connecting Agros with Treis Elies. The second possible location is to the

²⁰⁷ Mas Latrerie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 506.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 506.

east of Treis Elies and north of Agios Demetrios. According to local tradition, this area was called *Καπουράλλης* and it had a church dedicated to Saint George.²⁰⁹

5.4.3.6 *Agro*

The second largest settlement of the area was Agros. The name of this settlement is rather confusing. As Grivaud says, Esso and Exo Agros were connected to the village of Lemithou (figure 25). Both Agros and Lemidou appear in the 1523 report as part of the Count of Edessa's Marathasa. On the other hand, a settlement named Esso Agros is also mentioned in the report as part of *Marathasse Real*.²¹⁰ It may thus be deduced that in 1523 Agros, Esso Agros and Lemidou were three different settlements.

Most probably, the three settlements were at some point made into one named Lemithou. Today the village is located very close to Prodromos (less than 4 km. away to the east) and there is also a hiking trail between the two villages. Like Prodromos, it is built at a very high altitude, 880 m. above sea level, being one of the ten highest settlements on the island. The village can be divided into four smaller neighbourhoods, which could be identified as the smaller Venetian settlements of Agros, Esso and Exo and Livadi, another small village mentioned in the documents. Today, there are four churches in the village. The two larger churches are within the settlement, the first, which is the newest one (built in 1721 and renovated in 1908), is dedicated to the Virgin Mary and the second, the oldest one (sixteenth century), is dedicated to Saint Theodoros. According to Kyriazes, there was an older church dedicated to the Virgin Mary, which collapsed, the ruins of which were visible until 1900.²¹¹ This was the main church of the village of Agros. The church of Saint Theodoros, on the other hand, is one of the oldest in the area. Kyriazes dates the year of its construction to 1550, based on an inscription found on an icon.²¹² Aggeliki Pieridou, on the other hand, rejects this suggestion.²¹³ The other two churches are smaller and located in the surrounding area. The church dedicated to Saint Nicolas appears to have been the main church of the settlement of Livadi²¹⁴ while the church of Saint George on the east side could have been the second church for the settlement of Agros. The latter is the same church that was mentioned in relation to San

²⁰⁹ Kokkinoftas, *Χωριά και Μοναστήρια της Νότιας Μαραθάσας*, pp. 96-97.

²¹⁰ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, pp. 505-506.

²¹¹ Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας, Λεμίθου', p. 72.

²¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

²¹³ A. Pieridou, 'Τύποι και συνθέσεις από κυπριακές τοιχογραφίες του 15ου και 16ου αιώνα', *Κυπριακά Σπουδαί*, XII, 1948, p. 13.

²¹⁴ Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας, Λεμίθου', pp. 74-75.

Zorzi de Josifi. In that case it could be presumed that the settlements of Agros and San Zorzi de Josifi were in the same area.

The number of inhabitants has decreased steadily over the centuries. Despite the small numbers today (only 88 individuals in 2011), the population of Lemithou was, surprisingly, much larger (over 700 inhabitants) in the previous century. As one of Cyprus's 'wine villages', Lemithou is known for its vineyards and the local products derived from grapes, such as sweets and wine. Due to the small area of cultivable land, the local population grows fruit trees, vegetables and herbs. Like Prodromos, Lemithou is built amphitheatrically on the slopes. The stone-built houses are connected by small, narrow, paved paths. The view from the area is almost the same as that from Prodromos. On the east side there is Mount Olympos as well as the last houses of the nearby village. On the south, there is the valley, while on the west there are some smaller hills.

Again, the landscape must not have changed at all. Nonetheless the built areas might not have remained the same. When the census was being carried out the *prastio* of Agro was one of the villages owned by the Chercasso and Chadit families, while Lemidu, belonged to the *Real*, and is given as the birthplace of some of the *parici* listed in the survey. Livadi is also mentioned as the dwelling place of a few *parici*. Therefore, the *parici* living in Agros who are mentioned in the manuscript might have been living on the west side of Lemithou. The landscape in this part is slightly different. The mountain top and the valley are still visible to the east and the south respectively. Other than that, there are only mountains with lush greenery and forests surrounding the area. According to the sources, the three villages, Lemithou, Livadi and Agros, eventually merged into one before 1763.²¹⁵

5.4.3.7 *Gatani*

Prastio Gatani, or Agros tou Gatani, mentioned in the 1523 report as part of *Marathasse Real*,²¹⁶ is another small settlement listed in MR2 (figure 26). As Grivaud states, Gatani was a settlement next to Treis Elies that was abandoned after 1825.²¹⁷ Although this settlement is not explicitly recorded by Attar, an illustration probably depicting Agros tou Gatani, but unfortunately untitled, is found in that location.

²¹⁵ Ktirides, *Χωριά και πολιτείες της Κύπρου*, p. 142.

²¹⁶ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 506.

²¹⁷ Grivaud, 'Villages désertés à Chypre', pp. 202,261 and 470.

5.4.3.8 *Tris Eglies*

Treis Elies (or Tris Eglies as mentioned in the examined documents) in one of the three settlements discussed in the documents which is still inhabited (figure 27). As Klirides explains, its name comes from three olive trees that grew there. There is also another tradition concerning the name, which might have derived from the three icons of the Panayia *Ελεούσης*, the merciful.²¹⁸ A location with the same name appears in the 1523 report as part of *Marathasse Real*.²¹⁹

The village is built 845 m. above sea level and belongs to the district of Limassol. It adjoins Lemithou on the north-east, Mylikouri on the north-west, Kaminaria on the south-west and Agios Dimitrios on the south-east. The area is chiefly covered by pine trees and oaks as well as mountain scrub. Like the other settlements in the area, its traditional stone-built houses were placed amphitheatrically on the mountain slopes. The small neighbourhoods are linked via narrow paths going either up or downhill. The village is very popular due to the nature trail leading to Tzelefos bridge, a thermal spring as well as the ancient trees within the settlement. It also attracts pilgrims due to the four churches and the relics kept in them. According to the locals, the village has a very strong Greek Orthodox tradition. Over the last three centuries a large number of them have been ordained as priests while others, especially during the Ottoman period, were appointed bishops and even archbishop of Cyprus. There are two main churches in the area. The first dedicated to Saint Michael was built in 1730 while the second, dedicated to the Virgin Mary was built in 1740 over a pre-existing one.²²⁰

Over the past century, there has been a big fluctuation in population numbers. At some point there were over four hundred inhabitants in Treis Elies but today this number has decreased to less than sixty. Due to its location, surrounded by mountains, and with little cultivated land, the main occupations of the locals are the vineyards and traditional products made from grapes. Other than that, there are a few orchards and vegetable and herb gardens.

5.5 **Centrality and social networks**

Fortunately, both the MR documents as well as KK and AR provide modern researchers with a large number of specified and unspecified locations on the island. In the interests of subsequent research, localities mentioned in these documents were recorded in the *Heritage*

²¹⁸ N. G. Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Τρείς Ελιές', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, I, 1934, p. 191.

²¹⁹ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 506.

²²⁰ Kyriazis, 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Τρείς Ελιές', pp. 193-196.

Gazetteer of Cyprus.²²¹ Recording settlements on a map allowed a reconstruction of the area for the first time and, most importantly, provided a picture of any location that had previously been obscure. This opened up new avenues of archaeological and geographical research. Even though this kind of analysis needs time to produce substantial results, some very helpful preliminary conclusions can be drawn.

The main information extracted from the documents can be quite revealing as to the landscape of each area during the Venetian period. A more comprehensive study, based on indications provided by the manuscripts as well as evidence provided by an archaeological survey in the area, would lead to the most reliable results. Unfortunately, for the moment, the required archaeological evidence is unavailable since there has been no systematic field survey. However, a settlement's importance could be assessed using the concept of centrality. Each of the settlements examined, the nine villages of Marathasa, Aradippou and Kato Koutrafas, are locations with specific topological, chronological and chorological characteristics.²²² A thorough examination of these factors could result in more evidence. That research requires the use of two important theoretical models, central place theory and central flow theory.

The prominent theory of central places was introduced by Walter Christaller in his monograph, published in 1933. The German geographer was the first to consider a location, in his case a city, as part of a system and not as a single entity. His theory, which is purely based on economic factors, examines the importance of a settlement within a network of others. By identifying some key 'laws' such as the size, the distribution and the services provided, he establishes this settlement as a central place. This central place, in an isotropic world, is the main supplier of goods within a network with a perfect distribution. In an imaginary application the transportation costs are proportionated while the distance from other locations to the main market is equally measured. In addition, this central place accommodates all the central functions and provides the hinterland with services.²²³ Based on the functions available, a central place can be defined as a higher order centre or as a lower order centre. The former, can offer the network all the functions available from a lower centre and a few more specific ones. As result of this segregation, a second important element was introduced, the hierarchical

²²¹ "The overall aim of this project is to facilitate the use of a wide range of expertise in recording the historic geography of Cyprus," <http://www.cyprusgazetteer.org>.

²²² D. Knitter et al., 'Integrated centrality: A diachronic comparison of selected Western Anatolian locations', *Quaternary International*, 312, 2013, p. 45.

²²³ W. Christaller, *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, Jena, Germany, 1933, pp. 28-31; Knitter et al., 'Integrated centrality', p. 47; A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou, 'Central Place Theory Reloaded and Revised: Political Economy and Landscape Dynamics in the Longue Durée', *Land*, 8, 2019; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, p. 1.

organisation of settlements. This hierarchy, according to Christaller, is related to three core principles: the market, transportation and the administration.²²⁴ It is also important to note that the theory does not only refer to settlements. A central place could also be any institution, such as a market or a church. As long as this institution has central functions and provides the surrounding area with goods and commodities, then it can be considered a central place. Since then the theory of central places has been increasingly utilised and evolved to embrace a more comprehensive approach. The original theory is still of great importance, since scholars are still using the concept of centrality, as a result of several key factors.²²⁵

However, new approaches to the subject of central places have emerged. Of great importance is the theory of central flow, which should be examined together with the theory of central places. This theory focuses on the relationship between the settlements of a network deriving from the interaction between the populations. According to this, a central place is made up of a cluster of interactions, including any economic aspect.²²⁶ A central place, being a nodal point, can be a place of interaction, controlling the trade routes on a regional scale. Acting as a hub, a settlement is actively involved in long-distance traffic, hence a great number of tools and raw materials are likely to be found in there.²²⁷ For that reason, combining this type of archaeological evidence found in a survey with the theory of central flow could provide a more detailed picture of a nodal point and its significance. Nonetheless, when no such evidence is available, the theory could still be valuable in a first attempt at investigating a central place in relation to other places and analysing patterns of interaction.²²⁸

A third important factor in determining the centrality of a settlement is its physical environment. The location of a place and the availability of materials, arable land and, of course, access to clean water cannot be neglected.²²⁹ All of these elements are of primary importance when it comes to the centrality of a place. The natural world is not without effect

²²⁴ D. Knitter and O. Nakoinz, 'The Relative Concentration of Interaction - A Proposal for an Integrated Understanding of Centrality and Central Places', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, p. 24.

²²⁵ Vionis and Papantoniou, 'Central Place Theory Reloaded and Revised', p. 1.

²²⁶ Knitter and Nakoinz, 'The Relative Concentration of Interaction', p. 24.

²²⁷ J. M. Webb, 'Shifting Centres: Site Location and Resource Procurement on the North Coast of Cyprus over the Longue Durée of the Prehistoric Bronze Age', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, p. 84.

²²⁸ S. M. Sindbæk, 'Networks and nodal points: the emergence of towns in early Viking Age Scandinavia', *Antiquity*, 81, 2007, pp. 120-123.

²²⁹ Vionis and Papantoniou, 'Central Place Theory Reloaded and Revised', p. 1.

on people's actions. On the contrary, it may impinge upon their choices and undertakings.²³⁰ The landscape of each location indeed played a significant role in the development of all the settlements examined in this thesis, thus it will be given the appropriate consideration.

Even though a spatial analysis of the settlements mentioned in the documents needs more detailed study, a few conclusions can already be drawn. The TAESP team has done an excellent job in locating the Venetian settlement of Kato Koutrafas. Not far from its current location, the village in the Venetian period was in the middle of an area of economic importance. Linked to Ano Koutrafas in the south, Angolemi in the north, the small hamlet of Mandres and the village of Potami to the east, Kato Koutrafas might possibly have been a hub of social and economic activity (figures 28 and 29). Owing to its natural boundary, the Elias River, the location seems to have been ideal for agriculture.²³¹ Crops and harvests that were probably kept in warehouses next to Mandres could easily make their way first to Kato Koutrafas and then to the capital. In addition, the mill found by the TAESP team is another indicator of the settlement's importance.

Aradippou may have been a similar nodal point. The location of the village continues to this day to be in a privileged position with an ample supply of good farmland. It is placed in a geographically strategic position, having easy access in all directions (figure 30).²³² The village is situated between numerous smaller settlements, surrounded by good, cultivable land, and in the heart of an area of extensive commercial activity. Aradippou had been a key location since Lusignan times, as it is near the sea, and next to the *Salines* (salt lakes), another huge source of income and commercial centre for the Venetian government. The 1523 report listed *Aradippo* as an *embalio*, so it might have been the main village and the focus of activity among nine others. The large number of *parici* originating from Aradippou but recorded as inhabitants of another settlement clearly suggests that social networks were well developed in the area (figure 31).

Information provided by the two Marathasa documents is more revealing concerning networks not only on a local scale but also on a larger, regional scale. Nine settlements belonging to Audet were located in the southern part of the valley. Given that Audet's heirs possessed no other settlements in the area, it may be concluded that these nine locations were

²³⁰ L. Steel, 'Watery Entanglements in the Cypriot Hinterland', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 101 and 103.

²³¹ On the river and its location within the village see G. Papantoniou and A. K. Vionis, 'The River as an Economic Asset: Settlement and Society in the Xeros Valley in Cyprus', *Land*, 7, 2018; Steel, 'Watery Entanglements in the Cypriot Hinterland', p. 106.

²³² Knitter and Nakoinz, 'The Relative Concentration of Interaction', p. 26.

a complex of connected villages. In fact, situated in an area surrounded by mountains, and marked by three important monasteries, Kykkos in the north-west, Trikoukiotissa in the north-east and Trooditisa in the south-east, these settlements were somewhat isolated (figure 32). The environment here is of considerable importance. The villages are located between the forest of Paphos and the highest point of the Troodos mountains, within the Marathasa valley. The settlement farthest south, Treis Elies, has direct access to the main road leading to Paphos and the Limassol area. Myllikouri in the northwest could have direct access to the north coast of Cyprus through the Marathasa valley. Prodromos, on the other hand, is located next to Mount Olympus and has direct access to settlements in the east and to the villages of the Troodos mountains in the north, such as Galata, as well as to the main road leading to the capital. Ease of movement may have been hampered by the mountainous landscape, but the fact that it offered the area natural fortification was very advantageous for the local population. Today there is only one main road through the mountains connecting Prodromos to Treis Elies which is about 10 km. to the south. The same road links Prodromos to Myllikouri in the east, which is about 20 km. away. It is necessary to pass through Prodromos when going from Treis Elies to Myllikouri. That could also have been the case during the Venetian period but several nature trails in the area alongside the Diarizos River may argue against that. The fact that the famous Venetian bridges form part of these trails may indicate that there was another road next to the tributary of the Diarizos, the Platysriver, which led from Treis Elies to Platis Valley and Myllikouri.

San Zuan de Ramon or Prodromo, the only *casal* amongst the nine settlements, is situated at the northern entrance to the area. For several reasons Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon may have been a high-level central place and the nodal point of the area during the Venetian period (figure 33). Despite being in an un-central location, the settlement was built in a very advantageous position, since almost every road within this area passes through or next to it. In addition, any road leading to other areas in the vicinity also passed through Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon. The existence of extended social networks and the large number of *parici* who were moved from this village to others can be used to reach some conclusions. For example, several members of families originating from Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon, were living in Galata in 1549 mainly due to marriage. Thus, it could be assumed that many of them were regularly travelling from one settlement to the other. In moving around, they were no doubt bringing with them goods to be given to family members but also to be sold in the local market. These goods, which were placed in special ceramic containers, may have been transferred to other

local settlements and eventually reached other regions. Thus, Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon must have been the main nodal point in the area.

Another of the main factors indicating its importance is the density of population.²³³ The majority of the *parici* recorded in the documents either lived in or originated from this village. Over the centuries Prodromos was one of the biggest settlements in the area, just as it is nowadays. The geographic concentration of population could be seen as another indication of centrality. Apart from having a large population, the settlement appeared to be at the centre of several other institutions. One of its most important functions was the administration of the fief. Chadit and Frasenge, the owners of the area, most probably resided in the capital. Since they were away much of the time, they needed several representatives to act as administrators and to supervise any activity performed by the *parici*. They must have been locals who had a good knowledge of the area and the local population. As will be discussed below, members of the important Nomicu and Protopapa families (Protopapas, the head priest, and Nomicos, the area's notary), lived in Prodromo. Other 'officers', such as the *castellano*, responsible for production and general administration, probably also lived in this village. If that was the case, a communal building might have existed that acted as a warehouse for the surplus, but unfortunately there is no archaeological evidence to support this assumption. The document also refers to a mill which was called *tou Sotiros o Cambiotis*. Again, there is a lack of evidence as to the exact location of this mill, but it could have been very close to Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon. In addition, the settlement would have been a commercial centre. According to the document, a *chanuta*, a tavern which was also the main market area was situated in Livadi, the small settlement located next to Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon in the south-east. Some other indications of centrality could be related to cult since, apart from the church of Saint John the Baptist, the village is very close to the monastery of Trikoukkia. Last but not least, the settlement is also well fortified due to the physical boundaries provided by the mountains.

Mylikouri and Treis Elies were presumably smaller administrative, commercial and social hubs. As mentioned above, these two villages incorporated other small, nearby settlements during the Ottoman period. During the Venetian period, other smaller settlements such as Ano and Kato Platis and Gatani were probably relied on Mylikouri and Treis Elies. Both these settlements are in very strategic positions, with good connections to other areas of the island. Treis Elies has direct access to the Venetian bridges of Elias and Tzelefos. The *parici* of the Venetian period may have travelled from and to this area along what are now

²³³ *Ibid*, p. 27.

nature trails, taking advantage of the safety provided by the river.²³⁴ To a large extent, they may also have been centres of importance from a religious point of view. Treis Elies is surrounded by small churches while Mylikouri is only 4 km. from the Holy Monastery of the Virgin of Kykkos, one of the most important religious houses on the island. Thus, the local population probably visited this area at least once a year, during the religious festivals on 8th September (the birth of the Virgin) or on the 15th of August (the Dormition of the Virgin). Next to Mylikouri there were two smaller settlements called Ano and Kato Platis. According to the manuscript I examined there was another *chanuta* in this area. Mylikouri was also very close to Milo de Chico, the small settlement probably located near the Kykkos monastery. As indicated by its name, Milo de Chico probably had a mill for grinding grain. Both Mylikouri and Treis Elies were very important settlements in this fief during the Venetian period, being smaller hubs within a wider network. Their development and incorporation of other villages during the Ottoman period supports the assumption that they were central places, albeit on a lower level.

5.6 Conclusions

Despite being administrative documents focusing on the population, the manuscripts examined have a lot to offer. The *parici's* social activity is an aspect of life worth exploring, but in order to get more comprehensive information, more details are required. For that reason a correlation between the maps and archaeological evidence could be valuable in many ways. For example, the exact location of each settlement during the Venetian period could have remained obscure, but thanks to Leonida Attar's contemporary detailed map, there is an indication of the site of each village. As might be expected in Cyprus, the settlements examined are still located within the same area and have the same or almost the same names. Also, the information deduced concerning the locations and the identification of two specific types of settlements, the *casal* and the *prastio*, was another important factor. The terms, which were well explained by Florio Bustron in his 'Historia', are presented here in context as defining the size of a settlement. That has led to several other conclusions concerning each location and opens the way to a more comprehensive and detailed study. Such a project could easily be undertaken in respect of the settlement of Kato Koutrafas. A thorough cross-referencing of the archaeological data and the primary conclusions of this thesis could produce a detailed picture of the area during the Venetian period. More extensive research is also needed into the

²³⁴ K Ragkou, 'The Economic Centrality of Urban Centers in the Medieval Peloponnese: Late 11th–Mid-14th Centuries', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, p. 282.

chronological evolution of the settlements. A clearer picture of the sixteenth century is now available, but each location should be studied over a longer time scale. Despite several similarities between the settlements of the earlier period and today, the landscape in the villages examined here has changed to some extent. Aradippou would be a good example of the above. The village, which was of great importance as a central place during the period under examination, has altered. Human activity has had a significant impact on the environment and the size of the settlement. The built area has significantly increased, and a new industrial area has emerged. Nonetheless, the importance of the location remains almost the same, as a nodal point connecting the harbour of Larnaca to the mainland. Similarly, Kato Koutrafas is still within the same area of activity. The surrounding arable land is the main source of income and the village is still next to the road leading from the capital to the Troodos mountains. What has changed is the size of the village which has decreased significantly. By contrast, the landscape in Marathasa has not changed a lot. Being a very closed society, it appears to be mainly unaltered by time while later human activity has not erased reminders of earlier periods. Of course, urbanisation and mass migration to the cities or other countries has affected the population numbers, but the landscape remains almost the same. Prodromos is still a very important settlement in the area, proving the continuation of its centrality over time. Treis Elies and Mylikouri have also evolved by incorporating other settlements in the vicinity. The three villages are still a network of settlements, closely interrelated through their social and commercial activities.

MARINA ILIA

6 Family

The medieval peasant is usually examined as a member of a community, a village or, more specifically, a household, habitually identified with the family. In fact, the family and its evolution over time is one of the most popular fields of study in social history. The Oxford English Dictionary defines nuclear family as “a group consisting of two parents and their children living together as a unit”; and an extended family as “a group of people related by blood or marriage” and/or “all the descendants of a common ancestor.” The word comes from the Latin familia, related to famulus, a household servant.²³⁵ In general, family is a group of people related to each other by kin. Relations between its members are either vertical (grandparent, parent, child) or horizontal (siblings, cousins).²³⁶ The size of a family is affected by various factors: epidemics, hereditary and other diseases as well as political issues, economic issues and/or changes in social structure could all make a family larger or smaller. Nowadays, the term family may refer to several groups of people. Since the key roles are not assigned to specific members, as they were a hundred years ago, any group of people of any gender sharing a special bond may now be described as family. Opinions on the size of a ‘normal family’ vary around the world, but in Europe, at least, several surveys on fertility and family over the last two decades²³⁷ have shown that the word ‘family’ is usually understood as four individuals, the parents/guardians and two children.²³⁸

To paint the most accurate picture possible of the family in Venetian Cyprus, two different areas must be analysed: the Byzantine East and the medieval West.²³⁹ The peasant family of the Byzantine world may be considered the ancestor of the Cypriot rural family, since many customs and habits lived on from the earlier period. A family was not just a group of people with kinship but individuals who shared common interests, and more specifically property.²⁴⁰ Although the social history of the Byzantine Empire has been well studied in the past century, its lower social stratum and specifically the families therein have not. Details of

²³⁵ https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/family_1

²³⁶ W. Goldschmidt and E. Jacobson-Kunkel, ‘The Structure of Peasant Family’, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, vol. 73, 1971, p. 1061.

²³⁷ M. Kreyenfeld, G. Andersson and A. Pailhé, ‘Economic uncertainty and family dynamics in Europe: Introduction’, *Demographic Research*, vol. 2, 2012, pp. 835-852.

²³⁸ K. Harknett and C. Sten-Hartnett, ‘The gap between births intended and births achieved in 22 European countries, 2004-07’, *Population Studies*, vol. 68, 2014, pp. 265-266.

²³⁹ For general information about the family see J. Bernardes, ‘Family Ideology: Identification and Exploration’, *The Sociological Review*, 33(2), 1985, pp. 275-297; L. E. Mitchell, *Family Life in the Middle Ages*, Westport, Greenwood, 2007; M. J. Carlson and D. M Meyer, ‘Family Complexity: Setting the Context’, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654(1), 2014, pp. 6-11.

²⁴⁰ D. Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1985, pp. 136-139.

the life of Byzantine households can be found in economic and administrative documents.²⁴¹ Most of the time, information regarding a family is summarised under the name of the father of the family, or the *pater familias* to use the Latin term. The sources indicate that in the ninth–tenth centuries nuclear families consisted of two parents and their three or four children. Such families were the basic social unit of the population.²⁴² Similarly a medieval peasant family, could be considered a group of people with agnatic kinship, i.e. patrilineality. As was also the case in Byzantine society, families followed the direct line of their male ancestors. This intensely patri-orientated medieval family evolved over time, but its fundamental structure remained almost the same. Property and its inheritance were consistently the main indicator of each family type. In broad terms, there were two main types of inheritance: firstly, patrilineal impartible inheritance, and secondly bilateral partible inheritance.²⁴³ The former, which is the more traditional, is also called ‘stem’ inheritance by modern historians, and provided for property transfer to just one descendant, most of the time the firstborn.²⁴⁴ The second, also called ‘joint family’ inheritance, was more complex, and stipulated that property should be shared, whether equally or not, among several family members. These individuals took on the responsibility of cultivating the land together, and the whole family enjoyed the profits.²⁴⁵ As for the number of children, the sources vary, some indicating that it was exceptionally small (on average two children)²⁴⁶ and some very large (on average five children).²⁴⁷ Sometimes a family sharing the same house could include members of two generations.²⁴⁸

Scholars studying the medieval family regularly refer to the roles assumed or given within a household. Even if the distinction between the father, mother and the children is clear, the identification of their roles is not always well-defined because the main documents providing information are statistical records.²⁴⁹ The male, in the person of the father, was the figure of power within the family. He is mentioned in the sources in relation to his social and professional roles as a peasant and an agricultural labourer. He is also mentioned occasionally as the one who arranged marriages for his daughters.²⁵⁰ Other than that, the specific

²⁴¹ M. L. Rautman, *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire*, Westport, Conn, Greenwood Press, 2006, p. 40.

²⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

²⁴³ Goldschmidt and Jacobson-Kunkel, ‘The Structure of Peasant Family’, p. 1061.

²⁴⁴ Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 136.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

²⁴⁷ M. Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980, p. 6.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁴⁹ Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 112.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-128.

contribution of the male as father to everyday family life remains obscure. Sources mention that, if the father was absent, the mother's father or brother was also a strong male figure within the family.²⁵¹

The role of the woman as a mother, on the other hand, has been better analysed by scholars. The mother was the intermediary within the family.²⁵² Her main occupation was the maintenance of the household and she was the person in charge of raising and educating the children. Some of them were also involved in the trade of domestic products while weaving and spinning was a frequent daily occupation.²⁵³ The *mulier bona* was the model of behaviour especially for her daughter.²⁵⁴ Her role as a protecting mother was important for the medieval world and therefore there were several laws, moral treatises and narrative texts giving advice on how the good mother should behave.²⁵⁵ Mortality was higher for females due to childbirth.²⁵⁶ Nevertheless, the mortality rates and living standards in medieval Europe depended on many other factors too, such as place of residence, diseases, harvests etc. and living conditions during the sixteenth century seem to have been very good.²⁵⁷

Although children are the least examined members of the family, a few conclusions may be drawn about their role.²⁵⁸ Until recently, scholars studying medieval populations have customarily considered children as small adults, living within the village community and working in the fields or the manor. Nonetheless, medieval sources provide a more varied picture of infancy and childhood. Infancy stopped at 7 years of age and childhood usually at 12 years for girls and 14 for boys.²⁵⁹ This age division was mainly determined by an individual's biological maturity and, consequently, their fitness to reproduce. For the girls, on

²⁵¹ J. Goody, *The European Family: an Historico-anthropological Essay*, Oxford and Malden, Blackwell, 2000, p. 2; J. Herrin, *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*, Princeton Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2013, p. 81.

²⁵² Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, pp. 121-122.

²⁵³ Devroey, 'Men and Women in Early Medieval Serfdom', p. 4; M., Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou, 'Η συμμετοχή της γυναίκας στην οικονομία κατά τον Ύστερο Μεσαίωνα (η περίπτωση της Σερβίδας κλώστριας)', *Eoa kai Esperia*, 5, 2003, pp. 147-177.

²⁵⁴ M. Hirsch, 'Mothers and Daughters', *Signs*, vol. 7, 1981, p. 81; Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 115.

²⁵⁵ Herrin, *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*, p. 84.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84; M. Kowaleski, 'Medieval People in Town and Country: New Perspectives from Demography and Bioarchaeology', *Speculum*, vol. 89, 2014, p. 585.

²⁵⁷ Kelly and Grada, 'Living standards and mortality since the middle ages', p. 359.

²⁵⁸ P. Aries, *Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life*, trans. R. Baldick, London, Jonathan Cape, 1962.

²⁵⁹ D. Youngs, *The Life-Cycle in Western Europe c1300-1500*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2006, pp. 71-73; Ch. Maltezou, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, p. 215.

whom the family honour depended, their only option was marriage.²⁶⁰ Nevertheless, several sources mention girls who enjoyed a 'period of freedom' before marriage, working as apprentices in western medieval towns.²⁶¹ For boys the age of 14 or 15 years old was also the passage to adulthood in legal terms. Once he reached this age the male became liable to pay taxes. In medieval England, the age of 20 for males and 16 for females were the legal ages for inheriting property and owning land.²⁶² Infants were in no position to make decisions on their own and could not take responsibility for their actions. They were therefore recipients of an adult's care.²⁶³ During the day, children stayed at home, playing, learning and helping with simple tasks. It is difficult to be precise about the numbers of children (especially infants). Since the mortality rate in infancy was high, the first five years in their lives being when they were most vulnerable to diseases, many children were not recorded in administrative documents and censuses.²⁶⁴ Children lived at the family home until adulthood or marriage.

Several other interesting facts concerning family relations and attitudes are mentioned in the sources. The number of crimes within families and especially between male family members is revealing. Several cases concern fratricide or infanticide and these crimes drew the attention of medieval writers, who castigated the killers.²⁶⁵ Another interesting fact about both western medieval and Byzantine peasant society was the ability of the rural population to move from one village to another. This movement could be due to various reasons and marriage was one of them, allowing the members of one family to connect with others from distant villages and to enlarge their social and economic networks. In addition, links to other families could offer many opportunities to an individual and protected a family from being an isolated clan. The everyday life of a family is also worth exploring. The house of a peasant family was located in the countryside, in the villages or in small hamlets. The members of the family worked mainly in daylight hours on the fields of the landlord or on their rented land. As Frank Ellis

²⁶⁰ R. M. Karras, *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: doing unto others*, New York, Routledge, 2005, p.187; J. Meyendorff, 'Christian Marriage in Byzantium: The Canonical and Liturgical Tradition', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 44 (1990), p. 99.

²⁶¹ S. Brouquet, 'Girls at Work in the Middle Ages', in M. O'Dowd and J. Purvis (eds.), *A History of the Girl*, Cham, Springer International Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 13-31; K. L. Reyerson, *Women's Networks in Medieval France: Gender and Community in Montpellier, 1300-1350*, Cham, Springer International Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 67-90.

²⁶² Youngs, *The Life-Cycle in Western Europe*, pp. 71-72 and 97-100; M. Muller, *Childhood, Orphans and Underage Heirs in Medieval Rural England*, Springer International Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan, 2019, p. 59.

²⁶³ Youngs, *The Life-Cycle in Western Europe*, pp. 40-43.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24; Herrin, *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*, p. 84.

²⁶⁵ B. Hanawalt-Westman, 'The Peasant Family and Crime in Fourteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 13, 1974, pp. 1-18; K. Barclay and K. Reynolds, 'Introduction: Small Graves: Histories of Childhood, Death and Emotion', in K. Barclay, K. Reynolds and C. Rawnsley (eds.), *Death, Emotion and Childhood in Premodern Europe*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 1-24.

remarks: “Peasants are households, which derive their livelihoods mainly from agriculture, utilise mainly family labour in farm production, and are characterised by partial engagement in input and output markets which are often imperfect or incomplete.”²⁶⁶ Their contribution to the family unit was also significant to the agrarian economy. Though the medieval family model is often seen in a negative light today, an appraisal of its structure and practices is essential.

Things seem to have been similar in the *Stato da mar*. As well as being a location, the village in Venetian colonies could also be described as a community of people, most of the time members of just a few families. The development of family in the village of origin as well as the creation of family ties with other local families were habitual to the rural population. Nonetheless, studies on rural families during the Venetian period are rare. Scholars tend to depict the family as the household, but this need not be the case. In general terms a family could be described as a group of people with a relationship by blood and affinity, while a household is the small economic unit in which one or more families live.²⁶⁷ The population of each settlement was always recorded in the village’s *praktiko*. Commonly the name of the father is recorded as the chief of the family, but there are cases where a woman, probably a widow, appears as the head. Sometimes the name of the father is followed by the names of the other family members and their age or just the number of individuals under his control.²⁶⁸ As in the documents examined in this thesis, members of the family are usually divided into men (*da fatti*), women (*donne*) and children. Sometimes younger girls and women were categorised in one group.²⁶⁹ The person responsible for keeping these records up to date was sometimes a local officer such as the *castellano*, as was the case in Modon and Coron in 1318,²⁷⁰ or the priests in the local parishes, as was the case in Kythira.²⁷¹

Creating a family for a couple was directly related to having a child. As mentioned above, the history of children has been much neglected by scholars since they are almost always considered as ‘young adults’. Nonetheless, a child and its position within society is rather an

²⁶⁶ Ellis, *Peasant Economics: Farm Households and agrarian development*, p. 13.

²⁶⁷ A. Papadaki, ‘Η οικογένεια στα Κύθηρα’, *Nostos*, 2003, p. 173; E. Orlando, ‘Η εικόνα της οικογένειας’, A. Kolonia (trans.), in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 2, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 805-806.

²⁶⁸ Maltezos, ‘Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές’, p. 211.

²⁶⁹ Ch. Maltezos, ‘Το παιδί στην κοινωνία της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης’, *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 1987, p. 217; ‘Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές’, p. 211.

²⁷⁰ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, pp. 294-295.

²⁷¹ Papadaki, ‘Η οικογένεια στα Κύθηρα’, pp. 174-175; K. E. Lambrinos, ‘Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου’, in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, p. 148.

interesting subject of research. Archival documents refer to them and aspects of their daily life. As mentioned by Chryssa Maltezou, children from noble families and upper social groups were always a blessing, whereas, by contrast, having a child in a family from the rural population was mainly a tribulation. Even though they were legally adults at a very young age, they were considered to be juveniles up until the age of 18. A major issue concerning this part of the population was the high death rate.²⁷² The majority of infants could not survive the hardship and diseases, while older children were liable to sustain injuries and even suffer violence exerted by an adult.

Family members, whether of the small nuclear family or in extended ones, appeared to be very close to one another. In many cases there was enmity between families, which could lead to a clash or even murder.²⁷³ In addition, family members tried to keep other members safe. For example, in Kefalonia, families, even those lacking sufficient money, tried to enfranchise those in captivity after the Ottoman attacks.²⁷⁴

The majority of people recorded in the manuscripts examined in this thesis are members of either a smaller or a wider family. In fact, in both MR and KK documents, individuals are recorded as a member of a nuclear family. A male *parico*, the head of the family and the person responsible for paying taxes, is the main figure. His wife (or wives if he married for a second time) and children are always mentioned in relation to him. In the MR document, a male over 15 years old has his own entry while unmarried females are always recorded with their father. In the KK document the nuclear family is always recorded together, while in the AR *pratico* the name of each married *parico* or *parica* is always followed by the name of their wife or husband respectively.

6.1 Aradippou

Identifying families in the AR manuscript was not as straightforward as in the MR and KK manuscripts, due to the way the document is structured. *Parici* are recorded as individuals in alphabetical order, although other family members are also mentioned. Out of 140 entries, fifty-eight related to men over the age of 16, thirty-eight to women over 16, and thirty-eight to children under 15 (table 3). The remaining four records concern two males and two females of unspecified age, while two more records are entries that repeat the information on two men (Costantin Nicola Limbitj Chiriaco Lembitj tu Palluri, nos. 24 and 30, and Filipus Nicola Limbitj Chiriaco Limbiti Palurj, nos. 59 and 69) who were members of the same family.

²⁷² Maltezou, 'Το παιδί στην κοινωνία της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης', pp. 214-217.

²⁷³ Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, pp. 321-322.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 311-313.

The average age of the population recorded here is undoubtedly lower than in the Marathasa document. The author of the census lists the ages of 134 people, omitting data for only two women and two men. The majority of the population recorded in the survey was born at the end of the fifteenth century, thirty to forty years before this census was conducted. In fact, 45.6% of the people mentioned in the *catastico*, of whom twenty-nine were men and thirty-four women, were between 31 and 40 years old. Moreover, children under 15 represent 28% of the population. An exceptionally interesting detail is that only two persons (one man and one woman) were listed as having died (*morto/a* or *mori*) in the period when the census was being carried out. This detail, combined with the extremely high proportion of young people, raises several questions. Was the life expectancy of this population really that low? Did the author include all the individuals in the settlement or just those who were alive at that moment? According to the report of 1523, Aradippou appeared to be an *embalio*, a term which is used for an administrative district. Thus, it could be presumed that it was a large settlement similar to Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon. Nonetheless, the AR document provides information on only 138 individuals. Since only a few of the *parici* were actually living in Aradippou, as will be explained below, this survey was probably made to record inhabitants who for some reason had left.

Based on the information extracted, the *parici* listed in the document had most probably inhabited Aradippou for a specific period of time. Many of their relatives most probably lived in the area at that time too, as indicated by the number of married men and women recorded in the manuscript whose spouses originated from other settlements on the island. There were also most likely other indigenous males and females who were married to each other. Nevertheless, this document is for the moment the only source regarding the population of 'Aradippo'. Despite the possibility that some information is missing, the modern reader can reach some general conclusions. 124 individuals have family names similar to someone else's in the survey and this has enabled the creation of eight family trees. In most of the following cases families are patri-oriented since only the name of the father and male ancestors are given (table 4). However, there are a few cases in which a child is named after the family of his or her mother, and these will be discussed extensively below.

6.1.1 Allupi

Information on the Allupi family comes from the records of eight individuals: four women, Christina (no. 33), Christina (no. 41), Lioretta (no. 88) and Maria (no. 98); and four men Dimitris (no.48), Lois (no. 87), Paraschefgas (no. 122) and Stathis (no.125). They were

members of four different branches of the family. The fathers' names of these individuals show that the family goes back six generations. Their ages range from 15 to 26; Christina (no. 41) is the oldest and appears to belong to the fifth generation of the family. What is historically important for these people is their status. Three of them, Dimitris (no. 48), Lois (no. 87) and Stathis (no. 125) seem to have been taken to Nicosia to work as servants in the house of Count Eugenio Synglitico. Lioretta (no. 88) and Paraschefgas (no. 122) are named after their mother's family, implying that they were illegitimate.

6.1.2 Chila

The Chila family appears in ten entries: five men, Filippo (no. 61), Andranis (no. 12), Filippos (no. 63), Nicolas (no. 111) and Limbitis (no. 85); and five women, Cali (no. 42), Frangu (no. 64), Christina (no. 27), Erini (no. 52) and Maria (no. 97). The youngest member of this family is Christina (no. 27) 15 years old, while the oldest is Andranis (no. 12), 31 years old. All ten individuals seem to be from the same generation of the family, the fifth, and this is supported by the fact that they are very close in age. The names Nicola and Filippos are popular in the family, while the name Andranis is not, either in this family or generally in Cyprus. As far as the social status of the ten members of the Chilas family documented is concerned, none of them lived in Aradippou; some were given to another lord while others were sold. Lastly, it is worth noting that Erini Vassili (no. 52) changed her name to Erini Loisas, her mother's name, though unfortunately the author does not provide a reason for this (family tree 1).

6.1.3 Colocassi

Like the Aluppi family, the Colocassi family includes eight recorded individuals: four men, Benetto (no. 19), Fluris (no. 71), Tomasin (no. 127) and Zorzis (no. 135); and four women, Anussa (no. 2), Lorria (no. 91), Maria (no. 95) and Mire (no. 96). They belong to three different branches of the family. The four females are sisters, daughters of Sava, while Benetto (no. 19), Fluris (no. 71), and Tomasin (no. 127) are first cousins, descendants of three brothers. The last member listed, Zorzis (no. 135), was most probably a distant relative of the other males, despite the fact that their ancestors shared the same name Thoma/Thomasin. The age range in this family is somewhat wider than in the other families: the youngest member, Benetto (no. 19), is 11 years old, whereas Lorria (no. 91) is 32 years old. The ages of the four sisters are interesting: Lorria, Anussa, Maria and Mire, 32, 27, 18 and 14 years old respectively, were all born around five years apart. Thus, if there were no other siblings, Mire was born eighteen years after her sister Lorria. Lastly, the names in this family, Lorria, Benetto and Mire

were not very common compared with those of other families in Aradippou or in other areas examined.

6.1.4 *Comerchiari*

The second largest family in the document, the Comerchiari family, has nineteen members: eleven men over 15 years old, two women and six children. Ancestors can be traced back six generations, and the individuals included in the *catastico* can be sorted into three main branches. Like the Palluri family discussed below, there is a wide age range in the members of the Comerchiari family. The youngest are Caterina (no. 43) and Frangudi (no. 67), ten-year-old twins; the oldest is Lois/Ducas (no. 83), 44 years old, a close relative of Caterina and Frangudi's father, who is recorded with two different first names. It is also worth mentioning that Lois/Ducas and his daughter, Chiriacu (no. 45), are the only first-degree relatives recorded in separate entries. Children are usually recorded together with their father or mother in the parent's entry. Here, though, while Chiriacu is mentioned next to her father's name in no. 83, she also appears on her own in no. 45. In addition to the peculiar case of Lois/Ducas having two first names, another oddity in this family's naming patterns is the case of a father and son in the third and fourth generations who appear to have the same name, Nicolas or Nicolis. Many of these individuals were sold or given to lords outside their home district. Two, however, were able to pay for their freedom: Chiriacos (no. 38) and Filippos (no. 66). Also, Caterina and Frangudis, the aforementioned siblings, and their older sister Loisisia, were sent to Nicosia, to serve in the house of Count Eugenio Synglitico (family tree 2).

6.1.5 *Comodromo*

Unlike Marathasa's Comodromo family, the Comodromos of Aradippou are few in number. Only four members, three men, Antonio (no. 1), Christoforos (no. 22) and Zuanj (no. 131), and one woman, Maria (no. 105), appear with this surname. The youngest and oldest of these four, Antonio and Christoforos, 18 and 22 years old respectively, were possibly brothers. Zuanj and Maria were from different branches of the family and shared the same surname without being closely related. Zuanj lived in Potamia, while the other three served different masters. Maria appears to have been an illegitimate child, since she was given the family name of her mother.

6.1.6 *Jorgizi*

The Jorgizis are another small family recorded in the *catastico*, with five members: two men, Agustis (no. 10) and Filippos (no. 58), two women, Fimia (no. 55) and Fenngu (no. 56),

and one girl, Fluru (no. 57). Middle names show that the family goes back six generations. Again, these individuals are young: Fluru, the youngest, is 12 years old, and the eldest, Filippos, a distant relative, is 25. Fluru and Fenngu were sisters, the daughters of Joti, and Agustis was their first cousin (family tree 3).

6.1.7 Nichiforo

Five members of the Nichiforo family appear in the survey. One of them was a woman, Limbia (no. 80) and four of them were males: two men over 15, Giacomo (no. 75) and Nicolis (no. 112); and two distant relatives from a common ancestor, Christophis (no. 35) and Stamatis (no. 126). None lived in Aradippou; some were sold, and others given to several masters. Limbia (no.40) is 44 years old, one of the oldest people to feature in the survey (family tree 4).

6.1.8 Palluri

The Palluri family is one of the biggest in the survey. Thirteen individuals, ten men and three children, Nicolis (no. 113), Cali (no. 25) and Mandalena (no. 93), who seem to have belonged to three basic branches. Two more members, Christina and Jorgi, are mentioned in the entries of their fathers, Manolis (no. 94) and Agustis (no. 11) respectively. Because it is so large, the family displays a wider age range than other families. The youngest, Christina, was just one year old, while the oldest, Zias (no. 137), was 37. The size of this family also causes a number of problems when attempting to draw up the family tree. Firstly, it is not clear if an ancestor of the family, whose name was either Margarita or Marta, was one or two persons; if Marta and Margarita are the same person, the family tree is split into three branches as mentioned above, but, if they are two different people, then the family would have had a more extensive horizontal expansion. Given the author's numerous errors and omissions, the former hypothesis seems more plausible. Moreover, two members of the family, Filippos (nos. 59 and 69) and Costis/Costantis (nos. 24 and 30) are recorded twice in the *catastico*. The two entries for Filippos give the same information regarding his status and masters, but for Costis the two records are slightly different. Lastly, it is worth mentioning the listing of eight people after their mothers' names, which indicates that their fathers were unknown, and another whose middle name is that of a female ancestor (family tree 5).

6.1.9 Papa Dimitrano

The Papa Dimitrano family is recorded in the document twelve times: four men, Andrias (no. 16), Chiriaco (no. 36), Filippus (no. 70) and Petros (no. 119); seven women, Christina (no. 37), Loxe (no. 89), Maria (no. 101), Mariu (no. 108), Nengomia (no. 116), Plumu

(no. 120) and Zarla (no 134); and one boy, Paraschefgas (no. 123). There may also have been another member, since the *catastico* suggests that Petros (no. 119) had a daughter. The age range in this family is not that wide, the youngest, Paraschefgas, being 11, and the eldest, Loxe, 29 years old. As illustrated in the family tree, they are all up to third degree relatives. Most of them were given to nobles, and some were exchanged for other *parici*. The names of this family's descendants were not easy to identify, and this created problems for the creation of the family tree. In two cases, the name is illegible; the name of the father/mother of Paraschefgas appears to be Arali, a rare name in Cyprus; and the grandparent of Mariu, Nengomia and Plumu is called Chamiras, a name which probably indicates that this was their grandmother, the 's' at the end of the name suggesting the genitive of a female name (της Χαμίρας) (family tree 6).

6.1.10 Sclavogianni

Another small family from Aradippou was the Sclavogianni. Five members appear in the records: three men, Bernardis (no. 17), Fluris (no. 60) and Antonio (no. 9); and two children, Antonio (no. 3) and Elenj (no. 49), the only female of the family. One more member, Jorgi, is recorded underneath his father, Antonio (no. 9). Four of the members, including Jorgi, are under 20 years old. Furthermore, although Antonio (no. 3) and Bernardis (no. 17) are nephew and uncle, they are almost the same age, 13 and 16 respectively. Lastly, another important detail regarding this family is the tendency to name members of the family Jorgis and Antonio. Though this was in different groups of the same family, both names were used for their descendants as shown in the family tree 7.

6.1.11 Thomasi

The Thomasi family was the easiest to identify in the manuscript. Three sisters, Catarina (no. 40), Erinj (no. 53) and Flura (no. 68) are recorded below Phillipou, on whom no information is given, but who appears to be their father's brother. The women, who are almost the same age, 15, 19 and 17 years old respectively, did not live in Aradippou. Catarina, the youngest, was given to another lord, Erinj was transferred to a different settlement and was married, while Flura was sent to Nicosia, to the house of the Count Eugenio Synglitico. However, their uncle Philippos was enfranchised.

6.1.12 Zangari

The Zangari family is the biggest in the *catastico*, with nineteen members. Nine were men, six women, and the remaining four were children, two girls and two boys, 13 and 14 years

old. The oldest recorded member of this family is a woman, Zuana (no. 130) who was 56 years old. Four more members may be added to this group since Limbia (no. 81) had two children, whose first names and ages are not stated, Annessa (no. 14) had a child called Giacomo, and Zuana (no. 130) had one called Jason. Although the large size of this family yields much information, still five of its members could not be placed on the family tree. Andrias (no. 15), possibly had a second surname, Cerati, which was the surname of some other family members. Lois (no. 78), Liontis (no. 79) and Zorzis (no. 133) could theoretically be father and sons, but Lois's two last names, Chiriacu Bizzi, are not given for Liontis or Zorzis, and are not encountered elsewhere in the survey. The many names mentioned indicate that this family could also be one of the oldest, going back eight generations. Most of the members of this family were either given or sold to a master, although two of them Savas (no. 124) and Zorzis (no. 133), were enfranchised. Finally, most of the first names in this family, such as Limbitis and Jorgis/Zorzis, were common. Jason, however, is not (family tree 8).²⁷⁵

6.1.13 Zolani

The last group examined was a small family, the Zolani, with only three women, Arguiri (no. 7), Christina (no. 34) and Marieta (no.104), and one man, Meningo (no. 107), who belonged to three different branches of the family. Arguiri and Christina were daughters of Nengomia, while Meningo, son of Nengomiti, could be a distant cousin. He could also be Arguiri and Christina's brother, given their closeness in age and the possibility that Nengomiti is a misspelling for Nengomia, given that the scribe is prone to grammar and spelling mistakes. The name of Arguiri's and Christina's father is recorded in no. 34. He was Vagliantis Clacia, a *francomato*. Marietta, 13 years old, is the youngest Zolani and could be a member of the sixth generation. All four Zolanis were enfranchised at the request of the Count and his son Marco Synglitico.

6.2 Kato Koutrafas

The abundance of details provided by the Kato Koutrafas survey, together with the fact that the information is not particularly scattered as well as the small size of the village, rendered the identification of individuals and their incorporation into family networks much easier than in the case of the Aradippou document. In most cases, a male *parico* is recorded followed by the name of his spouse and their young children. However, all 101 entries are contradictory. Most of the twenty-seven males recorded present inconsistent names or surnames. Moreover,

²⁷⁵ See also chapter 9.

the surnames of twenty-eight females, most of them wives of the aforementioned *parici*, are not recorded; twenty-five of these women could therefore not be placed within a family. In addition, the document rarely gives birthplaces and, consequently, it was not possible to determine relations between nearby settlements, as was the case with the AR and MR documents.

Another issue is the age of the *parici*. As mentioned above, the manuscript lists 101 people in total. The conductor of the survey added a summary of the population statistics on the last folio. He records 101 souls as the total number of *parici* ('suma d(e)n parizi anime 101'), a number which he divides into twenty-seven men (*homini*), twenty-nine women (*done*), twenty-seven boys (*putti maschi*) and eighteen girls (*putte femine*).²⁷⁶ This information about the population numbers by gender is correct, because fifty-four males and forty-seven females are recorded in total (table 5). Nonetheless, the division by age, between children and adults is not that clear. The survey gives the age of fifty-three males; the unnamed illegitimate child of Chiriacho tu Lefteri (no. 24) is missing. Chiriacho was given to another lord, therefore the surveyor had limited information about him and his child. According to the document, Chiriacho was 32 years old. Based on calculations, the average age at which males had their first child according to the census was 24 years old. Therefore, Chiriacho's son could have been between 1 and 10 years old and therefore he should be considered a child. By placing him in this age group, an interesting fact emerges. The *putti maschi* of the document appear to be the males between 1 and 17 years of age. This is odd, since a male was considered an adult when he reached the age of 15 (not 17), when he had to start paying taxes in his own right. In fact, the age limit of 15 is very clear in the MR documents and males at that age have their own entries. A few possible explanations could be offered here. In the rather unlikely case that Chiriacho's son was more than 15 years old, then he would legally be an adult and then the age limit for boys would be 14. The second possibility is that the scribe made a mistake, either in the main survey or in the summary. The only male recorded under the name of his father above the age of 14 is Chiriacho, son of protopapa Charito (no. 26). Chiriacho was 17 years old during the period in which the census was carried out and he was the firstborn. The writer might have made a mistake concerning his age; he could have been 14 years old rather than 17. In that case, he would have been the same age as the second child of the family, Luois. On the other hand, Chiriacho might indeed have been 17 years old and for some reason not able to work. Hence, he remained under the protection of his father even after his legal adulthood.

²⁷⁶ Folio 5^v.

Similar issues emerged regarding females. Apart from the two widows Mandalena (no. 8) and Mangu (no. 21), and three other *parice*, Fiorenza (no.7), Argiri (no 25) and Cali (no. 32), the remaining females, adults or children, are recorded in relation to a male, their husband, fiancé or father. The majority are between 1 and 28 years old while only six *parice* are over 40. According to the document, there are eighteen *putte femine* while the remaining twenty-nine females are *done*, a term implying that they were considered to be adults. As may be seen in table 6, the first eighteen were between 1 and 15 years of age and the other twenty-nine between 15 and 55. In that respect, there is no clear limit concerning adulthood of majority for females. A possible explanation might be once again a mistake by the author of the survey about the age of a *parica* or the total number of persons in each age group. The problem arises in relation to three *parice* who were 15 years old and had many things in common concerning their marital status. Stauriani (no. 8) was the daughter of the widow Madalena and was engaged to someone living in another village, Melanissia. Linora (no. 19) was the daughter of Chiriaco and was also engaged to a male, called Zorzi, from another village, Kakopetria. It is not clear whether these females lived in Kato Koutrafas or not at the time of the survey but, since they were engaged and not married, the person responsible for paying taxes were a widowed mother and a father respectively.²⁷⁷ This is the reason why they were included in the summary made under each family. The third case concerns a 15-year-old girl named Safira (no. 28). Unlike the first two, Safira, a foreign *parica* coming from the village of Visachia, was recorded with her fiancé Chiriacho. In view of the way these three girls were recorded, it could be presumed that the first two were still engaged and this is the reason why they were mentioned with their parents, while Safira was married or in the process of marrying Chiriaco.²⁷⁸ Therefore, Safira should not be examined as a *putta femina* but as a *dona*. In reality, there was no specific age for girls entering adulthood as was the case for boys. Since females did not pay taxes, the only factor was the minimum age of marriage, which was 12 to 14 years old. Thus, a married female might be considered by the conductor of the census as a *dona*, even if other unmarried/engaged females of the same age were *putte femine*.

Lastly, none of the individuals recorded are listed as *morto/a*. For example, the names of Mandelena's (no. 8) and Mangu's (no. 21) spouses are not given, which indicates that they had passed away before the census was carried out. Unlike MR, only the living inhabitants of the settlement, those who had to pay taxes and work for their master, were recorded.

²⁷⁷ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', pp. 72-73.

²⁷⁸ For the term 'sposato' see chapter 7.

Several omissions and misinterpretations in the manuscript concerning the names led to numerous difficulties when creating family trees. The 101 recorded *parici* can be assembled into roughly ten families, all composed of a father and/or a mother and their children (table 7). Only three of these families, Plasti, Chatoardieri and Papa Chiriaco, appear to have been larger, stretching horizontally to the father's brothers and their descendants. However, males recorded in the list of the duties owed to the lord produced different family trees. For instance, Zorzin (no. 11), Costin (no. 13) and Valentin (no. 15) are recorded in the census under the family name Staurinu but listed as Plasti in the list of tax-paying males. Similarly, Zorzin (no. 10), Zuan (no. 12), Perrin (no. 20) and Chiriacho (no. 24) appear as Lefteri in the census but owe servile obligations under the name of Chatopardieri. Members of the Papa Chiriacho family may also have been named Chatopardieri, since the first folio of the document contains the signature of Papa Chiriacho Chatopardieri.

In view of the issues discussed above, the *parici* of Kato Koutrafas may be grouped into four families (family trees 9-12).

6.3 Marathasa

Unlike the AR and KK manuscripts, MR1 and MR2 provide a clear view of the population and their families. There are 1,629 *parici* and they can be divided into thirty-four families (family trees 13-46 and table 8). The remaining 172 recorded individuals were not from this area and were thus considered outsiders (table 9). Due to the volume of information and owing to several inconsistencies, data extracted from the document was very carefully processed. Firstly, *parici* with a similar surname were assembled in a table. Family ties were determined once these *parici* found their place in the respective family trees. Then, a spreadsheet was created for every family containing all relevant information: names, ages, place of residence, birthplace, marital status etc. From these spreadsheets, several other general tables based on specific information were also created. That finally led to statistical results and the corresponding charts. Scrutinising these tables helped me to make it possible to draw some general conclusions, which are given below.

The MR documents record a variety of families. Some of them had just a few members. The small size of these families suggests that they were fairly new in the area and that an older member had moved there for some reason only a few years before. Alternatively, these smaller families could have been larger before the census but had decreased in numbers after some of their members had moved to another place. Unfortunately, the document provides no answer to this question. The smallest families in the survey were the Sculli (family tree 13), the

Zavatari (family tree 14), the Logotheti (family tree 15) and the Pelecano (family tree 16) with three, five, six and fourteen members respectively. Also, nine families had less than thirty individuals (family tree 17- 26), which made the identification of their members easier.

The main issues that arose were related to the three largest families. Due to the inconsistent recording of names, identifying members of the Nomicu (family tree 44), Athipatu (family tree 45), and Spathari (family tree 46) families was difficult, all the more so since members of these families were dispersed in several villages. On the other hand, the fourth and fifth largest families, Mouchli (family tree 43) and Condu Dipotatu (family tree 42), were almost effortlessly reconstructed, since most of their members were recorded in one village, Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon. The first of these is the largest family vertically since its members can be traced back seven generations. Establishing horizontal extension was also challenging. For some *parici*, the names of the male ancestors were well recorded, and this meant that distant relatives were easy to spot. The writer usually recorded a person with his/her first name, followed by his/her father/mother's name, a grandparent's name (usually the grandfather's) and the family name. For members of the bigger families, another of the ancestor's names was added. Obviously, due to the size of these families, Florio Bustron wanted to be clear about everyone and an extra name was very helpful for their identification. Nonetheless, for others, only one name was available besides their first and family name, making the construction of a family tree difficult.

Another problem was the inconsistent recording of ages, with frequent double entries, missing numbers and erroneous records. In order to extract statistical data, wherever possible, for these entries the age of the siblings and parents was used in an effort to identify at least which decade of their life a person was in at the time of the census. For example, Jorgi (no. 203) and his son Loys (no. 204) had the same age in the document, 57 years old. The age is plausible for Jorgi since his wife was 53 and he had six children. Flura (no. 213), 27 years old, was the firstborn and Loys was the fourth child. His younger brothers Petritis and Chiriacos were 16 and 14 years old. Therefore, Loys must have been between 16 and 27. Family names also cause problems, since sometimes *parici* who belong to the same family are recorded with two different names. For example, some of the members of the Protopsalti family were called Valili rather than Protopsalti (no. 382). The surname Valili probably derived from an ancestor with the first name Vasili. Either the scribe misspelled the name, or the pronunciation of the name had indeed changed over time. Another case concerns members of the Leuressi Tithicu family: some of them had only one of the two names (no. 69 and 45), while others had both (no. 91).

Many of these families were located in specific villages, as was the case of the Monacho family, which was established in the village Milo de Chicho. Other were scattered across several villages like the Spathari family. Movement between the settlements was not unusual. Much like Western and Byzantine rural societies, people in Marathasa were relocated to other settlements for several reasons. As a result, family connections and networks were established amongst the various villages. Several cases of members of a specific family married to members of another family are attested in the survey. For example, five members of the Comodromo family were married to a Nomicu while four members of the Cazzamundi family were married to a Chrussugliu. The Milona family was an exception since a number of its members were married to distant relatives within the same family. However, the majority of the population in this family was married to an outsider.

Other than marriage, there is no specific information on relations between families, with the exception of references to crimes. Five males were recorded as *amazato* in the document. For the two of them, Vassilis, (no. 59) and Loys (no. 461), the murderer is not known, while for the latter there is also mention of the year of the crime. Loys had been dead for six years in 1549, therefore he was killed in 1543, leaving his wife Margarita with four children of whom two were under 10 years old and one was still in the womb or a newborn (Xristoforo was 6 when the census was carried out). The other three murdered males were Vassilis (no. 251), Limbitis (no. 212) and his brother Petros (no. 342). Vassilis was 32 years old when a *parico* named Michalis (no. 8) murdered him. After this crime, the murderer Michalis left Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon and became a fugitive. The second, Limbitis, was killed by his own son Michalis (no. 213). The last one, Petros, a father of 4 children, was murdered by Michalis (no. 324).

Despite a number of problems caused by the inconsistencies of the survey, it was possible to extract data and reach conclusions concerning 1,629 individuals (table 10). These *parici* could be divided into four groups on the basis of age and sex. The first age group includes 554 men over the age of 15, excluding outsiders. Over 93% (506 men) are registered in an entry of their own, while the remaining 7% were either dead or belonged to another estate. Four of these 506 males were also registered in a second entry: Peris (no. 88 and 379), Loys (nos. 415 and 443), Anttonis (nos. 89 and 390) and Costantis (nos. 182 and 261). Except for Loys, information about the family of the *parico* was given only in the first entry whereas the second recorded his name, age and place of residence. In the interest of clarification, the census conductor added the other village, where the male was recorded. For example, for Anttonis he recorded 'a Prodromo et qui'. Therefore, these records were not added by mistake, since the

writer was aware of the double entries. Nonetheless, there is no possible reason behind these records.

The mortality rate for the male *parici* is 27%. This percentage could be reduced if we take into consideration the fact that a great number of the males recorded as deceased had been dead for some time before the census. In addition, the mortality rate is extremely low for *parici* in their twenties and thirties since only nine men from this age group were recorded as having died. The oldest males alive at the time of the census were Argiros (no. 77), Paulos (no. 149) and Argiros (no. 432), all 79 years old. On the other hand, the oldest males mentioned as *morto* were Limbitis (no. 131), who died at the age of 105, and Chiriacos (no. 148), who was 116 years old. The average age of living males recorded is 25, whereas for the dead it was 67. Interestingly, eighteen males were over 67 years old and another ten were born before 1490.

The second age group of the Marathasa population includes women over the age of 15. The survey provides information on 500 women, excluding foreigners. The majority were married or engaged to a local man but there are several others who were recorded as daughters married to a foreigner. Two cases are worth mentioning: Flura (no. 147) and Zarla (no. 508) were married to a freedman and therefore there was no entry for a man next to their names. A few were mentioned in two entries since they had married twice or had an illegitimate child and therefore were also included in the third part of the document.²⁷⁹ As shown in table 11, 109 of them, which represents 22% of this age group, were dead, a similar number to that for the men. Again, the mortality rate could be reduced since only two women, Flura (no. 279) and Margarita (no. 375), both 38 years old, died before reaching their forties. The average age for living women was 36 while the oldest women alive were Annussa (no. 242) and Maria (no. 331), both 88 years old. The corresponding average age for deceased women was 66 while the oldest *parice* recorded as *morta* were Anna (no. 131) and Erinj (no. 333), both 97 years old, and Nengomia (no. 235), 96 years old. Eighteen females were over 66 years old during the census and another twenty could have been born before 1490.

The last age group, which can be divided into two sub-groups, is that of the children. For statistical reasons, all the individuals between 1 and 14 years old were considered to be minors. This group of the population numbered 303 boys and 282 girls. All of them were recorded as *figlioli*, legitimate or not, of a man or a woman. The vast majority of the minors were alive during the census and only four boys and three girls were mentioned as *morto/morta*. A possible explanation regarding this extremely low mortality rate is that already given above

²⁷⁹ See the cases in chapters 7.3 and 8.3.

concerning the infants of Western and Byzantine peasant societies: i.e. due to various diseases, many of these infants died very young and the conductor of a census did not record them. On the other hand, this low mortality rate for children might be correct since Florio was very cautious concerning statistics and therefore he must have recorded all the members of families, including the deceased. Another interesting fact is the existence of twins, the *gentelli* or *genttelli*. Eight individuals were recorded as twins, Jannj and Petro (no. 211), Jannis and Flurin (no. 314), Fostira and Christina (no. 346) and Argiri and Xristina (no. 428).²⁸⁰

6.4 Conclusions

Undeniably, the composition of families was the starting point of this enquiry. All of the surveys examined were composed in a way that enabled a reader to find family members and connections effortlessly. This was rather easier in the KK and AR manuscripts than in MR. As in other locations, people are mainly recorded in the *catastica* as members of a nuclear family. The name of the father is usually followed by the name of the spouse and then the children. Despite the way of listing the population in the documents consulted for this thesis, it can be assumed that families, in terms of a household, could differ from one another. In broad terms a household in a village contained members of the wider family such as the grandparents and the siblings with their families, as was the case in other Venetian locations. Concerning the documentation, the practice followed appear to be the same as in other Venetian settlements and even in Western Europe. A local officer such as the *castellano* or a priest, was likely to be the person responsible for recording the population and keeping track of their important life events such as births, marriages and deaths. Therefore, during an official census handled by an officer of the central administration, such as the one in Marathasa, executed by Florio Bustron, these local officers would have been called upon to assist and advise.

Family tables and trees created from the data provided by the documents offer precious conclusions regarding life expectancy, mortality and fertility rates. Despite modest living standards, *parici* appear to have lived longer than one might have anticipated. Child mortality in particular was very low, as examined in the Marathasa area. Blood and marriage relations between families, especially those living in the same area, were common. As will be described below, marriage made people move from one place to another, and thus new bonds were created between families. Hence, the Cypriot family as a unit had very similar characteristics

²⁸⁰ The additional two adults must have been twins Michalis and Fostira (no. 193) due to their being of the same age, 47 years old. This was not explicitly mentioned by the writer.

to families in other locations. Individuals sharing family ties were very close, protecting family members and their common interests.

MARINA ILIA

7 Marriage

Marriage was the first step in the creation of a family. As scholars emphasise, the institution of marriage was not static throughout the medieval period. Laws and regulations regarding matrimony changed over time and varied from place to place. Consequently, a marriage and the family that ensued in an urban environment differed from that in a rural society. An important source for this period is the 'Catasto of Florence', conducted in 1427-30, as it provides abundant information concerning the distinctive characteristics of populations living in different environments and belonging to different social groups in Florence during the fifteenth century.²⁸¹ Christianity was a major determinant in the history of marriage. First of all, matrimony between persons who were related within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity and affinity was forbidden. Jack Goody attributes this prohibition to three main reasons: the moral ethos of a family; the well-being of the mother and a child born from closely related parents; economic considerations, since marriages within the same family would prevent the community from expanding and creating social networks with other settlements.²⁸² Despite prohibitions by the State and the Church, several sources mention clandestine marriages being contracted between relatives, which sometimes led to bigamy.²⁸³ Several laws and ecclesiastical regulations and canons refer to marriage, while others focus on the protection of both spouses, especially women, and children. The 'Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois', the corpus of legislation applied to the population of Cyprus during the Latin period, includes several clauses about marriage.²⁸⁴

To a large extent, in medieval and Byzantine societies the main, socially acceptable reason for contracting a marriage was the formation of a family and procreation.²⁸⁵ To this one could add the financial and social arrangements between families or between landlords and tenants. For the majority of the rural population, the fief holder and/or the father were the

²⁸¹ D. Herlihy and C. Klapisch-Zuber, *Tuscans and Their Families: A Study of the Florentine Catasto of 1427*, London, Yale University Press, 1985.

²⁸² J. Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983, pp. 56-57.

²⁸³ S. McDougall, *Bigamy and Christian identity in late medieval Champagne*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012; D. G. Hunter, 'Single Marriage and Priestly Identity A Symbol and its Functions in Ancient Christianity', in L. C. Engh (ed.), *The Symbolism of Marriage in Early Christianity and the Latin Middle Ages*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2019, pp. 111-130.

²⁸⁴ A. Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Women in Medieval Famagusta: Law, Family, and Society', in G. Grivaud, A. Nicolaou-Konnari, and C. Schabel (eds.), *Famagusta. History and Society*, 2 vols., Mediterranean Nexus 1110-1700. Conflict, Influence and Inspiration in the Mediterranean Area, Turnhout, Brepols, forthcoming, pp. 12-13.

²⁸⁵ Meyendorff, 'Christian Marriage in Byzantium: The Canonical and Liturgical Tradition', pp. 99.

persons responsible for these arrangements.²⁸⁶ However, scholars mention unarranged, freely chosen marriages, and some couples in Venice are attested to have lived together before matrimony.²⁸⁷ The majority of the information concerning married couples of the lower classes may be found in parish records. Scholars interested in historical demography have been able to reach important conclusions by comparing statistical data.²⁸⁸ The age a person entered upon married life varied depending on the time and place. The usual age for marriage in the rural population of Europe in the late Middle Ages was 26 for men and 24 for women. Couples were usually coevals but, naturally, there are cases, as shown in the Florentine *catasto*, of men who were up to thirteen years older than their wives.²⁸⁹ Although procreation was the main reason for a marriage, this did not always result in the birth of a child within the first few years. There are several mentions of women getting married in their second decade but having their first child later, in their mid twenties, for biological reasons or thanks to birth control.²⁹⁰ On the other hand, about 10%, a relatively large number of people in western Europe during the Middle Ages, never married.

In both the medieval West and in Byzantium marriage was insoluble, meaning divorce was prohibited.²⁹¹ Nonetheless, there were some cases where a marriage could be dissolved, for example in cases of consanguinity, which constituted a major impediment. Other valid reasons for annulment were adultery, and impotence on the part of the husband. The Church also accepted a second marriage for persons whose first marriage had been annulled. Other than that, the death of one of the spouses was the only acceptable reason for a second marriage. A widow was in many ways protected by law and her role within society was greatly valued.²⁹² After the sixth century widows could not marry close relatives, such as the brother of their deceased husband.²⁹³ In Latin Cyprus a widow could remarry within nine months of her

²⁸⁶ J. A. McNamara and S. Wemple, 'The Power of Women through the Family in Medieval Europe: 500-1100', *Feminist Studies*, No. 3/4, Special Double Issue: Women's History, 1973, pp. 128-129; Raftis, *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, pp. 193-194; Hirsch, 'Mothers and Daughters', p. 84.

²⁸⁷ Maltezou, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', pp. 213-217.

²⁸⁸ Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family*, pp. 4-5.

²⁸⁹ Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, pp. 64-65; Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, pp. 124-125 and 154.

²⁹⁰ Hirsch, 'Mothers and Daughters', p. 85; Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, pp. 146-147.

²⁹¹ Goody, *The European Family: an Historico-anthropological Essay*, pp. 22-27 and 34.

²⁹² V. Harding, 'Families in Later Medieval London: Sex, Marriage and Mortality', in E. A. New and C. Steer (eds.), *Medieval Londoners: essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, London, University of London Press, Institute of Historical Research, 2019, pp. 27-31; A. Papadia-Lala, 'Γυναίκα και αγροτικός πληθυσμός στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη. Αποφάσεις του Συνδίκου, Ανακριτή Ανατολής Ottaviano Bon (1613)', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Women in Medieval Famagusta', p. 17.

²⁹³ Harding, 'Families in Later Medieval London: Sex, Marriage and Mortality', p. 44.

husband's death according to the Orthodox Church or after a year and a day according to the Latin Church and the *Assises*. In addition, in the medieval West a remarried widow had to leave her previous residence.²⁹⁴ In that case, apart from a second marriage, a widow had several other options, such as returning to her paternal household or becoming the head of the family responsible for her children and the family's property including her dowry.²⁹⁵ Although separation was not endorsed in the early Middle Ages, attitudes gradually evolved.

Information concerning family ties and marriages in the rural population in Venetian colonies is equally valuable. In the *Stato da mar*, the boys and girls of the rural population were usually married to each other. In that way family ties were created between locals while the next generation of male heirs inherited adequate shares of leased lands. Although marriage between individuals of different social status, ethnicity or religion was prohibited, cases of mixed weddings were frequently recorded in the sources. In order to avoid decreasing the numbers in the labour force, landlords could allow mixed marriages, but any offspring of that marriage would then always be of the lowest social status.²⁹⁶ Age at marriage differed according to sex. Even though they were legally adults from the age of 14 or 15 years, depending on location, men were married after they reached their twenties. On the other hand, there was no legal minimum age for girls, but they were assumed to be adults at 12 years of age. There are a few cases where girls were engaged or even married at 8 years of age, but the vast majority of the rural population married between their twenty-second and their twenty-fourth year.²⁹⁷ Usually both individuals were the same age but there are some records, like those concerning Kythira, in which the men were significantly younger than their wives.²⁹⁸

Sources describing wedding customs mention marriage following on from matchmaking. The arrangement between the families was brought about by a specific person, usually an older female, while both families were involved in discussing the dowry during this process. After the marriage females usually moved into their husband's house and the couple lived with his family.²⁹⁹ In cases of sudden loss, the widower or widow remained or became the head of the family and he or she took care of the children. Moreover, despite some common misconceptions about the medieval period, the liberties and rights of a couple were in fact quite

²⁹⁴ Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 135; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Women in Medieval Famagusta', p. 22.

²⁹⁵ Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, p. 59; Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, pp. 124-125; Maltezos, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', p. 217; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 73.

²⁹⁶ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, pp. 304-305.

²⁹⁷ Maltezos, 'Το παιδί στην κοινωνία της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης', p. 216; Orlando, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας', p. 817.

²⁹⁸ Papadaki, 'Η οικογένεια στα Κύθηρα', pp. 177-178.

²⁹⁹ Maltezos, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', pp. 215-217.

progressive. Cases describing couples in Venetian Corfu refer to the possibility of divorce or even a mandatory waiting period before a divorce could be granted.³⁰⁰

Few details are known regarding marriage in Latin Cyprus. During the Lusignan period, a *parico/parica*'s master had to give his consent for them to be married. It was more acceptable for a *parico/parica* to marry a person of his/her own social condition than a free man or woman. Thus, not many *parici* were married to *francomati* or *liberi*, although they may have wanted to contract such marriages, because, even though their status remained the same, by marrying a free person, they would have more chance of paying the fee for themselves and their descendants to be enfranchised. Moreover, if one *parico/parica* married another who belonged to a different lord or the state, his or her lord had to approve the marriage and a replacement of the same sex had to be sent to the *parico/parica*'s settlement. With the exception of laws and Church regulations concerning marriage and its dissolution, information about marriage in the lower social stratum in medieval Cyprus is negligible. Therefore, data extracted from the documents studied in this thesis are valuable in illuminating this aspect of the *parici*'s lives.³⁰¹

7.1 Aradippou

As mentioned above, information concerning the population is hard to find in the Aradippou *catastico*. However, there are a few mentions of the married population of the area. Out of 138 individuals, twenty-two, nine men and thirteen women, are recorded as *maridato/a*. Two more, Jacomos (no. 76) and Lois/Ducas (no. 83), were also possibly married. Next to the former's name the indication 'con Despina Martin ttu Filippu' is written, presumably meaning that he was married to Despina. As for the latter, Lois/Ducas is said to have two children; his daughter Chiriacu is also recorded in the *catastico* as a legitimate child, which indicates that Lois/Ducas was married (table 12).

The wives of the men recorded in the *catastico* came from a different, nearby village. Only one couple originated from Aradippou, Liontis (no. 79) and Christina (no. 29). Married men and women were of different ages. The youngest married male listed is Zorzis (no. 139), who was 16 years old. The youngest married females are Parascheugu (no. 118), 10 years old, and then Anussa (no. 2), Christina (no. 29) and Christina (no. 33), all 18 years old. Parascefgu (no. 118) may be an exception, or a misinterpretation, the rest of the population were mostly married after 18, as indicated by the fact that most of them seem to have had children in the second or even third decade of their life. For example, Antonio (no. 9), 42 years old, had one

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 220-221.

³⁰¹ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', p. 34.

son, Jorgi, who was only 1 year old. On the other hand, Savas (no. 56), the oldest married man in the census, was 56 years old, and his two descendants, Anessa (no. 14) and Jacomo were 26 and 11 years old respectively. Since marriage was closely linked to childbearing, it may be presumed that couples were married for no more than two years before their first child arrived. Of course, cases of couples married before their twenties might exist, but on the basis of the data extracted from KK and MR, it seems that couples used to marry after their twenties. However, all the information regarding the population of Aradippou is quite vague and the conclusions are only conjectural. Furthermore, as this survey does not list ages, comparing the ages of married couples is not possible, whereas the MR and KK documents allow it.

Moreover, information regarding married females is rare. Most of the time the only information given is the name of her husband; no information is given regarding their children. There is only one case where a woman is recorded as having a child, Anussa (no. 4). Her child may have been illegitimate, since there is no mention of either a father or a marriage. Most of these women moved to their husband's village, indicated in table 32 by the verb 'left'.³⁰² Others were either given or sold to a nobleman, with or without their partners while others were enfranchised. Lastly, a case of one female is worth mentioning. According to a rumour (*come dicono*), Kristina (no. 13) abandoned her husband Andreas and lived alone.

7.2 Kato Koutrafas

There are many more recorded cases of married people in the KK manuscript than in AR. Since the document is, as mentioned above, in the form of a table, every married man is followed by the record for his wife, *sua moier* (table 13). Twenty-three out of twenty-seven men are shown as married, and another, Chiriacho (no. 28), is listed as *sposato*, which will be considered to mean engaged. However, the number of women listed as married or engaged differs. In addition to the spouses of the above twenty-three men, four more *parice* were married. The first two are Madalena (no. 8) and Mangu (no. 21), the two widows of the *catastico*. The other two are Fiorenza (no. 7), who was married and moved to the village of Melanissia, and Argiri (no. 25), who was transferred to the fief of Ser Martiningo. As to betrothed females, in addition to the entry of Safira (no. 28), there are three more *parice* in this category: Maria (no. 4) who was 12 years old and moved to the state's estates, Stauriani (no. 8) who was 15 years old and Linora (no. 19) who was also 15 years old. All of them probably lived in other nearby settlements. The names of Maria and Stauriani's fiancés are not known,

³⁰² Moving to the male's household was usual in Byzantium and other Venetian colonies see Ostrogorsky, 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire', p. 230; Maltezou, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', p. 215.

but Linora's is; she was engaged to Zorzin papa Vasili from Kakopetria, a village in the vicinity. Except for Safira (no. 28), who was recorded with her husband, they were all mentioned under a parent's name. A male *parico* or, in the event of his death, his widow, was the head of the family and thus the person responsible for paying taxes. The amount of money paid is specified on folio 3r-v and was determined by the particular circumstances of each family. On the other hand, Safira (no. 28) was mentioned with her fiancé because she was an outsider and therefore her father probably paid the tax for her in the village of Visachia. Surprisingly, Chiriacho, her future husband, was not included in the list of taxpayers despite his age.

The consistent recording of marriages in the survey of Kato Koutrafas allows several conclusions. As illustrated in table 13, spouses were close in age. On average, men are 4.9 years older than their wives, but with some exceptions: Chiriacho (no. 1), for example, was 20 years older than his wife Chiriachu, an age difference that suggests that this was Chiriacho's second marriage. Conversely, another exception is Frangu (no. 16), who was 6 years older than her husband Stati. One more woman, Zanna (no. 22) was also older than her spouse, while another four were of the same age, more closely following today's conventions.

The document does not tell us how old people were when they married, but for those *parici* who were also parents, a vague estimation is possible: since marriage at the time was primarily linked to childbirth, the birth of a first child most probably took place around two years after matrimony. On the basis of this calculation, men were on average 23 when they married, and women 18. This average age can be confirmed by the ages of the engaged girls, 12 and 15 years old, and of the only engaged couple, Chiriaco (no. 28), who was 18 years old, and his fiancée, who was 15. The case of twelve-year-old Maria (no. 4) appears to be exceptional, since she was very young, but the other engaged *parici* were very close to the average ages. There are also two entries for unmarried men, Zorzin (no. 30) and Sava (no. 31), while the last entry records an unmarried woman, Cali Stavrinu tu Plasti (no. 32), who was 25 years old. Due to the inconsistency in recording family names, her family is not easy to identify. She could be the sister of Valentin (no. 15) and Costin (no. 13), being at the same age as them. A *parico* named Staurino tu Plasti (no. 3), 56 years old, was also recorded in the document. Therefore, he could be Cali's father.

Finally, some conclusions concerning fertility rates may be drawn from the survey. Out of twenty-five married couples, the two widows included, seventeen had at least one child. Five of the seven childless couples were between 16 and 28 years of age (nos. 10, 13, 14, 16 and 18). These couples perhaps did not have a child right after the marriage and could still have

had one, although the age of Frangu (no. 16) and Xristoforo (no. 18), both 28 years old, allows for some doubt. The other couple recorded without a child are Chiriaco and Chiriachu (no. 1). If we take into consideration their ages, Chiriacho was 70 and Chiriachu 50, we could assume that the couple had adult children who were not recorded under their father's name. The document, however, does not record any other person named after Chiriacho and this could suggest that the couple was either childless or that their children had moved away. The average number of children per couple is 2 while the average age for having the first child is 20 for mothers and 25 for fathers. Their respective ages at the birth of the second child are on average 24 for women and 29.5 for men. Seven couples had only one child and the average age at birth in this case was 20 for mothers and 23.4 for fathers. Erini (no. 11) was the youngest mother, since she was 16 when her son Luois was born; the youngest man to be a father was Vasilis (no. 27), who was 18 when his son was born.

Consequently, these average ages and the fertility rates in the village of Kato Koutrafa are very close to the ones available for rural populations in medieval Western societies. Marriage for both sexes appears to have taken place in the second decade of their lives while fertility rates are also similar to those in rural western Europe. The average size of a family is a further indication of similar demographics between the peasantry in Europe and *parici* in Venetian Cyprus. Finally, as shown below, these numbers were very similar to those extracted from the MR document.

7.3 Marathasa

The well-written and highly informative Marathasa manuscript allows enlightening insights into marriage in Venetian Cyprus. In order to draw safe conclusions, the information provided by the survey was studied thoroughly to identify all the individuals listed as married. This was a rewarding process, as families were identified along the way. Some otherwise missing information was found in the MR1 document. Out of 608 males above the age of 11, 360 were married while, additionally, forty-nine women recorded next to their father's name were said to be married. Information about age could be gathered for only 203 married couples with both spouses alive (table 14). In the case of men who married only once, the age difference between them and their wives is on average four years. Some couples, however, present a different situation. Thirty-two women (around 10% of the total number of married women) were older than their husbands, the biggest age gap being that between Annussa (no. 320), 79 years old, and her husband Minas, 67. There are also several cases of men significantly older than their wives: Zorzis (no. 295) and his wife Flura had the biggest age difference between

them: eighteen years. Comparing data for couples with at least one child reveals that the average age at which men had their first child was 27.4 years and for women 23.7. It may thus be deduced that the average age for a *parico* to get married was 25 and for a *parica* 21. These figures are compatible with the average age for an engagement mentioned below. Moreover, there are thirty-five unmarried females recorded under their father's name, whose ages ranged between 15 and 24. Couples have on average four children, but the number could be reduced to 2.5 for couples under 40 years of age. The youngest *parice* to be mothers were Safira (no. 319) and Mariu (no. 321), both 12 years old. Conversely, the oldest *parica* to have a first child was Marita (no. 442), who gave birth to her only child Mariu when she was 38 years old. A significant number of *parice* had a child in their forties while Annussa (no. 320) was 58 years old when her seventh child was born. Similarly, the youngest *parico* to be a father was Loys (no. 488), 13 years old when his daughter was born, and the oldest was Savas (no. 392), 43 years old when his daughter Chiriacu was born.

Though very informative in general, the document has occasional mistakes or omissions. The most common confusion is caused by the use of the term *sposato/sposata*, since it is not clear whether it designates married or engaged couples. According to the 'Dizionario del Dialetto Veneziano', *sposar* means "Pigliar per moglie o per marito. Dar moglie ad un'uomo. Dar marito ad una femina."³⁰³ Therefore, the term is a synonym of *maritare* (to marry). However, both MR manuscripts as well as KK use two different terms to define a *parico's* or *parica's* marital status. For the majority of females who are recorded as married in MR2, the word *maridata* is written next to their name.³⁰⁴ On a few occasions, the word *sposata* is recorded in the same place, while for another eleven cases, the writer added the term above the entry.³⁰⁵ Since none of the women recorded as *sposata* was over twenty-five, the term must have been used to differentiate the engaged from the married. This hypothesis is supported by the content of the summary appended to the names of the children in some of the entries. For example, Jannis (no. 112) had four daughters registered in his entry. The two older daughters, Annussa, and her sister Maria were each described as *maridata*, married to *parici* of the estate; therefore, their father Jannis was not obliged to pay taxes for them. Their sister Fostira was 16 years old and no other information was recorded next to her name. The last sister, Christina, was 18 years old and was described as *sposata* to Zaco Iorgi Michali Condu (no. 9). Under the names of Jannis's children the writer has added the number 2, meaning that the *parico* had to

³⁰³ G. Boerio, *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*, 2 ed., Firenze, Giunti, 1993, p. 694.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 398.

³⁰⁵ For example, numbers 304, 305 and 348.

pay for two members of his family.³⁰⁶ Since a father was responsible for his daughters until they got married, it can be presumed that the girl recorded as *sposata* was not married yet. Since a man's name is always recorded after the term, women registered as *sposata* must have been engaged at the time of the census.

There were also some omissions in the recording of engaged individuals. In almost a third of cases where an engaged couple is mentioned in the entry for the girl's father, the engagement is not noted in the fiancé's entry. For example, Pericos (no. 178) and Francin (no. 127), both recorded as single in their own entries, are said to be the fiancés of Elena (no. 426) and Annussa (no. 194) respectively. As there is no other reference to these couples, they have been considered to be engaged for the sake of coherence. There are twenty-one engaged couples; fourteen are recorded as entries and seven more are related to females described as *sposata* next to their father's name (table 15). The average age at which men got engaged was 23 while for women it was 19 and men were on average four years older than their fiancées.

In the survey, sometimes ages are omitted; the ages of forty-nine couples are not stated. Even though many of them have two separate records, one with their spouse and one with their father, no ages are given. Another problem is the fact that some women appear with two different names, for example Angelina papa Jannj papa Petru Protopsalti (no. 49), who seems to be recorded again as Fostira (no. 321). On other occasions, an ancestor's name was omitted. In several cases, the scribe prefers to record only an individual's first name, father's name and last name or even only their first and last name. The identification of these individuals was more difficult since relatives with similar names existed. Finally, it is impossible to know whether the *parici* who are said to have died *senza figliogli* (Fluris no. 3 and Janni no. 294) were married or not.

Second marriage was an option for the widowed *parici*. There are only two women who married twice, a very small number compared to the twenty-eight men who contracted a second marriage. Since there is only a handful of people in the survey who married twice, we can study them in more detail. Most of the marriages concern two persons from the same area; but for the majority of twice-married men, either one (nos. 326, 149, 184, 432, 64, 217, 423 and 510) or both (nos. 311, 468 and 497) of their wives came from outside the fief, which gives an insight into relations between settlements. For men married twice, the age difference with their second wives is on average ten years. Both partners of one second marriage were married twice: Paulos (no. 149) was first married to Maria Iorgi tu Comodromu, a *parica* from the area, and

³⁰⁶ For similar cases see numbers 143, 154, 168 and 326.

after she passed away Paulos married Lose Zorzi papa Pifanj from San Pifani of Vilaraut. Lose is recorded as *vedua*, the widow of Limbiti Argiro Spatharj, who might have come to Marathasa for her first wedding. After the death of her first husband, Lose married Paulos and later on, she herself passed away (table 16).

As the previous examples show, a second marriage was usually socially acceptable only if a partner had died. One exception is the couple mentioned in fol. 71^r, Loysa Vassili Lasaru Athipatu and Fluris Poli Pangallu. Loysa separated from Fluris and went on to have two children with Xristoforo Marius Petru, a free man. Another is the couple Liasis Janj Liassi papa Stefano and Mariu Foti papa Lasaru (no. 217). Liasis abandoned his wife and married Maria papa Nicola Platagna; the scribe notes that his first wife also remarried. Unlike the widowers, out of forty-two widows, only three remarried: Lose (no. 149), Argirj (no. 176) and Christina (no. 180). Three more relocated after the deaths of their husbands: Maria (no. 172), who moved to Bafo, Maria (no. 177), who was transferred to Ambelicu, and Bele (no. 280), who was sent to serve Ser Marco Frasenge, one of the owners of Marathasa. Moreover, as will be discussed later, two of them had given birth after the death of their husbands. These children, even though legal descendants of the couple, were considered illegitimate. Another noteworthy case was Mariu (no. 76), who was only 20 years old when her spouse Limbitis passed away.

As several of these cases show, movement due to marriage was commonplace in Marathasa. Apart from nos 425 and 510, who married distant relatives, all the individuals in the record married members of other families, outsiders or enfranchised people (tables 9 and 17). Another exception is Margarita (no. 483), the daughter of Galinos; she probably married and had children with a *zingano*.³⁰⁷

7.4 Conclusions

The four documents examined shed much light on marriage amongst *parici* in Venetian Cyprus. People married in their mid-twenties, which was common in medieval western Europe and Byzantium. The main question that emerged was whether marriage on the island involved a reconsideration of the age of attaining adulthood. Even if the legal age for girls might have been 12 years old and for boys 15, in reality the average age at which couples married was later.³⁰⁸ In many cases recorded in MR females up to 24 still appeared to be considered as under

³⁰⁷ Stefano Lusignan refers to a village near Nicosia inhabited by that particular group of people. Gypsies were a minority within the lower orders and very little is known about their presence on the island. Lusignan, *Description de toute l'isle de Cypre*, p. 71^v; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 66.

³⁰⁸ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 73.

their father's protection. The same went for boys who started to pay taxes in their fifteenth year but the average age for marriage was eight to ten years after that. So, a reappraisal of when people reached the age of majority in Venetian Cyprus seems necessary. *Parici* were usually married to others of the same status, probably after matchmaking, but there were a few exceptions where *parici* were married to *francomati*. Arrangements between local families appeared to be very common for the population of a specific area. Couples mainly lived in their village of origin but there are recorded cases where the couple moved from one place to another. Second marriages are also worth noting: they were more common for men, who had in most cases lost their first wife during the first decade of marriage. A second marriage was especially important when the man had young children. These widowers appear to have married significantly younger women, just like males in Florence³⁰⁹ but also as in smaller communities where, until recently, a second marriage was a common practice. To conclude, marriage and related practices in Venetian Cyprus were not much different from the rest of European society.

³⁰⁹ Herlihy, *Medieval Households*, p. 154.

MARINA ILIA

8 Illegitimate and Orphan Children

Illegitimate children, or *bastardi* as they are called in the three documents under examination, are always a section of society worth exploring because their stories yield interesting details about family life. Children and their place in a family during the Middle Ages have not yet been well studied. And illegitimate and orphan children even less so, rendering any evaluations of this segment of the Cypriot population under examination quite interesting. As a preliminary, some terms and the way they are used should be defined.

The term illegitimate describes children born out of wedlock. Since their parents were not legally bound by marriage, the children were considered illegitimate. Even though sexual activity outside marriage was not tolerated, there were unmarried couples with children who could not contract a legitimate marriage because, for example, they were close relatives or already married to another person.³¹⁰ There is unfortunately no data concerning these children, especially regarding their everyday activities. Narrative sources described them in negative terms since they were a liability for their parents. The mother was usually the person responsible for raising these children, while grandparents or other close relatives might adopt them. Some illegitimate children, especially those of a priest, could be adopted and raised by monks or nuns in monasteries.³¹¹ In Venetian Corfu there were regulations about illegitimate children, stipulating that the father of a *bastardo* should inform the State of the child's existence.³¹² These children were usually mentioned as *fatti alla ventura*, a term emphasising that they were conceived and born by chance. Most importantly, they suffered social discrimination. The illegitimate offspring of a person of higher rank was more likely to be accepted than a poor illegitimate child, who was the offspring of a casual affair.³¹³ In Latin Cyprus illegitimate children were also discriminated against since they could inherit from their father only if his legitimate children agreed; they could, however, inherit from their mother, since both her legitimate and illegitimate children were equal before the law.³¹⁴

Since infant and child mortality was exceedingly high during the period, it may be presumed that most abandoned children died in the early years of their lives. However, as John Eastburn Boswell notes, *expositio*, the act of leaving a child “exposed to risk and harm”, had

³¹⁰ L. Wertheimer, ‘Children of Disorder: Clerical Parentage, Illegitimacy, and Reform in the Middle Ages’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, vol. 15, 2006, p. 385.

³¹¹ J. E. Boswell, ‘Expositio and Oblatio: The Abandonment of Children and the Ancient and Medieval Family’, *The American Historical Review*, vol. 89, 1984, pp. 21 and 28.

³¹² Maltezos, ‘Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές’, p. 220.

³¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-220.

³¹⁴ Nicolaou-Konnari, ‘Women in Medieval Famagusta’, p. 18 and *passim*.

been widespread since the Roman period. These children, legal or illegal, were abandoned by their parents in various places: hills, forests and/or, quite commonly, in a basket put in the water.³¹⁵ Many of them would not survive, but fortunately some, amongst them several important figures of Roman and Byzantine history, were adopted by relatives or strangers.³¹⁶ However, in the Middle Ages it was commonly believed that abandoned children were most likely to come from impoverished families. Another medieval practice was *oblatio*, the act of offering or donating a child to a church or monastery for it to be raised by religious communities.³¹⁷ Many parents preferred to leave their child outside a church door, as this type of abandonment was far more beneficial for the child.

This was a common procedure in Latin Cyprus as well, since numerous *parici* left their children outside the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom. Due to an old practice, these abandoned children, the *evreta/vreta*, would be raised as free.³¹⁸ The priests were obliged to show the *vreto* during a religious celebration. If someone recognised the child, the *vreto* was given back to the family. Otherwise the child was raised by a stepfamily or the church as free. This common practice, and above all the privileges and the freedoms given, had probably been a matter of concern to the king. According to a document from *Le livre des Remembrances de la Secrete*, in 1468 a group of six people, including nobles representing the High Court, were instructed to examine these special rights given by the Church to the *evreta*. The committee had to scrutinise the practice and present its findings to the king in writing.³¹⁹

This unwritten law was still in use during the Venetian period. In fact, not only the *evreta* left outside the cathedral but every abandoned infant or child appears to have been raised as free. *Parici* seem to have abused this right, since the number of infants left outside churches or in the streets was increasing, as mentioned in the reports sent to Venice.³²⁰ This impelled the Council to redefine its regulations for enfranchisement, especially regarding these children.³²¹ Orphans were also protected by regulations and authorities demonstrated great concern for them. For example, in Karpasia the local administrator was supposed to be informed if a person died leaving children behind.³²² The study of the cases of illegitimate and

³¹⁵ Boswell, 'Expositio and Oblatio', pp. 15-16.

³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 15; Rautman, *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 43-44.

³¹⁷ Boswell, 'Expositio and Oblatio', p. 17.

³¹⁸ I. Chatzakis, 'Τα «βρετά» παιδιά. Οι ιδιαίτερες διαστάσεις του φαινομένου της έκθεσης βρεφών στη βενετική Κύπρο', *Νόμος*, 13, 2010.

³¹⁹ Richard, *Le Livre des Remembrances de la Secrete du Royaume de Chypre*, document 155, pp. 97-98.

³²⁰ Chatzakis, 'Τα «βρετά» παιδιά.', p. 503.

³²¹ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, p. 108.

³²² Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Women in Medieval Famagusta', p. 26.

orphan children in the three documents examined in this thesis provides further insights into their lives in Venetian Cyprus.

Children were always under the protection of an adult. In the *Stato da mar*, the local Venetian administration almost always provided support and protection to those abandoned or orphaned. Otherwise, close family members or even childless couples adopted these children and provided them with the bare necessities.³²³ Illegitimate children, known as *bastardi* or *gasmulli*, were very common in the rural population. As in Cyprus, some mothers gave birth to more than one child by the same father, which is rather peculiar. In censuses of the population in Kythira, there are references to mothers having an illegitimate child and being illegitimate themselves as well.³²⁴ These children were numerous but not socially accepted, especially in the lower social groups. Nonetheless, some of them were generally recognised by the family and lived with their legitimate siblings. On the contrary, the illegitimate children recorded in the examined documents, appeared to be part of the community.

8.1 Aradippou

Whereas in MR2 illegitimate children are recorded in a separate table under the name of their mother, the AR manuscript is less detailed, and only two out of the 138 children are recorded as *bastardo/a*, Zorzis (no. 140) and Christina (no. 34). It is, however, possible to identify more children who could have been illegitimate, as twenty-two of them have a woman's second name. However, this may indicate that they were orphans, without a father, like a few other cases in MR2 (table 18). Thirteen of these twenty-two children were males coming from ten different families. The age range for these illegitimate children is wide: the youngest, Parascefgu (no. 118), was 10 years old at the time of the census, while Arguiri (no. 7) was 43 years old. This wide range indicates that illegitimate children named after their mother were common in almost every generation recorded in the manuscript. An interesting case is that of the mother of an illegitimate child who was illegitimate herself. This may have been the case for Niengomia (no. 116) and Mariu Cristinas (no. 108), daughters of Chamiras.³²⁵ There are two more children in the survey who may be illegitimate: Annusa (no. 4) may have given birth to a son out of wedlock, since, exceptionally, the child appears next to her name, though as a rule the scribe records children in their father's entries. However, since there are no specific details, this is just a hypothesis. The second case is a female child, Erinj (no. 52), daughter of Vasilj. The name of her father is given next to her name as well as that of her male

³²³ Maltezou, 'Το παιδί στην κοινωνία της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης', pp. 219-220.

³²⁴ Papadaki, 'Η οικογένεια στα Κύθηρα', pp. 184-186.

³²⁵ Regarding this name, see the Papa Dimitrano family above.

ancestors, from the Chila family. But there is an unexpected piece of information in her entry; the scribe says that Erinj had changed her name to Erinj Loisas, her mother's name. This amendment could indicate that Erinj was an illegitimate child, while her siblings, Christina (no. 27), Linbitis (no. 85) and Marita (no. 97) were the children of Vasilj.

Examining the data presented in table 18, an interesting question arises regarding illegitimate children and their siblings. Twelve of the children listed, the majority of the illegitimate children, have a brother or sister also recorded as illegitimate; this shows that having children out of marriage was in many cases not just a one-off accident. Regarding the status of these children, seven of them were sold and six more were given as servants to a noble. Surprisingly, five were able to pay for their enfranchisement Arguiri (no. 7), Christina (no. 34), Zias (no. 137), and two brothers Perris (no. 117) and Zorzis (no. 140). Of Christina (no. 34), the writer says that her father, Vaglianti Clacia, was a *francomato*. Christina was not born free like her father, but had to pay the amount of 40 ducats for her enfranchisement. The father's name is also known for Zorzis Nicola Cotj (no. 140), but not his status. Zorzis was also able to pay for his freedom (30 ducats), and the manuscript states that he moved to Paphos.

8.2 Kato Koutrafas

The number of illegitimate and orphan children in the KK manuscript is also small. In fact, only five out of forty-six children can be identified as *bastardi*. Firstly, the child of Chiriacho tu Lefteri Chatopadieri (no. 24), who lived, the author specifies, with Ser Balian de Nores, a noble, probably in Nicosia, is recorded as a *bastardo*, and was thus most probably a boy. This is the only information regarding this child, as his name, age and mother's name are unknown. Another *bastardo* mentioned is Zegno (no. 28), who was 1 year old, the illegitimate child of Plumu tu Charida. Since his mother was transferred to another village and replaced by Safira de papa Petro (no. 28), Zegno appears under his mother's name, but he was actually raised by Protopapa Charito (no. 26), the head priest of the village. It is worth noting that Protopapa Charito, who had five children of his own, was the one who looked after Zegno and not the boy's relative, Stasis (no. 16), who lived in the same village and had no children at the time of the census.

The other children in KK who are probably illegitimate are the offspring of *chira* Madalena (no. 8). As mentioned above, Madalena is one of the widows recorded in the Kato Koutrafas document; since the survey gives only the Christian names of her children, Stauriani, Eleni and Chiriacho, they could have been either legitimate descendants, i.e. the orphans of her deceased husband, or born out of wedlock. However, Madalena was 23 years old when she

gave birth to Stauriani and 29 when she had Chiriacho; if these three were the legitimate children of her husband, he would have died no earlier than 1512. Regarding their status, the three children are all *parici* like their mother; as a widow, she was not obliged to pay any fees, except for the *viduazo* (table 19).

8.3 Marathasa

Illegitimate and orphan children are well recorded in the Marathasa document. The scribe Peratis tries to document all cases: every time the mother of an illegitimate child is recorded next to the father, a note regarding her *bastardi* is given beside her name. In addition, following the instructions on how to create a *catastico* by Florio Bustron, an almost comprehensive table of illegitimate and orphan children is provided after the census of the adult *parici*.³²⁶ As is the case for the other two documents, more illegitimate children can be identified when *parici* have their mother's second name; this is not, however, true for orphans. Since these children were legal descendants of a married couple, they have their father's name. Therefore, only the orphans identified as such by the author can be counted.

Seventy-two *parici* in total are listed as illegitimate; fifteen of these, eight males and seven females, are *orfani*, as noted in table 20. Three of them, Loys (no. 86), Jannis (no. 91) and Argiros (no. 92), are the orphaned children of Limbiti Argiru Sfinarj, who died in 1503. Another three, Jorgis (no. 54), Vassilis (no. 70) and Chiprianos (no. 448) could possibly be his children as well, but the scribe does not include them in the list of orphans. Janj papa Mina tu Milona, who died in 1509, had nine descendants. The survey informs us that seven of his children were in Galata, while another two, Christina (no. 425) and Maria (no. 406), are not listed under his name. Surprisingly, there is no mention of these *parici*'s mothers.

Another fifty-seven *parici* are recorded as illegitimate: twenty-four males, thirty-two females, and two more of unknown gender, as they were not yet born at the time of the census (table 21). There are additional female *parice* recorded as mothers of *bastardi*, but no further information is given. These illegitimate children are members of eight different families, located in several nearby settlements. The age range is wide: the youngest is 1 year old and the oldest over 40. For many of them, the father is known, as well as his status and place of residence. For instance, the father of the four children of Argirj Iorgi Janj Stassi Cumninu (folio 68^v), was a monk from San Chiriaco. Another example is Annussa Limbiti Foti papa Lasaru (no. 237), who is recorded as living in Nicosia with Ser Hieronimo Arseni, a nobleman. However, one Hieronimo is listed as the father of her child (folio 69^r).

³²⁶ Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, p. 576.

The survey also gives details about where and with whom these children lived. Several of them lived with their father, such as the children of Argirj and Maria Protopsalti, mentioned on folio 69^v. Some, however, lived with relatives, and even if it is not expressly stated, they were probably ‘adopted’ by them. For example, the children of Fluru Loy Vassili tu Valili, Loysos and Petros lived with their maternal grandfather (folio 71^r), while the daughter and son of Elena Annussas Iorgi Vassili Vovo lived with papa Janj Nomicu (folio 70^v).

Another interesting case of adoption concerns the daughters of Annusa Lamberti Staurinu (no. 221), Christina and Maria. As indicated on f.72^r, the father of these two females was Mina papa Petru Protopsalti (no. 320). At the time of the census, Minas was married to Annussa Iorgi tu Mina, and had seven legitimate children with her. One of his legal daughters, Xristina was 30 years old, the same age as Maria, his illegitimate child with Annusa Lamberti. It thus appears that Minas had an affair with Annusa Lamberti, an illegitimate child herself, and that his two partners were pregnant simultaneously. On top of that, Annussa Lamberti was the second wife of Vassilis (no. 221). Vassilis and his first wife had never had a child; apparently, he adopted Annussa’s two daughters. They also had a son, Zorzis, who is the only child in the document with Vassilis’s name. He is recorded as 30 years old; if this is correct, Zorzis and Maria were twins. Therefore, either Zorzis is also the illegitimate child of Minas and has been recognised by Vassilis as his own, or Christina was the illegitimate child and her siblings, Zorzis and Maria were legal descendants of their mother’s marriage with Vassilis.

Two illegitimate children, Michalis Marius Trullinu (folio 69^r) and the unborn child of Areti Thomassi Caridi (folio 71^r), were born after their fathers’ deaths. As was the case in the KK manuscript, it is not certain whether these children were considered legitimate or illegitimate, but the latter seems more likely. Finally, as in the AR document, some mothers of *bastardi* were themselves illegitimate. Specific cases appear on folio 68^v, where Maria tis Annusas and Maria Vassili Comodromu are recorded both as children and as mothers.

8.4 Conclusions

Various patterns and trends emerge from a comparison of the three manuscripts. Firstly, illegitimate children were certainly considered to be a distinct social group hence, in the Marathasa census, Florio Bustron and the scribe Peratis list them in a separate table at the end of the document. Interestingly, the census authors knew that a child would be a *bastardo/a* even if the mother was still pregnant. Though they had the same servile obligations as all the other *parici*, these individuals were labelled *bastardo/a* or *orfani* throughout their lives. In addition, the number of these children suggests that many of them were not just “accidents”.

In fact, most illegitimate children's mothers gave birth to more than one illegitimate child by the same father. Though the surveys specify that these children were born *alla ventura*, meaning they were the outcome of accidental pregnancy, the fact that the same woman could have successive pregnancies out of wedlock suggests otherwise. The case of Loysa Galati Iorgi Muchli, in MR2 f.71^v, who gave birth *alla ventura* to seven illegitimate children and was expecting another at the time of the census, is quite indicative. Moreover, having an illegitimate child seems to have been a repetitive pattern across generations and an illegitimate woman often gave birth to illegitimate children herself, as happened in the Comodromu, Vovu and Stavrinu-Trullinu families in MR2, and the Papa Dimitrano family in AR show.

Finally, two special cases of adoption should be mentioned. Firstly, Michali Chiriacho Mirili Lazaru (no. 19) in KK f. 2^v and Zaco Zorzi Pifanj tu Tomasin (no. 136) in AR f.14^r are both cited as *vreto*, which, as explained earlier, normally denoted children who had been left outside the cathedral of Holy Wisdom in Nicosia and who were raised as free. In these two entries, however, this appears not to be the case. Both Michalis and Zacos have the name of an adult male next to their own, possibly their stepfather, and both of them were *parici*. Zaco managed to pay 50 ducats as an enfranchisement fee.

All of the above practices concerning these youngsters are very similar to the cases in other Venetian colonies. Illegitimate children were also part of the community, and they were to a large degree accepted. Of course, there might be a different approach towards the *bastardi*, but this appeared to be more the case in the higher social groups. A distinct characteristic of the Cypriot children examined in the documents, or to be more precise of the children in the Marathasa valley during the mid-sixteenth century, was their extremely low mortality rate. The numbers found in the documents give a completely different picture than that seen in other locations. Nevertheless, the information given in the documents examined could be misleading, as described above, and some doubt could possibly be cast upon the numbers.

To conclude, there is a good deal of information on illegitimate and orphaned children in the documents examined, displaying tendencies and practices in respect of these individuals. Once it is properly studied, the history of children and more specifically the history of the *bastardi* could reveal important information about the families and local society in general during the Venetian period.

MARINA ILIA

9 Onomatology

As Tassos Papacostas states “The study of the names of people is definitely a tool worth exploiting, for they shed ample light on the choices made and on shifting patterns of name giving”.³²⁷ Undeniably, the study of name formation and naming practices for both personal and family names yields much interesting information regarding a person’s identification, family network and social status. Though anthroponomastics and prosopography usually focus on power groups,³²⁸ it is important for scholars to apply similar methods to other sections of society.

The given name endows a person with specific characteristics, which create his or her unique identity. In both the Byzantine world and the medieval West, a newborn was usually baptised in the first weeks of his or her life.³²⁹ The majority of them, especially firstborns, were named after a direct relative, usually a grandparent. Other given names could be that of a close relative, usually on the father’s side, and/or that of the godparent. Several other circumstances could affect naming patterns, such as the locality and fashion.³³⁰ The given name was usually followed by a patronym, the name of the father, and sometimes by that of the paternal grandfather (a patrilinear pattern).³³¹ Exceptionally, a child could take the name of his/her mother if s he/she was illegitimate. Naming patterns appeared to be the same for both sexes. However, the fact that females were usually ignored in the sources makes the study of women’s prosopography more difficult.³³² A female was usually linked to a male, either her father or her husband, and her name was regularly structured in relation to his. In Venetian Crete as well as in Latin Cyprus, a woman’s Christian name was followed by the word *tu*, the personal pronoun in the genitive case, and the name of a male in the genitive.

Similar practices were followed in other locations under Venetian administration. During the first months of his or her life, a child was taken to church in order to be baptised. As in medieval France, this important event in a child’s life was recorded in the parish documents and kept in the local archive. Names of parents and godparents were recorded as well. Parents were very careful about choosing a godparent for their child since in that way

³²⁷ T. Papacostas, ‘The Byzantine tradition in late medieval Cyprus: selective continuity and creative diversification’, in A. Lymberopoulou (ed.), *Proceedings of the 48th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Open University*, Milton Keynes 28-30 March 2015, Routledge, London, 2018, p. 6.

³²⁸ L. Stone, ‘Prosopography’, *Daedalus*, vol. 100, Historical Studies Today, 1971, pp. 46-47.

³²⁹ Rautman, *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 43-44.

³³⁰ D. A. Postles, ‘Personal Naming Patterns of Peasants and Burgesses in Late Medieval England’, *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 12, 1991, pp. 32-34; P. Skinner, “‘And Her Name Was...?’ Gender and Naming in Medieval Southern Italy”, *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 20, 1999, p. 24.

³³¹ Postles, ‘Personal Naming Patterns of Peasants and Burgesses’, p. 30.

³³² Skinner, “‘And Her Name Was...?’ Gender and Naming’, p. 23.

they were creating new family ties. In the case of an illegitimate child, only the name of the mother was recorded along with the name of the godfather. This type of archive is very important for someone studying family history. Kythira has one such complete archive and thus studies on the island's families have been done.³³³ Children in Kythira, whether legitimate or not, were usually named after their grandparents or aunts and uncles. Names were mostly those of Greek Orthodox saints, but there are several cases where an individual had an Italian or a more western name.³³⁴

In the four documents examined, names are one of the most important aspects of the rural population recorded. Studying the evolution of the form of a name over time sheds light on societal trends and new ideas adopted by the group being studied.³³⁵ Fortunately, the documents provide a great number and variety of first and last names. Naming patterns were mainly similar to those described above. The individual was identified by a first name, one or more names of an ancestor and then a family name. These names are very important for this study, as they are the only way to accurately identify a person and place him or her in a family tree. The main practice concerning second names differs. In KK the males have one or two patronyms after their first name while the family name is sometimes omitted. For women only the first name is given except in the cases of Fiorenza de Michali Chafisi (no. 7) and Chali tu Staurino tu Plasti (no. 32), who had their own entries, and the women mentioned in no. 28: Safira de papa Petro, a foreigner, and Plumu tu Charida, who had left the settlement. In AR both males and females have a first name followed by the name of several ancestors and then a family name. The possessive pronoun *tu* is frequently used here. In MR documents, the conductor of the census is very consistent in the way he records names. *Parici* and *parice* are identified by a first name followed by two names of an ancestor and then the family name. The only exceptions are members of the larger families, such as the Nomicu and Athipatu, who usually have three names following the given name, and foreigners married to a local *parico/parica* but living outside the area, about whom there is little information and sometimes only the first name is given. Lastly, for a few males a nickname was also given, which might eventually become a second family name.³³⁶

³³³ *Ibid.*, pp. 184-185.

³³⁴ Maltezou, 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές', p. 219.

³³⁵ I. Shagrir, *Naming Patterns in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Oxford, Publications of the Unit for Prosopographical Research, 2003, pp. 2-3.

³³⁶ See Michalis Mina Athipatu o Caricas (no. 207) in MR2 and Savas Staurino Liondi Panagioti tu Zangarj o Canbanas (no.124) in AR.

The abundance of information given concerning names and surnames leads to so many conclusions that a comprehensive analysis of onomastics would require a study of its own. There follows a general description of the main naming patterns for the individuals recorded in the three surveys together with an attempt to trace their own and their family's origins.

9.1 Aradippou

The onomastics was much easier in the Aradippou document, where the 140 individuals are recorded just once and in alphabetical order. There is thus no confusion about ages and names. The procedure followed in regard to data processing is as follows: the names of the *parici* were divided into two tables. The first one shows age and sex. The second one shows people's surnames in order to establish family networks. Unlike in MR2, the copyist's handwriting is not very clear, especially when it comes to names. Where a name was unclear, an attempt was made to match it with a known name. Different spellings of a name (for example Andrias and Andreas) were given different entries in an effort to catalogue all the different forms of a name.

9.1.1 First Names by Age

As the charts 1-6 and table 22 show, the age groups 11-20 and 21-30 are much larger than the others. The eighty-six men and fifty women in all age groups have either western names or Latinised Greek names, possibly a sign of Aradippou's proximity to the *Saline*, the modern-day port of Larnaca. The mostly young population was probably influenced by new trends brought by travellers visiting Cyprus or the Cypriot aristocracy or new Venetian officers arriving to govern the island and its settlements. A great example is Jason, a very popular name amongst the Cypriot nobility, which was given to the son of Zuana (no. 130).

9.1.2 Surnames

Surnames recorded in Aradippou are very similar to those of Marathasa. The majority are related to first names, possibly linked to the first ancestor who came to the area: for example, Jorgizi, Pifani, Nichiforo and Thomassi. Names derived from an occupation are also frequently found. The area's three largest families are examples: Zangari, indicating that an ancestor was shoemaker; Comodromu a mender (as in MR2 below); and Comerchiari, from the word *κομμερκιάρης*, an officer of the *commerchium* the office that regulated local

commerce and foreign trade.³³⁷ The latter is a very interesting surname, since a serf was not allowed to hold an office; the name may indicate the importance of the family or an illegitimate ancestor, son of an officer of the *commerchium*. The surname of the next largest family in the area, Colocassi, comes from a vegetable found in the area and which is still common today. Surnames related to a characteristic are also common: for example, the name Allupi may come from *αλουπός*,³³⁸ the fox, meaning a devious person. Another example is the surname Palluri deriving probably from the word *παλλούρα*, a thorn with the scientific name *Paliurus australis*, commonly known as the Jerusalem thorn. Palluris was probably a nickname given to a member of this family due to his appearance. Other interesting surnames are Sclavogiannis, indicating that a member of the family named Giannis had been a *sclavo*, a serf and Xeno, suggesting that the first member of this family who had settled in the area was a foreigner. The surname Xeno was also common in other Venetian dominions, such as Crete.³³⁹ Finally, there are three surnames indicating descendants of priests: Papa Vassili, Papa Dimitrano and Papa Chiriaco.

9.2 Kato Koutrafas

Categorising the 101 people recorded in the Kato Katroufas document was not as complicated as for Marathasa. The *parici* mentioned in the document lived in small nuclear families. The most popular male name is Chiriaco (eight males) and Luois (five males). Chiriaco is a traditional Cypriot name, which appears in Marathasa and Aradippou as well. In fact, not far from the settlement, next to the village of Evrichou, there is a church built in the fifteenth century and the tomb of the local Saint Kyriakos. Luois, on the other hand, is a variation of Lois/Loisos. The name is very popular in the AR and MR documents as well, especially for older males, though there is no known saint in the area or famous noble in the Lusignan family with that name (chart 7). The most popular female name is Maria, also given as Mariu, a very common name then and now. There is also a small number of Western names, like Annotta, Fiorenza and Zanna (chart 8). Sometimes the same name appears in different forms: Katerina and Chatarina and Zuan and Janni. This probably shows the trend amongst younger generations for Westernising their names.

³³⁷ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', p. 30; K. Giagkoullis, *Θησαυρός κυπριακής διαλέκτου: ερμηνευτικό, ετυμολογικό, φρασολογικό και ονοματολογικό λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής και νεότερης κυπριακής διαλέκτου*, Nicosia, Theopress, 2009, pp. 234 and 250.

³³⁸ Giagkoullis, *Θησαυρός κυπριακής διαλέκτου*, pp. 33-34.

³³⁹ Ch. Gasparis, 'Οι ξένοι του χωριού. Κοινωνικά και πληθυσμιακά χαρακτηριστικά των μεσαιωνικών χωριών της Κρήτης', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019. pp. 25-50.

9.2.1 Surnames

The population of Kato Katroufas is too small to draw any real conclusions. Six out of the ten surnames were derived from first names, again probably linked to an ancestor or the first male of the family who came to the area. The surname of the biggest family, Plasti, meaning a moulder or a shaper, refers to the occupation of either a potter or a baker respectively.

9.3 Marathasa

As the longest document, MR2 was a valuable source of information. Studying a person's name made it possible to identify them and put them into small families in direct line of descent, normally composed of the grandfather, his children and his grandchildren, while middle names revealed ancestors and distant relatives of the same family. All of this information allowed the construction of family trees. Furthermore, MR1 provides extra information regarding people from other settlements that MR2 does not. Families can be traced back several generations, and their family trees reveal links between different people and, consequently, relations between different villages, connections that will be discussed more extensively below. The methods adopted are those used by Iris Shagrir in finding the most popular names in the Latin East;³⁴⁰ the various tables that have been created include members of thirty-four families. This process excludes 172 outsiders, men or women who were married to *parici* from Marathasa but originated from different areas of the island; and also 13 *liberi* (free men and women) and one *zingano*. This led to safer conclusions about the connections between people, the expansion of the branches of a family tree in the area in question, and the existence of a family over time. The data enabled two further tables to be drawn up, which show the distribution of names by age and village of origin. Conclusions drawn from these tables are reported in charts 9-30.

9.3.1 Popular First Names by Age

The identification of individuals in the survey has not always been easy due to various obstacles but the process has been very rewarding. First of all, the methodology should be explained. After all the information had been collected about a person, this individual was included in a family. Then, each individual (whether alive or not at the time of the survey) was recorded in tables showing gender and the decade in which they are mentioned. Charts 9-28

³⁴⁰ I. Shagrir, 'Franks and Normans in the Mediterranean: A Comparative Examination of Naming Patterns', *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 30, 2015, pp. 63-65.

were created recording 773 males and 680 females, whose age is mentioned at least once in the manuscript. Six more tables were produced to show seventy males and ninety-six females of unknown age. For these cases, details of siblings or parents, or even spouses and children, were used in order to place these people in a wider chronological context of two decades. Three main problems emerged during this process. The first concerned the case of people recorded with two different ages, which might or might not be close to one another. In order to find a plausible solution, these people's ages were collated with the ages of their relatives, as in the cases described above. The second problem was caused by the existence of variants of a person's name, one of the main issues in onomatology. The best example of the problem is provided by the names Maria and Mariu, or Michalis and Michelo. For the former, both forms of the name are recorded as one; but for the latter, both forms were retained. Lastly, some names are given in shortened forms, for example Nicolis is recorded as Nic. In most of these cases the right version of the name is unclear: 'Nic' could be either Nicolis or Nicolas. To be as accurate as possible, these abbreviations were expanded into the form of the name most commonly used by the scribe. Popular names are almost the same in every decade, which is not surprising since they represent common Christian names in use amongst Greek peasant families. Charts 9 and 19, showing the evolution of the form of these names appear below, followed by general conclusions.

Males

As shown in charts 9-10, the largest group of males are boys between 0 and 10 years of age; this is not surprising since older people may have been relocated and were thus more difficult to register. As was to be expected, Jannis (John) a very popular name in the Greek Orthodox world, was the most common name for boys up to the age of ten (table 23). The name Jannis, which is a variant of Ioannis, was linked to Saint John Prodromos (St. John the Baptist), the patron saint of the main settlement in Marathasa, San Zuan de Ramon or Prodromo. Moreover, there is the monastery of Saint John Lambadistis which is located in the area, next to the village of Kalopanayiotis. According to the local tradition, Saint John was a young, blind man, who escaped from his family home and decided to become a monk at the monastery of Saint Herakleidos. He was also well known for performing miracles.³⁴¹ The saint died at the age of 22 and was buried in the monastery.³⁴² Thus, locals could have named their sons after this local saint John. The second most common name for males was Vasilis, another very

³⁴¹ Μαχαιρά, *Χρονικό της Κύπρου*, p. 86.

³⁴² Κ. Papageorgiou, *Κυπριακά μοναστήρια από τον 4ο - 21ο αιώνα*, vol. 3, Nicosia, Paletta, 2011, pp.138-145.

popular name in the Greek Orthodox tradition. The name Zorzis, a variant of the name George, takes third place and Loys, a variant of Louis/Loyisos, is fourth. The forms of both names shows a Frankish or Venetian influence. The fifth most common name was another very popular Greek Orthodox name, Michalis (Michael). Other less popular names in this age group are either traditional Cypriot names like Glioris (a Cypriot variant of the name Gregoris), Thiocaris (Theocharis), Gliondis (Leondis) and Christudias (Christos), or names of Frankish or Venetian origin, like Valerio, Jacomo and Lorenzo. Names in Latinised form, although they all have a Greek equivalent, are quite common in the 0-10 group. For example, there are nine boys with the name Petro (Peter) and one with the name Piero. These forms illustrate the tendency to imitate the ruling classes, a common practice in medieval peasant society.

The second row of table 23 shows similar results for the second largest age group (between 11 and 20 years old), the most popular names being Greek Orthodox ones like Jannis, Michalis and Vassilis. There are also many western European names, like Francesco and Lorenzo, and Italianised forms of names, like Alissandro, Agustín and Jacomo, even though the names may be derived from Greek. An exceptional case is the name Fluris (of Latin origin), which is very popular in this group of people but nowhere else (nobody in the first age group has it). Older *parici* usually have traditional Greek names, such as Parascheugas, Zorzis and Limbitis.

Females

The conclusions reached above for male names are also valid for female names, as presented in charts 19-28. Both the number of persons and the number of names is greater in the younger than in the older age group. The conclusions regarding the popularity of names amongst women are similar to those for men. Maria, still a very popular name in both the Eastern and Western worlds, seems to have been the commonest female name during the period under examination. Settlements in Marathasa are surrounded by monasteries dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Consequently, many of the area's women are named after her. Also popular were Margarita, Argiri and Christina, all still regularly used for women in Cyprus today. Names and forms of names that probably came from western Europe were Catela, Lose, Luncretia and Marietta, all common amongst girls under 20, as shown in chart 20. Again, as in the male naming patterns, traditional Greek Cypriot names such as Marrussa, Vassilu, Plumu and Eugenu, were very popular for older ladies. These names all have the distinctive ending 'u', still common among the rural population today, especially for older females (table 24).

9.3.2 *Popular First Names by Village*

The same process was followed to determine the distribution of names by village. People who were first divided into families were then classified again in two charts 29-30 according to gender and village of origin. These 830 men and 785 women came from eleven villages, which either belonged to the heirs of Antonio Audet or were settlements located in the vicinity.

As with the age-based analysis, sorting names by village was not easy. The primary question was the family line of these people. There are many cases involving difficulties of identification: for example, a person's family might come from one village, but then that person might have moved to another settlement due to marriage and he or she might have then moved again to a third village. Other examples include persons whose family came from one village, were recorded in another, but actually lived in a third settlement. In order to produce accurate results, for those without a specific village mentioned, family records were taken into consideration. Additionally, the younger individuals, were added to the place of their father's residence. Another issue that emerged was again the matter of multiple forms of a person's name; here too variations have been treated as described above.

As the charts show, there are three main villages with a population of 200 to 300 people each. For these locations there is greater certainty about the distribution of names. As the tables show, Greek names are popular amongst both males and females. Marathasa was far away from the capital, so traditional Greek Cypriot names were common there. Exceptions to this rule are three villages that were not part of Marathasa, but from where *parici* of the *catastico* are registered. The first two are Calliana and Sinagorou, two adjacent villages, which belonged to the Carmelites, who had a monastery in the area. The third village is San Zuan Malonda, a settlement, which, the manuscript states, belonged to the Davilas, a very famous noble family of Spanish origin. Among the few inhabitants of these villages, there were many non-traditional names especially for the younger *parici* and *parice*. In the case of Calliana and Sinagorou, people may have been influenced by the frequent contact with the Catholic monks who owned the settlements. For San Zuan Malonda names were probably influenced by the proximity of the capital, Nicosia.

9.3.3 *Surnames*

The concept of the family name is a very important factor, since besides identifying a specific group of people, it could also preserve its memory. For the indigenous population of Marathasa, surnames can be roughly divided into six different groups.

The first group of surnames derive from the place of origin of the first ancestor who had moved to Marathasa. An example is Gatani, the name of a family from Gatani, a settlement that belonged to Audet. Another is Piru, the family name of sixty-three individuals. Nicolis (no. 350) is the only *parico* in this family who is recorded only by a first name and a surname. As mentioned in the *catastico* he had died in 1531. Therefore, the conductor of the survey had no further information concerning his ancestors. The word 'Piru' could well be connected to the Greek word *Ἠπειρος*, the mainland. Nicolis may have come from the Greek mainland, where Piru was a common name. A third example is Trullinu, the first of the two last names of the Trullinu Stavrinu family; Trullinu derives from Troulloi, a settlement in Mesaoria or Troulinos, a locality in the area.³⁴³ Stavrinu was later added to the family name, probably derived from Stavrinou, the first member of the family who moved to Marathasa. Two other surnames, Sculli and Carvunari, could be placed in this group. *Σκουλλίν* in the Greek Cypriot dialect is a noun, which means carded-flax or a piece of flax or linen,³⁴⁴ as well as being a village in the Paphos area.³⁴⁵ Similarly, the surname Carvunari could be related to the settlement of Carvunas, a locality in the Marathasa Valley area, or to the Greek word *κάρβουνο* (charcoal), indicating that someone from the family may have worked with this material.

Another group of surnames are those related to officials of the Church.³⁴⁶ It was a common tradition until just a few years ago in rural areas of Cyprus for a priest's descendants to bear the name of their father in the genitive form. In MR there are three families, Papa Lasaru, Papa Stefano and Papa Mina, which all descended from a priest (*papa*). Elsewhere, a man of the Logotheti family, a surname related to an office of the Orthodox Church, Petros, was ordained head priest (*protopapas*), and this is recorded as the name of his children. Another surname in this group is Protopsalti, meaning the chief cantor in an Orthodox Church. Many members of this family were priests. Finally, the family name Stefano Monacho (monk) is also attested. The first member of this family was probably a monk, who despite his vows had children, or a male who had a family and then became a monk. The name also appears in the genitive as Monachu meaning 'child of the monk' and indicating the relationship of the person to one of his ancestors. Surprisingly members of this family were living in Milo de Chico and were exempt from paying taxes because they worked on the land in the nearby Kykkos

³⁴³ Kyriazis, 'Παραδόσεις περί Τρουλλινοῦ καὶ Μαράθου'.

³⁴⁴ Giagkoullis, *Θησαυρός κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου*, p. 485.

³⁴⁵ Christodoulou and Konstantinidis, *A complete gazetteer*, p. 1114.

³⁴⁶ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', pp. 55-56.

Monastery. Therefore, the monk Stefanos who gave his name to the family might have been a monk at Kykkos.

The third group of surnames are those derived from an occupation. A first example is Milona, a Greek word for miller, and a surname still used in Greece. Members of this family most probably worked at the nearby mill. Further examples are Comodromu and Pelecanu, both words from the Greek Cypriot dialect. The first one, still a very common surname in modern Cyprus, means blacksmith,³⁴⁷ or more specifically a mender of copper pans, a person who until recently travelled through villages mending people's cooking pots. The second, also still popular in Cyprus today, means carpenter. A similar group of surnames refers to officials of the Byzantine era. Examples include Nomicu (a semi-ecclesiastical officer who probably worked as an administrator in the area),³⁴⁸ Logotheti (an administrative officer, most often a secretary), Athipatu (proconsul, the senior officer of the provincial governor), Spathari (an officer in a special corps of imperial guards who wore swords) and Domesticu (a senior military officer). Though Byzantine rule in Cyprus had ended almost half a millennium before the Venetians came to the island, traditional names like these were widespread, since members of these families represented almost half the population of Marathasa. A final surname in this group is Servo, which derives neither from an occupation nor from an office but refers to a servile status.

Another group of surnames is a person's first name in the genitive, for example, Stassi, Petru or Stavrinu. The habit of using a father's first name in the genitive as a surname was common in Cyprus, especially in the early 1900s, when the island was a British colony. Consequently, even today the majority of Cypriot family names are anthroponymic, meaning 'son of X'. A final group of surnames describes a distinctive physical feature or character attribute of the person in question or an ancestor. Such names are Macrimallis (long-haired), Condu (short), Pangallu (very good/handsome), Leuressi (*λευρός* is a thin person in Greek Cypriot dialect)³⁴⁹ and Cuzzu (someone who limps). Another example is Calognomu (someone whose opinion is considered good).

9.4 Cypriot Dialect

The abundant personal names and place names mentioned in the documents are usually simple transliterations of names in the Greek Cypriot dialect. The study of these names gave a valuable insight into the evolution of the local dialect. Regarding the scribes, Peratis, Zacharias

³⁴⁷ Giagkoullis, *Θησαυρός κυπριακής διαλέκτου*, p. 271.

³⁴⁸ Nomikos was a surname during the Lusignan period as well. Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', p. 24 and 55-56.

³⁴⁹ Giagkoullis, *Θησαυρός κυπριακής διαλέκτου*, p. 281.

and the anonymous writer of the AR *catastico* were almost certainly locals. The census itself was carried out by an official, then the scribe produced the manuscripts. Frequent misspellings and mistakes indicate that the scribes were probably not that familiar with the Italian language. Similar writing habits amongst the three scribes, such as the same abbreviations used for names and some symbols, could reveal characteristics of the dialect and similar writing habits amongst bureaucrats.

In the process of creating the family trees, several patterns regarding names and the Greek Cypriot dialect emerged. Four of them, in particular, deserve special attention. Firstly, some names have the special Cypriot pronunciation, such as Parascheugas in MR and Parascefgas in AR. Paraskeuas (*Παρασκευάς*), a very common name in that period, was written in two different ways but with the same pronunciation. In the spelling of that name in MR, the existence of three consecutive consonants is represented by a double 's'. In addition, the ending '-ugas' or '-fgas' shows the traditional way of saying this name, which is similar to how it is still pronounced in rural areas of the island. Likewise, the names Jorgis and Jannis, versions of *Georgios/Giorgis* and *Ioannis/Giannis* respectively, are transliterations that attempt to render the initial letter Γ. Since the sound of this letter could not be exactly reproduced by a letter of the Latin alphabet, they chose the letter J, which, combined with a vowel could sound similar to Γ. There was also a tendency to use Greek letters or words, particularly in MR2. Distinctive cases are the names Ducas and Dimitris, which in the manuscripts appear as Δucas and Δimitris. Writing the names with the Greek letter *delta* instead of the Latin D could show probably a misunderstanding of the original document. As mentioned earlier, Florio Bustron's letters are difficult to read, so Peratis may have simply misread the letter. On the other hand, the use of the Greek letter could have been intentional in order to render the sound Δ. Elsewhere, the Greek word *tu* (*του*), a possessive pronoun, is habitually used by the scribes when referring to an ancestor as mentioned before.

MARINA ILIA

10 Movement

The movement of *parici* around the island is a very important aspect of any study of the servile condition in Lusignan and Venetian Cyprus and deserves careful examination. Movement, whether a permanent move or occasional or daily travel, seems to have been important for the rural population both on social and economic terms. The free movement within the island was one of the main differences between the *parici* and the *francomati*. *Parici* were attached to the land, i.e. the estate owned by their lord or the state, where they lived and worked, and they were registered in the village's *pratico*. *Francomati* on the other hand were enjoying the benefit of free movement since they were allowed to leave their lands and relocate to another area. A prohibition on free movement for the *parici* was a strict measure taken by the government, in an effort to maintain the workforce. According to administrative documents sent by the officials in Cyprus, there was an important number of Cypriot *parici* who had fled to other locations in the *Stato da mar*.³⁵⁰ Marino Sanuto mentions 500 fugitive in 1519 who had left to the island of Rhodes.³⁵¹ The Venetian government of the island defined this a matter of importance. Hence, in 1507 they appointed two auditors (*auditori*) to travel around the island and more specifically to the public estates. Their job was to hear any complaint from the local population and to redress the grievances. In that way, they targeted on maintaining the numbers of their *parici*. There is no specific mention on the *parici* owned by private lords or the Church. It can be assumed that they followed a similar practice in order to keep the numbers of their *parici* untouched. However, it can also be assumed that due to their servile status, the *parici* in private estates may have been moved to other areas after the behest of their master.

Movement was as much a social as an economic characteristic of this group of people. *Parici* might move owing to some social relationship or an occasion such as a marriage. On the other hand, many of them were moved around for economic reasons such as work in the capital or to work on more productive land. An examination of the MR, AR and KK documents reveals four main reasons for travelling, whether for social or economic reasons. The first was family: a *parico/parica* sometimes travelled in order to marry someone from a different settlement. Also, some *parici* changed their location in order to live with relatives. The second reason was the will of the *parico/parica*'s landlord. As is often the case in both the MR and AR documents, *parici* were moved at the behest of their master to work elsewhere or as servants in his town house and some were sold. The third reason for travelling was work:

³⁵⁰ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, pp. 93-94.

³⁵¹ M. Sanuto, *I Diarii*, XXV1, Venice, 1889, p. 371.

sometimes *parici* were unable to grow crops due to their settlement's location, so they moved elsewhere. For all three the consent of the lord was necessary. The final group involves occasional fugitive *parici*, who escaped from their villages.

10.1 Marriage

10.1.1 Marathasa

The first reason mentioned above is what encouraged the owners of Marathasa to proceed with a census of the local population, as explained in their letter to Venice, published in this thesis. In their report, which was sent on 27 August 1534, Hannibal Chadit, Jacomo and Simon Frasenge apologised to the Council for having failed to prevent marriages between their *parici* and *parici* who belonged to the state, explaining that these marriages had taken place without their permission. A list of the offending male *parici* is given at the end of the letter; they are grouped in two categories: a) those who belonged to the *Real* and had married the lords' *parice* ('Li sottscritti parici dela real che sono maridati con pariche nostre') and b) those who belonged to the lords and had married the *Real's parice* ('Li sottscritti parici nostri sono maridati con parichi dela real'). Since that letter was sent almost ten years before the MR2 census, it may be presumed that the recorded marriages were one of the reasons for carrying out the survey in 1549. Besides apologising, both the Frasenges and Hannibal Chadit were also proposing a suitable solution to the issue. By conducting a census, they found out that the numbers of men and women who had moved between their estates were almost the same. Thus, they suggested that no further action was required. In reality the numbers were not equal, as more male *parici* had moved to Marathasa than the other way around. Unfortunately, there is no evidence in any published document of Venice's answer to this proposal. However, several mentions of the *parici* in question in the 1549 *pratico* suggest that the Council accepted the offer.

Similar information concerning married couples can be extracted from the *pratico* of 1549. Nonetheless, the data provided is not always consistent. The main issue is the identification of a *parico* as *nostro*, i.e. owned by Chadit and the Frasenges. As explained earlier, nine settlements are listed as belonging to Audet and his heirs (table 2). Other settlements, such as Galata, Panaia and Calliana, were the property of the *Real* or of another lord (table 1). Therefore, only a person originating from one of these nine settlements, could be described as '*parico nostro*'. A number of expressions were used by the writer in order to describe the place of origin of a person. The most common is the preposition *de/del* or *da/dal* followed by the word *loco/logo* or the name of a settlement. For the place of residence, the

writer used the preposition *a/al* followed by the name of the village or the word *loco/logo*. For instance, Michalis (no. 49) is registered in Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon but is said to be living ‘a Tris Eglies’ while Savas (no. 57) is recorded in Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon and said to be living ‘al loco’, i.e. in the same village. These references to places have led to several conclusions being drawn about movement and relationships. Nonetheless, the majority of entries do not give this kind of information. For most of the cases, only a name and their age were given for both males and females, making the identification harder. In addition, the term *loco* is rather problematic. It may indicate a specific village, but it could also indicate any one of the other eight settlements owned by the Frasenges and the Chadits. In the majority of cases, information concerning close relatives, such as parents and siblings, was used to identify an individual’s place of origin and residence. In other cases, such an identification was not possible and therefore they were not taken into consideration in tables 25-30.

Parici and places were divided into three distinct groups: a) *nostri* meaning the *parici* or the settlements owned by the Frasenge and Chadit families, b) *estranei* meaning the *parici* and villagers from the other nine villages recorded in the *pratico* and c) others meaning *parici* and villages outside of the area examined. Data on 435 couples was assembled in a table and then subdivided into smaller groups. The first relates to those who married a *parico/parica* owned by the Frasenge and Chadit families (table 25). This type of marriage can be termed ‘internal’ and is determined by geographical endogamy, since the *parico/parica* simply moved from their original settlement to another settlement within the same fief. The majority of these individuals, ninety-six out of one hundred and forty-eight, were women, whereas only twenty-nine were men. There were also twenty-three cases where both *parici* had moved to another settlement owned by the Frasenges and the Chadits. Since the *parici* appear to have lived in the estate, the workforce and income for the Frasenge and Chadit families remained the same. Hence there was no reason to reject such marriages. The vast majority of these couples had moved to one of the three main settlements in the fief: Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon (thirty-nine couples), Tris Eglies (twenty-one couples) and Agros (twenty couples).

The second group concerns those *parici* who had married an outsider, a *parico/parica* who belonged to another noble or the state. This group can be divided into three distinct categories: a) couples residing in a settlement described as ‘*nostro*’ (table 26), b) couples residing in a settlement described as ‘*estraneo*’ (table 27) and c) couples residing in another settlement (table 28). These ‘external’ marriages represent cases of geographical exogamy. The first category consists of sixty-five couples. As described above, the majority of the individuals who had moved were females: thirty-four women in all. Only eleven males had moved to their

spouse's settlement, while in the case of twenty couples, both *parici* had moved to a different settlement within the fief. Again, the settlement of Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon was the first choice (twenty-four couples) followed by Gatani (eight couples) and Tris Egliēs (six couples). In the second category, couples residing in a settlement described as *estraneo*, there are fifty-two entries of which sixteen refer to couples residing in Galata, while fifteen were living in Panagia and Aspoia. As was the case with other groups, it was mainly females that had moved (twenty-five) but there were also eighteen cases where both partners had moved to another settlement. The third category concerns thirty-seven couples who were residing in another settlement, outside of Marathasa. The majority of these cases were females (nineteen), who appear as the daughters of a *parico* and in respect of whom only the name of their outsider husband and his place of origin are mentioned. Their place of residence is not recorded, but it may be presumed that they had moved to their husband's place of origin.

The last group worth mentioning is the one related to the *parici nostri* who were married to *parice nostre* but were residing in a settlement described as *estraneo* (table 29) or another settlement (table 30). There are twenty-eight couples who had originated from one of the settlements belonging to the local lord(s) but who were now residing outside of the fief.

10.1.2 Aradippou

Similar cases in Arradippou were easier to identify. Like the Marathasa census, the Aradippou *catastico* was drawn up because of *parici* moving away from the settlement. Marriage was one of the main reasons for this movement. The majority of the *parici* recorded moved to a settlement within the *baliagio* of Aradippou, in settlements within the same area. At the time the census was carried out fifteen of them lived in Potamia and Alamino, two villages that belonged to Eugenio Synglitico, the former situated in the *Contrada de Visconta*³⁵² and the latter in the *Contrada di Mazoto*.³⁵³ Potamia, a village nowadays located next to the buffer zone, is a settlement about 25 km. to the north of Aradippou. Alamino is a village also situated about 25 km. away from Aradippou, but to the south-west. In an effort to preserve the number of *parici* in the settlement, two females, Marita (no. 97) and Mariu (no. 108), who moved to Potamia and Alamino, were exchanged for two other *parici* coming from these villages. In addition, one *parico*, Savas (no. 14), who moved to Potamia and one *parica* Cristina (no. 29) were emancipated after their transfer. Twenty-five others were recorded as living outside Aradippou. Most of them appear to have moved (indicated with the word 'left' in the table 32),

³⁵² <http://www.cyprusgazetteer.org/hu/76/>

³⁵³ <http://www.cyprusgazetteer.org/hu/161/>

while others were given away or exchanged. All of these individuals lived in the *Contrada di Mazoto*.³⁵⁴ Leonida Attar's map shows that this area was situated to the east of the *Contrada di Saline*, the region in which Aradippou was located at that time. The settlements of Pendaschinos, Anaphotida and Menigo, along with Alamino mentioned above, were approximately 30 to 40 km. from Aradippou as the crow flies. Unfortunately, there is no further mention of Menigo or Pendaschino and their lords. The *casal* Anaphotida, however, appears to have belonged to Petro Singlitico, Eugenio's brother (figures 30 and 31).

10.1.3 Kato Koutrafas

Identifying similar cases in the Kato Koutrafas survey was not easy because of the way it is structured. Francesco Zacharia does not give surnames for the wives of the *parici*, so their place of origin is unclear, and it cannot be established whether they were locals married to men from Kato Koutrafas or outsiders who had come to the settlement. However, the document does mention some *parici* who moved from or to Kato Koutrafas. Fiorenza (no. 7) married Argiro tu Michali tu Mudulis, a *parico* who belonged to Chalzeran Rechesens, and lived in Melarissia. Xristina, wife of Zuan (no. 14) came from the same settlement but lived in Kato Koutrafas. Both women were approximately the same age, 22 and 20 years old respectively, indicating that they may well have been an exchange between Venice and Chalzeran Rechesens. Similarly, the fiancée of Chiriacho (no. 28), Safira papa Petro, was a *parica* from a neighbouring settlement, Visachia. She had been exchanged for a local *parica* Plumu tu Charida, like the *parice* just mentioned. Another example of marriage between *parici* from different settlements is Linora, the daughter of Chiriaco (no. 19), who was engaged to Zorzin papa Vasili from Kakopetria, a settlement located around 20 km. away from Kato Koutrafas in the direction of the Troodos mountains. Unfortunately, there is no mention of this couple's place of residence, but Chiriaco, Linora's father, was still paying fees for his daughter as if she was living with him. A peculiar case regarding movement due to marriage with an outsider is that of Lucha (no. 23), who was in the service of a noble from the Bibi family. His wife Erini also belonged to this noble. As the scribe uses the verb *era*, it may be presumed that the couple were from one of the lord's settlements but were living in Kato Koutrafas when the census was carried out in 1512. Finally, Argiri (no. 25), appears in the record as a *parica* engaged to an outsider, a *parico* belonging to Zuan Martinincho. This couple most probably did not live in Kato Koutrafas in that period.

³⁵⁴ <http://www.cyprusgazetteer.org/hu/603/>

10.2 Landlords

The picture of the life of the *parici* that emerges from documents regarding the Venetian Cyprus is not a very pleasant one. Scholars agree on the fact that a *parico/parica* was little more than an object to their master, who could do as he pleased with them. Hence a *parico/parica* could be moved to another settlement because their landlord had made a deal with another noble or needed extra help on his property in the city. In the first case, the individual would have a new lord either temporarily or permanently. Examples of *parici* who were rented, sold or donated in such agreements will be described below. In the second case, the person would remain in the service of the same lord and just their place of residence changed for a period of time.

10.2.1 *Marathasa*

Despite its size, the *Marathasa pratico* contains only a small number of relevant cases. In addition to the aforementioned *parici*, who moved either to another settlement within the same area or to a different area after their marriage, eighteen people moved at their landlord's behest. Apart from Christina (no. 174) and Annussa (no. 237), who belonged to Zaco Calef and Ieronimo Arseni respectively, the rest were in the service of other lords, members of the Chadit and Frassenge families. It may be presumed that, like Christina, a few more *parici* were also owned by another master or the *Real* and were freed. Annussa, on the other hand, is an unusual example. She appears on two different folios in the manuscript: on folio 32^r she is listed in her father's entry and is recorded as belonging to Ieronimo Arseni, but on folio 69^r she is listed as the mother of one or more illegitimate children, whose father was the same Ieronimo.

Other than that, most of the *parici* listed in table 33 belonged to the Frassenge and Chadit families, living either at their town houses (*casa*) or in another settlement. Folio 67^v lists further *parici* living at the house of Marco Chadit. As mentioned above, Zarla (no. 508) and her relatives lived in San Demeti (Agios Dometios), a settlement near the capital, possibly where their master's house was located. All these cases confirm what many other documents say about nobles having domestic servants in their city dwellings. Three more *parici* could be added to these cases – two fugitives and a *xenotelis* – but they will be further discussed below, as their reasons for moving seem to have been different.

10.2.2 *Aradippou*

As mentioned above, what seems to have instigated the Aradippou census was the number of *parici* who had left the settlement for one reason or another. Some moved due to marriage, and some had been emancipated, so they could move as they pleased; but others changed location due to an arrangement between lords. These individuals can be roughly divided into three groups: a) *parici* who lived in the town house of a lord, b) those who had been sold to another lord, c) those who had been exchanged (tables 34 and 35). The main issue to emerge concerning these *parici* is that some of them changed lords and settlements on two or more occasions. Nevertheless, the document provides valuable insight into why Aradippou *parici* moved, especially for the first two groups.

10.2.2.1 *Parici who lived in a Lord's house*

As was the case for the *parici* of Marathasa, some of the *parici* in the Aradippou survey served in a lord's house. These thirteen individuals were presumably domestic servants living and working in their master's house, perhaps in the capital. The majority were under 20 years old and the oldest, Linbitis (no. 85), was 25 when the census was carried out. Ten of the thirteen lived in the house of Count Eugenio Synglitico, located in the capital. This could be the house said in other documents to have been destroyed during the construction of Nicosia's new fortifications. Frangudi (no. 67) is a special case. He was sent to Eugenio's house by mistake instead of his sister, possibly Argiri, of whom the document makes no further mention. The three others, Linbitis (no. 77), Stathis (no. 125) and Tomasin (no. 127) lived in the houses of other masters, the sons of Eugenio Singlitico: the first with Marco and the second with Zaco. Tomasin's case was different, as he lived and worked not at the house of a nobleman but of a *francomato*, Papa Brachimis, a priest who lived in Potamia. Tomasis moved to this settlement and paid his taxes there. In fact, since Potamia belonged to the Count, Tomasin can be considered as having served both papa Brachimi and Eugenio Synglitico.

10.2.2.2 *Parici sold to another landlord*

Another reason for *parici* to move away from Aradippou was if they were bought by another lord. For these individuals the scribe usually marks the amount of money given to Eugenio, the date of the acquisition and the name of the officer, who had most probably drafted the deed of sale. The majority of these cases were confirmed by Florio Bustron and Zaco Calefe. As the date of purchase is known for most of these cases, the age of a *parico* when sold can be estimated. Twenty-two of them were between 7 and 15 years of age. Nengomia (no. 115) 51 and Zuana (no. 130) 40 years old, were the oldest to be exchanged or sold. As for their

price, most were sold for fifty ducats. Three cases are unusual, however: Martis (no. 92) was sold to Maria da Levante when he was eleven years old, for sixty-five ducats, the highest price paid for any of these *parici*. Conversely, Cali (no. 32) and Nicolis (no. 114) were sold for 26 and twenty-five ducats respectively, despite both being very young. Andrias (no. 15) was, like Frangudi mentioned above, sent to Vasili Lumma, the *castellano* of Eftagonia, by mistake (*fallo*), after being confused with another *parico* named Andreas. Lastly, Christina (no 27) was sold for thirty-six ducats and a *cavallo* (a horse).

10.3 Work

Located in the Troodos mountains, the Marathasa valley and its settlements were not easily reached from the capital or from other towns in the south. Araddipou, on the other hand, was placed in a more generally accessible location not only from Nicosia but also from the nearby harbour of Salines. As for Kato Koutrafas, it was and still is situated right next to the main road leading to the north side of the Troodos mountains. Looking at the geographical location of these three settlements, several conclusions can be drawn.

Araddipou's location was ideal for *parici* living and working in the area. Just to the north-east of the settlement there were several sheepfolds, which are still there today; and to the north-west there was land for crop-growing. The salt flat and the harbour of Larnaca were also close by. So, an Aradippou *parico* in Venetian Cyprus had easy access to several important lines of work besides farming. The settlement may also have been a stop on the journey from the harbour to the capital, hence a busy commercial area. In fact, many of them were moved to settlements near the area of the salt lakes. Exploitation of salt was always an activity based on manual labour, so it may be presumed that this was the main cause of movement. However, this is mere speculation, since the *catastico* does not give the number of *parici* actually living in Aradippou.

Kato Koutrafas also enjoyed a very advantageous geographical location. Semi-plains, excellent for crop-growing, are found to the north and east of the village, while a river runs through it. In addition, small hills neighbouring the village to the north-east are great for pasture. Kato Koutrafas residents thus appear to have had everything they needed for everyday life and they did not need to move away in order to find work. The few *parici* who moved from or to the settlement did so because of marriage. The only occasion for which people moved temporarily was the summer harvest: as in other similar insular locations, farmers relocated for a few weeks in order to gather the crops. Mandres, the settlement to the east, was most likely

where the Kato Koutrafas *parici* practised livestock breeding; the name Mandres itself describes its use as a location for sheepfolds.

The case of Marathasa was slightly different. Each of its settlements had its own characteristics, as they were situated in different parts of the mountain range. Prodromos was the only settlement built at high altitude; the Olympus peak is a few kilometres to the east. Mylikouri was located between the Troodos mountains next to the Platis valley. Many *parici* were probably unable to grow crops in the area of Mylikouri, as there was a shortage of suitable land. Thus, movement within the area must have been crucial for some. By contrast, a significant number of *parici*, mainly members of the Condu and Muchli families, moved from Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon to Peristerona, a village located in the vicinity of Kato Koutrafas. As mentioned in the document, these individuals paid their fees to the lord of Peristerona but worked their fifty-two days forced labour for the lords of Marathasa. The *xenotelis* mentioned in the document may have moved to this area due to marriage, but their numbers suggest that this movement was mainly for work purposes. In addition, other *parici* belonging to the Frasenge and the Chadit families worked for the nearby monasteries. Since moving around within this mountainous area is not easy, even today, the *parici* who moved from Peristerona or to a nearby monastery probably stayed there at least semi-permanently.

10.4 Fugitives

Moving away from a settlement had to be approved by the landlord, so *parici* who left without permission became fugitives. The reasons for doing so seem to have been their living conditions. Families would seek a better future either in Cyprus or elsewhere, for example in Crete.³⁵⁵ The Council of Ten appears to have been very concerned as mentioned above, and repeated instructions were sent to the *Reggimento*; for example, letters were sent to the captain of every ship leaving the island, telling them not to allow anyone on board their vessel without the written consent of their master.³⁵⁶ In addition, *civitani* were ordered to inspect every ship for fugitives. Any captain allowing fleeing *parici* to travel with their ships, would be guilty of an offence and they would be charged with a year of imprisonment as well as a fine of 100 ducats for each *parico* discovered.³⁵⁷

The Marathasa document mentions several *parici* who were fugitives (listed as *fugito* or *fugite*) when the census was carried out. Out of a total of seventeen, sixteen were men and

³⁵⁵ E. Aristeidou, 'Απελευθερώσεις Παροίκων και Αντισηκώματα Απελεύθερων στην Βενετοκρατούμενη Κύπρο (1509-1517)', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXIII, 1997, p. 115.

³⁵⁶ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 81.

³⁵⁷ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, pp. 93-94.

only one a woman (table 36). For the majority of them neither age nor location is known. For those for whom ages are available, it may be said that many were over 40 years of age, while two were under 20: Dimitri (no. 317) and Loys (no. 446), the youngest. The fact that their location is not given is not surprising, since they were fugitives. However, for four of them, Jannis (no. 129), Michalis (no. 343), Chiriacos (no. 348) and Loys (no. 418), a current location is listed. All the males recorded as fugitives happened to be single, apart from one, Filippus (no. 388) and Angelina, the only *parica* fugitive; the document reveals that the couple had left Galata three years before (in 1546), leaving their son Xristoforo with his uncle Sino.

As for Aradippou, only two *parici* appear to have been fugitives. Adranis (no. 12) was 31 years old and was married to a *parica* from Potamia. Zuanj (no. 131) was 22 and had fled Potamia four years before, abandoning his wife.

10.5 Conclusions

All the documents examined abound with information concerning the movements of the servile population, mainly within the island. Both the Marathasa and Aradippou censuses appear to have been conducted in response to the relocation of *parici*. The documents do not always give reasons for this movement, but a number of different reasons can be established. Firstly, there was family and/or marriage. This applied to the majority of the Marathasa population. Marriage between *parici* living in the same settlement was common; but so was marriage between locals and outsiders. Despite the Council's wishes, lords appear to have accepted marriages between their *parici* and outsiders even when the couple would not subsequently live on their estates. Another reason for *parici* moving away was their being sold, exchanged or given away by their lord. This was the case for the majority of the Aradippou census: over 80% of the recorded *parici* moved at the behest of Eugenio Synglitico and his son Marco, confirming the observation commonly made by scholars that, for their lords, *parici* were mere objects to be given away, exchanged, rented or sold. A third motive was employment, but this is less well documented. Many *parici* may have moved due to work opportunities and then married locals in their new place of residence. The final motive, moving away as a fugitive, is interesting: the tiny percentage of people mentioned as fugitives contradicts the general opinion regarding the *parici*'s living conditions. Since only a few *parici* in Marathasa and Aradippou and none in Kato Koutrafas left their settlement without permission, it seems that an unjust lord or poor quality of life were not common reasons for moving on.

11 Revenues

The economic aspect of life in Venetian Cyprus one of the two main pillars of this thesis. The research focused on two important economic aspects, namely the taxation, paid by the *parici* both to the state and their lord, and their production and the compensation they received for their work. Fiscal burdens and taxes levied upon the local population were undeniably a very important aspect of people's lives recorded by the documents. After all, that was one of the main purposes of the *pratici*, i.e. examining the revenues in each area. Other than the amounts paid by *parici* as part of their fiscal obligations, the documents revealed some more interesting information concerning local production and the income derived from it. Hence, the research led to another important aspect of economic life, that of the family income. By taking into consideration the public reports and the useful work of Florio Bustron from the same period as the manuscripts I have examined, I shall attempt to make a general assessment of revenues for a *parico* and his family. A third, less detailed but very important economic factor was the revenue from the purchasing of offices and enfranchisements. All these things were closely related to the profits of a local estate but most importantly to the public revenues received by the state. All of them will be thoroughly examined below.

Before moving onto the documents, it is worth exploring the income of the state during the Venetian period. The main revenues for *la Serenissima* were firstly related to the local production of each location and then to the commerce between the *Stato da mar* and Venice. The main advantage of the overseas possessions was undeniably their profitable location. First and foremost, the acquisition of Crete provided Venice with easy access to the East as well as to the Aegean Sea. In addition, Coron and Modon served as stopover points for fleets sailing from and to Venice. Several other acquisitions in the Aegean Sea expanded the maritime routes, while the acquisition of Cyprus later on extended the routes to the Middle East and the north. Finally, by acquiring the Ionian islands, and especially Corfu, Venice added a few more important stops, facilitating travel in the area.³⁵⁸ Compared to Venice's other possessions, Cyprus was economically valuable in many ways, not just for its location. The Council of Ten itself described the island as a beneficial and fruitful dependency for Venice. The revenues from the island were vital not only for the population of Cyprus but for the metropolis as well. Cyprus brought income in three main ways: taxation, commerce and the acquisition of specific

³⁵⁸ N. Karapidakis, 'Οικονομία και εμπόριο', in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, p. 243.

services or offices and the leasing of state land. Another extra revenue stream, as was the case in the Lusignan period, was the enfranchisement of *parici* in exchange for a specific sum of money.

11.1 Grain and salt – a state monopoly

A vital part of the economy was agricultural production. The island's main income was derived from two key products: grain and salt. During the Venetian period, 1/5 and sometimes 1/3 of the island was cultivated land. The *parici* were the main workforce on the land planted with grain. Cereals, mainly wheat and barley, were extremely important for the local population. Grain along with legumes, fruits and dairy were the main commodities of their Mediterranean diet. In addition, part of the grain produced was given to the landlord who, in turn, was obliged to give a part to the state. During productive years, there was a surplus of local grain, which could be over two million *modi* per year. Several reports by Venetian officials testify that this production gradually became a state monopoly, since the majority of the income came from wheat and barley. In view of Venice's geographical location, which lacked land for cultivation, the surplus sent from Cyprus was vital to the *Serenissima*.³⁵⁹ By contrast, in periods of poor production, the grain was kept on the island for the local population.

Salt was another well-known local product that was sold and traded on the island. Travellers visiting Cyprus during the mid-fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were amazed by the salt lakes, especially the one next to the church of Saint Lazarus in Larnaca/*Salines*. The exploitation of salt had always been a royal privilege, and this privilege was inherited by the Venetian government. The salt lakes in *Salines* appear to have been the most important for the state.³⁶⁰ As a result of the workforce needed, the population of the area increased. During the last decades of the Venetian presence on the island over 75% of the salt produced in Cyprus was traded by Venice. The most important revenue from salt, however, did not come from trade but from the salt tax. As mentioned by Marcantonio Trevisan in his 1534 report, every male *parico* or *francomato* over 15 years old and every married female had to buy one *modio* of salt, which cost one *bezant*.³⁶¹ In addition, salt appears to have been in high demand due to the fact that it was used for several purposes.

³⁵⁹ E. Aristeidou, 'Διοίκηση και οικονομία', in A. Nicolaou-Konnari, *Η Γαληνοτάτη και η Ευγενεστάτη: η Βενετία στην Κύπρο και η Κύπρος στη Βενετία*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2009, p. 111.

³⁶⁰ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 48. Reports of Marcantonio Trevisan (1528) and (1524), Silvestro Minio (1530), Francesco Bragadin (1531) and Antonio Zane (1557).

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

11.2 Commerce

Throughout this period, Venetian commerce in the *Stato da mar* was prosperous by any standards. Individuals involved in trade not only flourished in this domain, but also became excessively rich and succeeded in other activities. A number of them managed to acquire the proceeds of a tax paid on some product, making a direct profit. Others were lending money to those who needed it.³⁶² In the first period, merchants travelled in a fleet under the protection of Venice. Gradually, more and more were engaged in trade and chose to travel alone. *La Serenissima* was still controlling the merchandise and procedures. Compulsory contributions to the state's revenue were levied on merchants while a number of them were able to lease a state-owned galleon. Venetian merchants and local traders bought and sold a variety of products which were either raw or processed materials. The most common goods mentioned in the documents are agricultural products such as grain, wine, olive oil but there were also other materials such as metals, textiles and wood.³⁶³ All of the above were mainly produced by the local rural population in each location. Despite their being an important link in the economy, peasants did not profit from trade. In fact, during the sixteenth century, the majority of them were exploited by the upper social stratum. On that account, the Venetian administration established pawn shops in several locations, the well-known *monte di pietà*.³⁶⁴

Situated at the heart of an important commercial crossroads, Cyprus was an emporium on the way to and from Syria and the Middle East. In fact, during the Lusignan period, Famagusta flourished mainly due to its port and the commercial activity in the city.³⁶⁵ Other lesser ports of the island were the one in Limassol and another in the above mentioned *Salines*. Due to its proximity to the salt lakes of Saint Lazarus, the port in what is now the Larnaca area rapidly developed during the mid-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, becoming one of the most important destinations or stopovers for the Venetian fleet. The numerous reports dispatched to the Council of Ten, published by Ekaterini Aristeidou and most recently Stathis Birtahas, are full of information concerning the exported products of the island. Apart from grain and salt, which were a state monopoly, other goods sent to Venice and Europe were sugar, cotton and textiles. The production of sugar had been one of the main agricultural activities since the Lusignan period. Large estates planted with sugarcane attracted the attention of travellers and

³⁶² Karapidakis, 'Οικονομία και εμπόριο', p. 239.

³⁶³ *Ibid*, pp. 260-261.

³⁶⁴ Ch. Desillas, *Η τράπεζα των φτωχών. Το monte di pietà της Κέρκυρας (1630-1864)*, Athens, Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2006; Karapidakis, 'Οικονομία και εμπόριο', pp. 246-247.

³⁶⁵ B. Arbel, 'Maritime Trade in Famagusta during the Venetian Period (1474-1571)', in M., J., K. Walsh, T. Kiss and N. Coureas, *The Harbour of All this Sea and Realm. Crusader to Venetian Famagusta*, Budapest, Central European University Press, 2014, pp. 91-103.

how it was cultivated and processed is often described at length in their accounts. The production of sugar in three different forms is also mentioned by several Venetian officials sent to Cyprus. Amongst the most important villages with sugarcane were Episkopi (the estate of the Cornaro family), Kolossi and Kouklia. Sugarcane from these locations was processed at local mills and sent to Venice. Unprocessed sugar from other locations, such Morphou and Lapithos, was sent to Nicosia. This local product offered an adequate income to the state, but due to a fall in demand the cultivation gradually decreased and was replaced by cotton.³⁶⁶ The cultivation of cotton started at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Cotton production could provide a considerable income with less expense than sugar production and Venetian officials often allude to the revenues coming from it.³⁶⁷ In addition, cotton was profitable both as a raw material and when processed, especially in the form of the famous gold thread. Along with wool and silk, it was used to produce several kinds of textiles, which were sold to Europe. The increase in, demand for and production of textiles is seen in the income mentioned in the reports between the 1520s and the 1540s.³⁶⁸

11.3 Exploitation of land

Besides taxation, the most important revenue for the state was the leasing or selling of public land. As scholars have shown, members of noble families, most of the time second sons who were excluded from the paternal inheritance, would lease some of the island's villages for a specific period.³⁶⁹ Such cases may be found in the four-volume edition of Venetian documents by Aristeidou. It has been calculated that about sixty-two villages near the capital were leased either directly or via an auction to the highest bidder.³⁷⁰ The new lord could pay either in money, most of the time an advance payment and then an annual rent, or in kind, which was usually grain produced on the leased land. As a result of the lease, the *parici* of the village or villages belonged to the new owner, who subsequently benefited from their taxes and labour. However, renting out a settlement was not always advantageous for Venice. In some instances, tenants could not afford to pay the contracted amount of money or the grain, leaving the *Camera* (the public treasury) facing a loss; the Cypriot government sent numerous letters to inform the Council of such situations.³⁷¹

³⁶⁶ Aristeidou, 'Διοίκηση και οικονομία', p. 112; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 512 (entry: got(t)on(e)).

³⁶⁷ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 524 (entry: zucaro/i zuc(c)haro/i).

³⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

³⁶⁹ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, p. 100; Birtahas, *Κοινωνία, πολιτισμός & διακυβέρνηση στο βενετικό κράτος της θάλασσας*. Thessaloniki, Vaniat, 2011, p. 69.

³⁷⁰ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 2, p. 90.

³⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

The documents published in this thesis are examples of such agreements. As mentioned earlier, in the case of Marathasa, an agreement had been reached between the Audet family and King Janus (1375- 1432) during the Lusignan period. According to Jean Richard, in 1431 the king offered the settlement of Aglangia to Antoine and Jean Audet for a price of 2,525 ducats. A few years later, in 1435 the Audets lent the king a sum of 8,000 ducats. In an effort to pay them back, King Janus offered the villages in Marathasa, which were apparently royal estates, to Marco Corner. There was a clause in this agreement requiring Marco to pay the money owed back to the Audets. Marco never managed to collect this amount of money and he gave the villages of Marathasa to Thomas Mansel, with a request to pay the Audets 7,000 ducats. It appears that the debt was still not paid in 1442, when the king offered the serfs belonging to the royal estates in Knodhara to Jean Audet. Eventually, a year later in 1443, part of the royal estates in Marathasa were sold to Jean and Antoine, who appeared to pay, while Thomas Mansel was allowed to keep his part. The three of them and their heirs, members of the Chadit and Cercasso families, were thus appointed sole lords of the area. What is worth mentioning is that production in the area during that period must have been low and revenues coming from the settlements were not enough for Marco Cornaro or Thomas Mansel to pay the sum of money owed. Moreover, the nine settlements examined must have been sold for between 10,000 and 20,000 ducats, a low price compared to that asked for other settlements.

Another typical case involving a settlement in the area is described in a letter dated 10 August 1515. In this extensive document, sent by Nicolaus Michael, the Council of Ten was informed that Filippos Palaiologos had leased Lapithos and Marathasa for 7,000 ducats per year but that since 1496 he had not fully honoured his side of the agreement because he owed the state a large amount of money. In an effort to settle his financial problems, Filippos mortgaged his wife's dowry.³⁷² Unfortunately, Nicolaus does not give a list of the public land and settlements that were rented by Filippos. However, the amounts he paid may provide some insight. Filippos had to pay 5,000 ducats per year for working the working land in Lapithos, but only 2000 per year for Marathasa. Thus Lapithos at that time may have been a large village with lots of surrounding arable land and extensive sugar cane production. In fact, Estienne de Lusignan mentions the village and a population of 10,000 or 15,000 inhabitants. Though this number is highly unlikely, Lapithos must have been the largest settlement in the area, since it was also the administrative centre of the *baliazzo*.³⁷³ As regards the settlement of Marathasa,

³⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 295-300.

³⁷³ Mas Latrie, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. III, p. 510.

it could be assumed that Filippou might have leased only a small part of the area located in a fertile valley. This part was the property of the *Real* and therefore cannot be one of the villages that belonged to the Audet. Nevertheless, this piece of information is important since the large amount demanded for the lease attests the significance of the area.

In this respect, information on Aradippou is more specific. In a letter sent on 7 February 1525 the Council of Ten contemplates the acquisition of the settlement by Eugenio Synglitico. The Greek-Cypriot Eugenio was one of the wealthiest noblemen in Cyprus during the Venetian period. He acquired several titles such as that of Viscount of Nicosia (1510-1512) and, most importantly, Count of Edessa/Rochas in 1521 thanks to payment of a significant amount of money. As Benjamin Arbel notes, he was the first Greek to acquire an important baronial title.³⁷⁴ Eugenio was constantly involved in buying and leasing estates and he travelled several times to Venice in order to obtain some of them. In 1521 he acquired the village of Potamia for himself and his children by paying 5,000 ducats and 900 *modia* of grain to the State on a yearly basis. In 1532 he also leased the village of Agia Eirini and its land, which belonged to Giorgio Corner. The lease was for five years and Eugenio had to pay eighty-six ducats a year. After the death of Giorgio Corner, Eugenio renewed the contract with the new owner of Agia Eirini, Giorgio's son, Jacobo. The addendum to the contract also mentioned the leasing of the village of Gadourades and the yearly rent increased to 125 ducats for both settlements.

Eugenio also invested in two more villages, Aradippou in 1525 and Morphou, one of the biggest villages in the island, in 1528.³⁷⁵ For the latter he paid the extremely large amount of 28,500 ducats while Venice had the right to take back the settlement after five years. The large amount of money paid and the possibility of its recovery after five years testify to the significance of the settlement. In fact, Venice tried to recover Morphou a few years later. The amount paid by Eugenio for Aradippou was 10,673 ducats and seven soldi, of which 10,000 was to be paid at once and the remainder in annual instalments and in grain. At the time the census was being conducted in Aradippou, Eugenio appears to have been the landlord of that settlement but most probably the terms of acquisition might have changed. When Venice tried to get Morphou back, they also tried to cancel the sale of Aradippou. This led Eugenio to pay an extra amount of 60,000 ducats to Venice in order to continue leasing both.

This raises some questions. What was Synglitico' trying to achieve? Were Aradippou and the settlements next to it really prosperous enough to justify the huge amount of money he

³⁷⁴ Arbel, 'Greek Magnates in Venetian Cyprus', pp. 329-220.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

spent? Was selling the settlement a mistake on the part of Venice and was that the reason why they tried to cancel it? And was the land able to produce the amount of grain Eugenio promised? Aradippou was situated in a privileged location, very close to the *Salines* and the rapidly developing port. However, as previously explained, many of its *parici* relocated to other areas of the island; this might explain the reduced productivity of the cultivated land. As was the case with Filippos Palaiologos and his lease on Marathasa, the lack of evidence means there are no concrete answers to such questions.

Kato Koutrafas, the third area examined, is substantially different. As mentioned above, the settlement had belonged to the Count of Edessa/Rochas, Morf de Grenier. When he died without leaving a male heir, the village and its population were inherited by the state, which is why the Cypriot government requested a census. There is no mention of other lords in the area in 1512. The settlement is mentioned in a document sent to Cyprus by the Council of Ten, dated 9 September 1513.³⁷⁶ This records that the Council rejected Philippo Flatro's request to acquire the settlement. At a time when the public treasury and Venice required all possible funds, declining Flatro's offer seems peculiar. The document does not state how much Flatro was willing to pay for the settlement. Maybe the Council was not satisfied with the amount and turned it down in the hope of a better offer.

11.4 Enfranchisement of *parici*

One of the most common requests from the dependant peasants in the *Stato da mar* was for enfranchisement. In the first centuries of the Venetian occupation, the metropolis and the Council of Ten were not in favour of enfranchisement. For example, in Coron and Modon a person could be emancipated only as a reward for his loyalty. That person was exempt from paying taxes and personal responsibility for the *angaria*. Other than that, a dependant peasant could be set free only by paying a fee of 200 ducats. In addition, the governor, who was the *castellan* in these two locations, and who was in charge of approving any request for enfranchisement, was obliged to pay 100 ducats as a penalty.³⁷⁷ After some centuries, due to fear of a possible Ottoman invasion, Venice changed its approach to enfranchisement. As a matter of fact, offering a *parico* the possibility to become a free man was an action repeatedly taken by the state in difficult times.³⁷⁸

The aforementioned letter, sent by the Council of Ten to the authorities in Cyprus in 1513, includes an instruction to increase the island's revenues. The proposed solution was the

³⁷⁶ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 2, p. 144.

³⁷⁷ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, p. 302.

³⁷⁸ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', pp. 81-83.

enfranchisement of *parici*. An increase in the population in addition to the occasional need for more income led the governors to enfranchise those who had the money to pay for it. The terms of enfranchisement in Cyprus differed from one period to another, depending on circumstances and need. For example, in 1510, two *parici* from the area of Marathasa were offered their freedom if they paid a total of 150 ducats.³⁷⁹

A few years later, in 1513, the *lugotenente* Petro Balbi was instructed to enfranchise as many *parici* as necessary due to the increase in their population, with specific restrictions. The *parico* had to pay between seventy and 100 ducats depending on age, gender, and physical condition. The government could free only one person from each family, who had to be under 20 years of age and not the male head of the family. In addition, there could not be more than three enfranchised persons per village. Any additional enfranchisements in subsequent years could not exceed the number of thirty *parici*. This clause was modified one year later, allowing the enfranchisement of 150 *parici* per year. The amount of money demanded decreased a few years later, giving more *parici* the opportunity to become *francomati*. In 1519 Bartolomeo Contarini refers to over 800 *parici* enfranchised by the counsellor Antonio Corona for a total of only two to three ducats each.³⁸⁰ A few years later, in 1525, the *lugotenente* Domenico Capello mentions cases of enfranchisement for between forty and sixty ducats. Domenico insists that the enfranchisement of those who will pay should be done at once.³⁸¹ Therefore enfranchisement was a possibility for a *parico*, but the relevant fee could sometimes be unaffordable.

In both the AR and MR2 documents there are mentions of enfranchised *parici*. In the case of MR2 there are two particular groups. The first one concerns the *parici* who became a priest or a *jurato*. These individuals paid an amount of money for their freedom and after their lords' approval they were emancipated. The money paid differs for each person but on average it was between thirty-five and thirty-seven ducats (table 37). The second group of people were those mentioned as enfranchised by a lord. These *parici* could have been freed either by paying the fee or due to the goodwill of their master. Unfortunately, there is no other information given about them. On the other hand, the data provided by the AR is more detailed. All the enfranchised *parici* were recorded in the *pratico* followed by their age, the person who granted permission for the enfranchisement and the number of ducats paid (table 38). Sometimes the date and the name of the *nodaro* drawing up the agreement is given. Out of twenty-one

³⁷⁹ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 2, pp. 89-90.

³⁸⁰ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 71.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

individuals, of whom fourteen were males and seven females, ten were enfranchised by Count Eugenio Synglitico, five by his son Marco and two by his other son, Zaco. The majority of these *parici* were under 30 years of age, while the oldest was Arguiri (no. 7), 43 years old. The fee paid varied between thirty and fifty ducats, but unfortunately no specific reason (such as age or sex) is given for the different amounts.

11.5 Conclusions

Throughout the Venetian period the island was a source of income for its governors. Due to its position in the Mediterranean, between Europe and the Middle East, Cyprus was a famous trading destination. Local products from all over the island reached the markets in the island's ports and then made their way to Europe. Sugar, salt and textiles, in particular, provided Cyprus with a significant income. Salt and grain were vital not only for the local economy but also for the *Serenissima* itself. Income from the salt tax was used in the maintenance of the Venetian navy, while a large amount of grain was constantly sent to Venice. Unfortunately, the documents I have examined say nothing about the production and trade between the local estates and the state. We may assume that there was at least some local commerce within the area. The products referred to in the manuscripts are mainly grain and sugarcane, which were widely exported by the state. Unfortunately, the sources do not provide the researcher with more information on this.

Apart from taxes, which will be extensively discussed below, the exploitation of the land was the most profitable revenue for the state. Reports sent either from or to the Council of Ten are full of agreements for leasing and selling state land to the highest bidder. Aradippou was one such case in which, according to the sources, Eugenio Synglitico paid an enormous sum for the area. This case reveals the importance of land and how the state sold and bought land with a view to a profit. Similarly, the first owners of Marathasa, which was apparently a very prosperous area, were granted the villages after giving the king a large amount of money as a loan. Last but not least, a substantial amount of money constantly accrued to the state as a result of *parici* purchasing their freedom. The amount of money demanded for this was not always beyond a *parico*'s financial resources. In fact, many of them were able to afford it and became *francomati* by the second decade of their life. As will be shown below, that was also the case for those who joined the local administration by holding an office. Some of the *parici* examined were able to give a similar amount of money to acquire an office and become enfranchised in return.

MARINA ILIA

12 Offices

Undeniably, remote administration of their possessions was one of the most difficult issues for landlords to handle. Lords who owned rural estates usually lived in the cities. Hence, they could not be constantly in every settlement. For that reason they employed locals to assist them with the administration. That appeared to be the case during the Lusignan period in Cyprus. The Psimolofos document, a great example of practices followed with regard to local administration, reports a great number of officials employed in the local court. There was a *seneschal*, who appears to have been a general administrator, a *bailo*, a *catepan* who was a tax collector, a judge and a scrivener. For the last two offices, they wisely chose two Greeks, Basile Bougas and Georges Panaguiris, since they must have known the local population well and most probably were able to speak both Greek and French. All of them were paid for their services.³⁸² A steward, a *bailo* and a *catepan* are also mentioned in the villages of Knodara, Morfittes and Dischoria. The first administered the property on behalf of Walter. The *bailo* appeared to handle production and he sold the grain in the local market. His salary, according to the document, was 1,200 *bezants*. Niquifore Limbitis Quiras was the *catepan* in Morfittes and papa Jehan tu Perati, who succeeded papa Dimitrano Toumquita, was the *catepan* in Knodara. They collected the taxes for each village.³⁸³ Papa Jehan tu Perati might also have been the priest of the village, who according to the document was paid 24 *bezants*.³⁸⁴ As implied by their names, the *bailo* and both the *catepans* were Greeks, probably *francomati*.

Employing the local population in administrative positions was a common practice in Cyprus under the Venetian administration as well. Following the same practice in every possession within the *Stato da mar*, Venice succeeded by employing both Venetians and locals as officers in the local government. The vast majority of them lived in the cities but, depending on their responsibilities, there were many who must have travelled from one village to another. Assessors, auditors, chancellors, notaries, *castellani* and *scrivani* were only a few of the officers in the lower ranks of the administration who visited the rural settlements. To assist them in various tasks, the landowner, whether a noble fief holder, the Church or even the state, appointed a number of locals, usually males over 50 years old, to minor administrative offices.

This group of people, frequently called *vecci* or *vecchi*, *vetrani*, *omotis*, *giuratis*, *primatis*, *protogeri*, formed the link between the local population, the lord and the Venetian

³⁸² Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolofos', p. 130.

³⁸³ Poncelet, 'Compte du domaine de Gautier de Brienne', p. 16.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

authorities.³⁸⁵ Venice rightly chose to adopt this institution, especially in the larger dominions such as Crete and Cyprus, as the *vecchi* were efficient at assisting in the administration.³⁸⁶ Over time, many peasants had the opportunity to be appointed a *vecchio* or *giurato*. The only restrictions applied as regards eligibility for such a position were that the candidate should have attained the age of 50 and the and that the appointment of representatives for each settlement would depended on the number of its inhabitants. People were usually elected to this position, and they could hold the office for a period of two years, but there are several mentions of that rule being broken. Their main responsibility was to handle local issues and prevent any lack of restraint in the use of their authority by officials. They were also responsible for listing the local male population.

In reality, being elderly, they knew the local population and the place. On that account, they assisted in various other tasks related to the land and production and the local administration. The *vecchi* also assisted officials in defining the settlement's boundaries, dividing cultivated lands and keeping the village's *catastico* up to date.³⁸⁷ They also assisted with censuses and keeping archives on the families of the local population. Other than that, they were involved in jurisdiction. Depending on the case, they were advising on conflicts between locals. In addition, they were in charge of local law enforcement by tracking down and arresting thieves, absconders and fugitives.³⁸⁸ In the sixteenth century, being appointed to that position gave a few individuals fame and power. Besides handling local affairs, they were also in charge of acting or speaking as local representatives, while they were also part of delegations, representing the local community. These delegations were sent to the central government in order to raise awareness about important issues. Despite some abuse of the offices by several individuals, the majority did help with local matters, representing the *parici*, who most of the time were unable to act for themselves.³⁸⁹

The offices mentioned in all four documents examined has led to a very interesting area of research. The administration of the area and the engagement of the local population in it could give a new picture of the *parici*'s social lives. Nonetheless, the documents are very vague concerning the offices granted to *parici*. In many instances, there are just mentions of an office

³⁸⁵ C. A. Hodgetts, 'Venetian Officials and the Greek Peasantry in the Fourteenth Century', in J. Chrysostomides (ed.), *Καθηγήτρια. Essays presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th birthday*, Athens, Porphyrogenitus, 1988, p. 483; Maltezu, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, p. 87; Lambrinos, 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', p. 140.

³⁸⁶ Lambrinos, 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', pp. 139-140.

³⁸⁷ Aristeidou, 'Κτηματολογική πρακτική στην Κύπρο για τον καθορισμό συνόρων', pp. 269-276.

³⁸⁸ Maltezu, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, pp. 87-89.

³⁸⁹ Lambrinos, 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', pp.142-145.

along with a *parico*'s name. No information is given concerning the responsibilities of this person and his involvement in the local administration. However, what is recorded in the sources is the amount of money paid to acquire such an office. When collated with similar notes in public documents of the same period, this amount can reveal several things about the economic aspect of holding an office.

12.1 Administrative offices

The administration of the settlements examined in this thesis appear to have been very similar to those mentioned in other settlements of the *Stato da mar*. Members of the rural population were appointed as local officers, assisting in the administration of each area. According to the documents, Frasenge and Chadit, lords of Marathasa and Eugenio Synglitico, lord of Aradippo, were permanent residents in the capital Nicosia. Hence, local administrators reporting to them assisted in managing the settlements. Kato Koutrafas, on the other hand, was part of the *Real*. Similarly, the island's Venetian government had carefully chosen three locals to assist in the administration. All of them were in charge of specific tasks for which they must have been paid. The majority appear to have been *francomati*, but there might have been some cases where a *parico* was also appointed to an office.

12.1.1 Jurato/Omoti

As the name implies, a *jurato* (or *omotis* in Greek) is someone who took an oath to serve. Individuals of the lower class with this title were often mentioned in Venetian documents from Cyprus. The main responsibility of the *jurati* was to give information regarding the area and to sign documents in order to verify their authenticity. In the area of Marathasa the descendants of Antonio Audet appointed two *jurati*. Fotis Janni Stassi tu Cumninu (no. 138) and papa Michalis papa Petru Protopsalti (no. 322) were the *omoti* of Marathasa during the census. Fotis was appointed *jurato* on 22 November 1530 by Hanibal Chadit. According to the document, Foti paid a lump sum of 300 *bezants* and was excused from the *angarie*. Papa Michalis, the second *jurato*, who was also a priest, acquired the office on 7 April 1521. As mentioned in the document, 'Tute le parte', i.e. all parties concerned, approved this appointment. Papa Michalis had also paid a lump sum of 150 *bezants*. The difference between the amount paid by papa Michalis and that paid by Fotis is explained by the fact that papa Michalis had made a previous payment in order to be ordained. In the KK document, there is no mention of an *omoti* or *jurato* but Chiriacho Petriti, the *portaro* of Kato Koutrafas, along

with two priests, fulfilled the latter function for the census carried out by Hugo de Lusignan, Piero Urrj and Jacomo de Negron.

12.1.2 Nodaro/Nomico

Another important office in every area was that of *nodaro/nomico*. In Marathasa, according to the document, the owners were allowed by custom to appoint a *nomico* in addition to a *protopapa*. The *nomico* was probably a semi-ecclesiastical office and the *parico* appointed was the settlement's scribe and notary. He might also assist in disputes between locals adjudicated in the ecclesiastical courts. Given the size of the location and its population, an educated person would have been required. This office is recorded in the surname of the third largest family in the area. Hence it must have been given to a local since the early fourteenth century. That appeared to be the case in other settlements as well. For example, there was a Nomikou family originating from the village of Alsos in the Limassol area and another one from the village of Letympou in the Paphos area.³⁹⁰

12.1.3 Castellano

As scholars have explained, a *castellano* was the person appointed as the administrator of an area.³⁹¹ This office was usually related to the administration of larger areas, usually surrounded by a castle, such as a town. By contrast there are several references to the presence of *castellani* in Cypriot rural settlements. Most of the time the *castellano*, a free person, lived with his family in a special house next to the granary. His responsibility was to administer the estate on behalf of the landlord, collecting various taxes and regulating daily production. Thus he had to know all the *parici* and their families by name.³⁹² There is no further information on the *castellani*, their status or their responsibilities. A *castellano* named Lois is mentioned in the Kato Koutrafas document in relation to the salary (48 *bezants*) he received from the *parici*; he is the only *francomato* mentioned in the document and this is why he could hold the office. *Castellani* are also mentioned in the Marathasa documents. In the author's introduction, there is a note regarding the *castellani* and *jurati*, whose local knowledge helped Florio to complete the census; the fact that there are no other mentions of them indicates that they were free tenants. In addition, Costantis Argiro Nengomiti Tu Cuzzu (no. 471) is listed as the *castellano* for Covoclia, a village in the Paphos area. Unfortunately, there is no other mention of this

³⁹⁰ J. Darrouzès, 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Chypre (premier article)', *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί*, 17, 1953, pp. 81-102; reprint. in J. Darrouzès, *e Littérature et histoire des textes byzantins*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1972, XIV; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', pp. 58-59.

³⁹¹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό ενετική κυριαρχία', p. 511.

³⁹² MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46, f. 18^v.

person or his status, since he did not live on the estate. Lastly, in the Aradippou document there is an individual called Vassili Liuma, the *castellano* of Eftagonia, a settlement in the vicinity, who was apparently the lord of a *parica*, Erinj Liondj tu Manolj (no. 54) and two *parici* Andria (no. 15) and Dimitris (no. 47). There are no further details about this person and his status, since he was not a member of Aradippou's population.

12.2 Ecclesiastical offices

In the documents examined, males of the Greek rural population are attested as priests (*papa* and *protopapa*) of the Orthodox Church. These people merit special attention, especially given the relative lack of information on the Greek clergy and their privileges at the time. The majority of the population under Lusignan rule were Greek Orthodox, therefore priests were very important from both a religious and an administrative point of view. Apparently, during the first years of Frankish rule on the island, many *parici* chose to be ordained priests because the priesthood meant they would be enfranchised. Several arrangements were tried in order to regulate relations between the Greek Orthodox and the Latin Church of the island before the final compromise of the 1260 *Bulla Cyprica*. The 1220 Limassol agreement and the 1222 Famagusta agreement explicitly mentioned the cases of *parici* who wanted to become priests.³⁹³ In order to prevent a decrease in the numbers of the *parici*, it was decided that ordination would only be accepted under certain circumstances: *parici* who were ordained priests were automatically enfranchised after paying a fixed sum, although the privilege was not transferred to their children and they needed the consent of both their lay lord and the local Latin bishop; serfs who entered a monastery were relieved of their servile obligations but not enfranchised.

In the Venetian period, many of these institutions and regulations remained in place unaltered, and the rules governing the ordination of Greek Orthodox priests were left untouched. The requirement for a priest or monk to be a free man may have encouraged many of the *parici* to pay the corresponding fee in order to gain their freedom.³⁹⁴ Several official reports sent to Venice mention that a large number of *parici* belonging to the state were ordained priests and therefore the work force in the *Real* was reduced. In an effort to prevent this, the rules allowing ordination were altered by the Council of Ten in a document sent out in 1512. They now stated that every settlement of up to 30 households should have only one priest, while settlements of up to 60 households should have two. For *casali* composed of more

³⁹³ Schabel, 'Religion', pp. 191-192.

³⁹⁴ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 84.

than 60 households, the number of priests could be three. In addition, several other rules were established concerning monks and how they could enter a monastery.³⁹⁵ To better understand the new policies, a closer examination of the *pratici* is necessary.

12.2.1 Priests

12.2.1.1 Marathasa

Priests were members of a group that attracted the attention of administrators. In his report, Florio Bustron mentions an aspect of the ordination process:³⁹⁶

‘Hano usanza di recomparssi quelli parici ch(e) si// voleno far preti zoe compar l’ obligo ch(e) hanno// d(e) andar a s(er)vio zornate et p(er) anihilar ditto obligo// pagano p(er) una volta duc(ati) 36/ et da algunj piu et// algunj manco li quali danari deveno p(er)tir secondo// J carati d(e) ciascuno p(er)ticipa et li ditti preti pagano// poi ogni anno in contadi 8 26/ 2 ½’

So, due to an old custom, a Marathasa *parico* who wanted to be a priest had to pay a one-off fee of thirty-six ducats. He would be exempt from forced labour but, as appears to have been the case for other males, priests had to pay 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie* annually. As will be explained below, this was similar to the amount usually paid by all men over 19 years old. The survey gives further information concerning Marathasa’s priests besides their names: i.e. the date they were ordained and the lord who gave his permission. In some cases, the scribe also lists the village the priest was attached to as a *parico* before the ordination, his new parish and a number of *bezants*, perhaps the payment for the enfranchisement.

As table 37 shows, eleven men from seven different families were exempted from their servile obligations and ordained as priests. Four of them were members of the same family, Michalis (no. 322), a father, and his three sons Petros (no. 328), Vassilis (no. 329) and Jannis (no. 330). These four men are recorded in the *prastio* Tris Eglies, a settlement that might have been their parish, except for Petros who lived in nearby Paglio Milo. In addition, three more people were descendants of clerics: Michalis (no. 117), son of a priest (*protopapa*); Loys (no. 284), whose surname was Papa Mina; and Jannis (no. 452), whose ancestor was also a ‘protopapas’. As for the ages of these men, at the time of the census most of them were over 25 years old. However, their age at the time they were ordained varied, averaging 19.8 years. Jannis (no. 452) was the youngest, only 14; while Lasaros (no. 39) was the oldest at 26. The years the ordination took place varied. Only four of them were ordained in the 1540s, whereas the remaining seven were ordained before 1535. It can thus be presumed that there was no

³⁹⁵ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 1, p. 77.

³⁹⁶ Folio 74^v.

pratico or census of the settlements conducted after 1514. The name of the lord who gave permission for the enfranchisement is noted. All of the lords mentioned are members of the Chadit family, descendants of Antonio Audet. As Florio explains, one of the powers that had been granted to the owners of the area since the Lusignan period was to appoint a head priest for the settlement, a *protopapas*. Lastly, the amount paid by each priest for his enfranchisement is also mentioned in the survey. Most of them paid 350 or 360 *bezants*, i.e. thirty-five or thirty-six ducats at a rate of exchange at that time, as was the custom, mentioned on folio 74^v (*Hano usanza di recomparssi ... pagano per una volta ducati 36*). The exceptions were Michalis (no. 322.), the first to be ordained in 1514, who paid 310 *bezants*, Jannis (no. 126), the youngest to become a priest, who paid 126 *bezants*, and Petros (no. 17), the oldest to be ordained, who paid 169 *bezants* and 18 *carcie*; the priest who paid more than thirty-six ducats was another Michalis (no. 117), who paid 370 *bezants*.

12.2.1.2 *Kato Koutrafas*

For Kato Koutrafas the situation is slightly different. There are only three males recorded as priests: papa Argiro Chatopardieri (no. 9) and Protopapa Charito da Maratasse (no. 26) are mentioned in the list of duties paid and again in the list of families. Papa Argiros paid 40 *bezants* and 12 *carcie* per year and was the father of five young children. Protopapa Charitos, who had most probably moved from Marathasa, was the head priest of the village. He appears in the list of duties, paying 24 *bezants* a year, and was the head of a family of six, not including his adopted child Zegno. He is also one of the signatories on the first page of the document, vouching for its authenticity. The third priest of the village was Papa Chiriachio Chattopardierj, who also appears as a signatory on the first page of the document but is not mentioned anywhere else. He was presumably either a *francomato* or a *parico* exempt from fees and forced labour in the *Real's* manors in the area. However, given that papa Argiros is not a signatory of the document, while papa Chiriacos does not appear in the lists of duties and families, they may be the same person; both appear to be 43 years old, and both have the surname Chatopardieri. Unfortunately, there is no other mention of these individuals.

12.3 Conclusions

As elsewhere in Venetian Cyprus and Greece, the foreign rulers relied on local people and their knowledge. The *omotijurati* were chosen from among the elderly *parici*, the *homini vechii*. Their knowledge of the customs, the area and its history and population rendered them able to assist in the administration and organisation of the estate. These people managed eventually to gain more power in specific rural areas of Venetian Greece and rose to be the

representatives of their villages before the Council of Ten was instituted. In Cyprus, the *omoti*, together with the *castellani* and the *bailli*, appear to have been the administrators of estates that belonged to a landlord or the *Real*. Only certain people seem to have been able to hold these offices and, as was the case in other Venetian areas, they were most probably free.

Ecclesiastical offices, on the other hand, were open, with some restrictions, to whoever had enough *bezants* to pay to be enfranchised. The amount of money paid differs between the *parici* mentioned in MR2 but on average they had to pay between 300 to 350 *bezants* (30 - 35 ducats). The landlords followed the Council's orders and always requested the *Reggimento's* approval for a new ordination. However, regulations regarding the number of priests per village were not always observed: as mentioned above, Tris Egliēs, a rather small settlement in the Marathasa valley, had three priests, a father and his two sons; similarly, Kato Koutrafas, a settlement of 24 households, had two or three priests. An interesting fact is that neither the priests nor the monks were completely enfranchised as decreed by the 1220 and 1222 agreements. Though the priests in the manuscripts examined were exempt from servile duties, they had to pay some taxes just like other *parici*.³⁹⁷ In Kato Koutrafas priests had to pay even more than other men; but they may have been exempt from forced labour. In addition, there is no mention of a salary, as was the case in Knodara. Conditions for monks do not differ. The monks mentioned in MR2 were exempt from forced labour, but they paid taxes to the monastery (table 39).

As mentioned above, despite the different approach adopted in the acquisition of each location, Venice managed to create a well organised administrative system by employing Venetians in higher positions and utilising the knowledge of the local population on specific matters. By having these individuals in very significant positions, the central government in each location was able to control and manage any matter effectively. Appointing locals as officers was also very beneficial for the *parici*. In many cases, these officers must have acted as representatives of the local population, requesting benefits and privileges for all.

³⁹⁷ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 83.

13 Taxes and Duties

The *parici*'s fiscal obligations and forced labour determined the quality of their lives; this is the main angle from which they have been studied by several scholars of the Venetian period in Cyprus. Up to now most of the published documents relating to the island's period of Latin rule, such as the Marathasa *pratico* or the Psimolofos document, have been analysed from the point of view of the population's fiscal and other obligations, and the social and everyday life of the population have been disregarded. Hence, the picture of the Cypriot lower social stratum painted by researchers describes people who were accustomed to hardship, obliged to pay heavy taxes, and fighting to survive.³⁹⁸ Therefore, in order to have a better understanding of the living conditions of the *parici*, it is vital to study their duties and the different amounts of money paid in taxes by different groups. Several documents refer to taxes, but the data is scattered and not clear, probably due to the fact that taxes and the forced labour of the *parici* were the lord's responsibility. Individuals working on a fief owned by a lord paid different amounts to those working for the state. In fact, even in Venetian colonies governed by the *Serenissima*, such as Crete and Zante, basic taxes were not identical for the lower social stratum.

Similarly, not all Cypriot *parici* paid the same amount. As various scholars have explained, most of the main taxes had been inherited from the Byzantine and Lusignan periods. The Venetians were clearly determined to maintain these institutions; an interesting question though is whether the taxes were modified or continued unaltered. It is also important to identify taxes newly introduced by Venice, and old taxes that they did not keep.

There are two main sources for the study of duties and taxes owed by the *parici*: the *Ordine della Segreta* and the *Memorie*. The authors, Florio Bustron and Leonardo Donà, were given access to the island's archives; they were thus able to study the island's past in order to give a better understanding of its present. Moreover, they had travelled around the island, accumulating information from the peasantry. Their reports may thus be considered to be the most accurate picture of Cypriot rural life. In an effort to reach more secure conclusions with regard to the continuity of these obligations in the Latin period in Cyprus two more documents will be examined. The first is the *Apokope tou psomion*, a document from 1231-1232, which provides basic instructions on how to record the revenues of an area and the relevant sums owed by each group of people. The second is the Psimolofos document, an inventory for the year 1317-1318.

³⁹⁸ Aristeidou, *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα*, vol. 2, p. 314; Aristeidou, 'Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί', p. 377.

13.1 Taxes

With a few exceptions, e.g. widows, the taxes for a household were paid by the male head of the family on a regular basis either in money or in products, usually grain. The most important tax mentioned in the sources is the poll tax. Along with other *corvees*, the days of forced labour, the *catepanazo* had constituted the main duties of the *parici* since the Byzantine period. In the *Apocope*, the population living in the mountains were segregated into three distinct groups. A *zeugaratos* (owner of a pair of oxen) had to pay 60 coins, a *monoboidatos* (owner of one ox) had to pay 40 while a *pezos* (a peasant without any cattle) had to pay 20. There is also a mention of priests who had to pay twenty coins. In Psimolof, the *catepanazo* was paid in money and not in kind. As was the case in France, officials as well as villagers had to pay a similar tax. According to the document, the amount paid for *chevage* depended on the office held by the individual. Some of them paid two *bezants* and sixteen *deniers* while others paid 6 *bezants* and 16 *deniers*. In addition to this tax, the *parici* also paid another tax in kind, i.e. part of their production. In the *Apocope*, there is an instruction to keep 1/10 of the total production. In Psimolof, *parici* had to give 1/3 and *francomati* 1/4 or 1/5 of the barley and wheat they produced. Other taxes were related to the level of production, the annual yield, and the lands cultivated. For example, in the *Apocope*, there is a specific instruction with regard to vineyards and gardens. According to the document, for a vineyard 1/10 and three coins should be given to the landlord, while in the case of a garden it would be considered for extra taxes.³⁹⁹ In Psimolof, there was the *sergentagium*, a tax paid in kind (29 *modia* in wheat and 55.5 *modia* in barley). There was also a corresponding tax related to the livestock owned by an individual. For sheep and goats, payment was made in kind, while for pigs, beef and chickens the tax was paid in money. In fact, there is a specific reference to the tax paid for pigs, which was one *bezant* for every ten *bezants* of its value.⁴⁰⁰ Other fees were related to an individual's status. For example, a widow in the *Apocope* had to pay 46 coins if she owned a pair of oxen, 26 if she had one ox and 6 if she had no cattle in her possession. In addition, young boys appear to have been obliged to pay taxes. According to the document each had to give 15 coins. There was also a tax on the dead, the *zaeta*.

To some extent, the above taxes were adopted by the Venetian authorities during the century of their administration in Cyprus. The *catepanazo*, which was mentioned by Donà and Bustron, still constituted the sum total of all the taxes paid by a male. The amount of money

³⁹⁹ Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern*, p. 155.

⁴⁰⁰ Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolof', pp. 133-134.

paid might differ according to a person's age, the productivity of their land, and the demands of the lord, as was previously the case. According to the sources, the tax paid for the land granted to a peasant by his lord to cultivate was usually up to 15 *bezants*.⁴⁰¹ In addition to this, there was also a payment in kind. The amount given appears to have been the same as in Psimolofu, i.e. it was usually equal to 1/3 of the crop-yield.⁴⁰²

Further taxes, regular or exceptional, are mentioned in the documents. A common duty was the *stratia*⁴⁰³ or *militia*⁴⁰⁴, the tax related to the coastguards. This tax was paid by adult males and the amount was 6 *bezants* according to both Donà and Bustron. Other important levies related to crop production and animals owned by the population. The most commonly concerned products were grain and legumes. As regards domestic animals, the *decimo di bestiami* or *marzason*, was an important tax and compulsory for every *parico*;⁴⁰⁵ the *marzason* varied depending on what animals people owned. Another tax was one that had existed since the Lusignan period on one of the island's most important products, salt. As explained above, Venice's main income from the island was the trade in and the duty on salt paid by the population. As Donà and other sources explain, every man over 15, whether *parico* or *francomato*, and every married woman had to buy a *modio* of salt, equal to one *bezant*.⁴⁰⁶

Bustron and Donà also record some lesser taxes that certain *parici* had to pay depending on their particular status. For instance, the *parangario*, according to Florio Bustron, was a tax paid by minors, while according to Gilles Grivaud the tax was paid by boys over 5 and girls over 12.⁴⁰⁷ Other taxes were the *marizado*, 3 *bezants* paid by every *parica* about to be married; the *vedovado*, 4 *bezants* paid by widows; or the *zaeta*, the percentage of a deceased *parico*'s property owed to their lord.⁴⁰⁸ Researchers mention the *zaeta* as a heavy burden on the population, but unfortunately it does not appear either in the MR2 or the KK documents. It can thus be presumed that the levy may have been repealed. The *parici* also paid a levy on animal products (*rendita di animali*), such as *halloumi* and *trachana* (two traditional products of the island), and for beehives and honey (*api*).⁴⁰⁹ Other fees were sometimes paid for the use of

⁴⁰¹ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, pp. 11 and 93.

⁴⁰² Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική', p. 516; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, pp. 11 and 93.

⁴⁰³ Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, pp. 576 and 581; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 76.

⁴⁰⁴ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 45, f. 103^v.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 45, f. 100^v and 102^r.

⁴⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 45, f. 153^r; Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική', p. 483; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 121.

⁴⁰⁷ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 45, f. 101^r; Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, p. 576; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 74.

⁴⁰⁸ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', pp. 75-77.

⁴⁰⁹ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 45, f. 102^r; Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, pp. 555, 583, 588 and 590; Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική', p. 77.

communal facilities, *servitii del loco*, such as the village mill or tavern (*chanuta*).⁴¹⁰ *Parici* also pay for the salary of several officials, such as the *castellano* and the guardians of the estate. Last but not least, *Donà* refers to a periodic tax called the *decimo delle bieve*, which was an additional 1/10 of the grain yield.

13.2 Forced labour

Forced labour or the *angaria* was, together with the *catepanazo* obligations inextricably linked with a *parico*'s social status. The *angaria* or *corvees* involved a number of days labour per week on the lord's or the state's land. This had been common practice since the Byzantine period (twelve to twenty-four days per year) which was also adopted during the Frankish period on the island (two to three days per week). The *angaria* continued to be applied during the Venetian period as well. Not all sources give the same number of days. As Benjamin Arbel states, the number varied depending on the nature and productivity of the land in question.⁴¹¹ *Donà*, based on Sebastiano Moro's report, notes that a *parico* had to work 111 days per year.⁴¹² On the other hand, both *lugotenenti* Silvestro Minio in 1530 and Francesco Bragadin in 1531 explain that every male between 15 and 60 years of age had to work three days per week.⁴¹³ Data regarding paid work days for *francomati* is similarly inconsistent. Minio refers to ten days⁴¹⁴ while Bragadin, a few years later, mentions in his report that *francomati* used to work ten days, but on the Council's orders this was reduced to six.⁴¹⁵ Additional days of labour in the fields were added to the above for both *parici* and *francomati*.

A *parico* or a *francomato* also had the option of commuting their *angaria*. The *appaltato della angario* is not very well documented in the sources as regards the *parici*, but *Donà* suggests that fifty-two days' labour could be commuted for those that could not work for a payment of 51 *bezants* in addition to 1/3 of the individual's crop yield.⁴¹⁶ *Francomati* on the other hand could convert their ten days of *angaria* into a payment of 5 *bezants*.⁴¹⁷ The amount was proportionate to the number of days and after 1531 this payment was reduced to 3 *bezants*.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁰ A fee for the use of *chanuta* is also mentioned in the *Apocope*. Beihammer, *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern*, p. 155.

⁴¹¹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική', pp. 512-513.

⁴¹² MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46, f. 24^v.

⁴¹³ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, pp. 93-93 and 112.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 93 and 101

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁴¹⁶ MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46, f. 24^v.

⁴¹⁷ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 101.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

13.3 Taxes in the *Stato da mar*

Before moving on to the documents examined for this thesis, it is also worth exploring the taxes applied in the other areas under Venetian administration. And the situation appears to have been very similar elsewhere as regards the rural population. Several fiscal obligations were directly associated with the possession of land and agricultural yields. Depending on the land leased and the terms of each contract, a peasant had to pay a number of taxes to his lord. In addition, a peasant family was obliged to give part of their yield and some gifts, known as *kaniskia*, usually small animals. Taxes paid by the rural population are well recorded in *catastica* and documents from every Venetian possession. The majority of these taxes derive from an equivalent tax paid during the Byzantine period. For example, the poll tax paid by a peasant with a small *stasis* in Modon and Coron was called the *acrostico*.⁴¹⁹ Similarly the tax paid by the *angari* or *ermi* in Corfu was the *acrosticho* and the *viologio* which came to a total of 64 *hyperpera*.⁴²⁰ On top of this, a peasant had to give part of his annual production. Usually it was a third or sometimes a fifth, but there are records from Kefalonia mentioning even half of the production.⁴²¹ Besides payment in money and kind, peasants whether free or not, had to work a specific number of days for the landowner. Again, the days of forced labour, the *angaria*, differed according to the location. In fact, even locations in the same administrative district could have different regulations.⁴²² In the majority of cases, the *angaria* was one or two days a week. It could also be paid off, but the amount applicable varied according to each location.

Over and above their fiscal obligations to the landowner and forced labour, peasants had to pay government taxes. Two of the most important taxes imposed by the government of each location was the one on grain and another on salt.⁴²³ In times of war, the rural population was also forced to fulfil their obligations in respect of the *angaria* on the galleons or guarding the coastline. According to some statements, the *angaria* on the galleons was very hard and usually equated to a death sentence. Guarding the coast or the fortifications on the other hand was easier, while in order to build up their armed forces, the Venetian administration, from

⁴¹⁹ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, pp. 207-210.

⁴²⁰ Asdrachas and Asdracha, 'Στη φαιουδαλική Κέρκυρα', pp. 81-82.

⁴²¹ S. Asdrachas, 'Φεουδαλική πρόσοδος και γαιοπρόσοδος στην Κέρκυρα την εποχή της βενετοκρατίας', *Τα Ιστορικά*, 2/4, 1985, pp. 379; Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη*, pp. 183-184; Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 221.

⁴²² For example, Modon and Coron. See Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, p. 213.

⁴²³ Ch. Gasparis, 'Εμπόριο και φορολόγηση προϊόντων', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 262-263.

time to time compensated them with a sum of money.⁴²⁴ In broad terms, fiscal obligations are described as a burden for the rural population, since the majority were poor. Nonetheless, the fees and policies followed were not always bad for this social group.⁴²⁵ Age limits for and exemptions from the *angaria* were in place in almost every location. As a matter of fact, as was the case in Venetian Cyprus, men over 60 years old were exempt from forced labour. In addition, priests and notaries paid smaller amounts of money or even had no such obligations at all.⁴²⁶

13.4 Kato Koutrafas

The Kato Koutrafas document is a valuable source concerning the *parici*'s fiscal obligations. Since the purpose of the census was to inform the government of the status of its property, Francesco Zacaria's account may reasonably be considered accurate. As mentioned above, one part of this document is dedicated to the fees and obligations of the area's male *parici*. The first folio of document number 80 lists the names of twenty-five men in the form of a table entitled: 'Catepanazo dele casal ante deto Chato Chutrafa'. On the right-hand side, after each name, a number of *bezants* and *carcie* are recorded; and, at the bottom, after the last name, a grand total is given, 430 *bezants* and 16 *carcie*. The other side of this folio lists other taxes that male inhabitants of the village (with one exception, i.e. the tax paid by widows) had to pay. In addition, after a list of inhabitants, the last folio (5^v) of the document gives an inventory of the 'indrada', i.e. the state revenues from duties paid by *parici* in the area.

13.4.1 Duties paid by males

The men of Kato Koutrafa who had to pay the *catepanazo* can be split into five groups. The first comprises those who paid the fee of 15 *bezants* and 12 *carcie*: Vasili (no. 27), Valentin (no. 15), Zuanni (no. 12), Xristoforo (no. 18), Zorzin (no. 10), Perin (no. 20), Costi (no. 13), Florio (no. 29) and Sava (no. 31). There is no mention of forced labour, the *angaria*, for these *parici*. However, some of them are recorded as *angaremeno*, meaning either only these individuals performed this labour, or that everyone did but the scribe did not record it every time. Another individual who may be linked to this group is Sava (no. 22), who had possibly been rented out to Miser Gasparo in Palo but paid his *catepanazo* in his village of origin, Kato

⁴²⁴ Th. Detorakis, 'Η αγγαρεία της θάλασσας στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη', *Κρητολογία*, 16-19, 1983-1984, pp. 103-139; Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 324; Lambrinos, 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', pp. 135-136.

⁴²⁵ Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 328.

⁴²⁶ Asdrachas and Asdracha, 'Στη φαιουδαϊκή Κέρκυρα', p. 85; Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 326; Maltezos, *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, pp. 65; Lambrinos, 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', p. 137.

Koutrafas. Sava paid 15 *bezants* and 12 *carcie* per year. Similarly, Chiriaco (no. 24), who was with Balian Denores but paid taxes in Kato Koutrafas and Stati (no. 16), who was perhaps from Aplanda and had to pay 16 *bezants* and 8 *carcie*, the amount that corresponded to his situation in his birthplace.

The second group of people are those paying more than the normal *catepanazo*. This group of *parici* could be divided into two subcategories. The first, containing just two men, concerns the *Appalatti della angario*, those who commuted their forced labour. These were the *parici* Sotiri (no. 17), who was *apaldo* and had to pay 40 *bezants* and 12 *carcie* and Ducha (no. 23), who was *achordado*, meaning that he probably had a special agreement to pay 25 *bezants*. The other subcategory concerns the priests and their sons. Papa Argiro (no. 9) and Protopapa Charito (no. 26) are the priests of the settlement who, despite being ordained, are recorded as *parici* and paid the *catepanazo*. Charito, the archpriest, paid 24 *bezants*, less than Argiro, who paid 40 *bezants* and 12 *carcie*. Other than their ecclesiastical office, there is no evidence to justify the difference in the amount paid by each of them. Surprisingly, their descendants, Lois (no. 4), Zian (no. 14) and Filipon (no. 5), also paid 26 *bezants*, a larger sum than the average paid by the others as *catepanazo*.

The fourth group of people is the *parici* who for some reason paid a reduced amount. These were Chiriacho (no. 2), who paid 12 *bezants* and 12 *carcie*, and Zorzi (no. 11), who paid 13 *bezants* and 12 *carcie*. Michali (no. 6), a *parico* from Agridia, had also been paying 14 *bezants* and 20 *carcie*, but in 1512, the year of the census, he paid 9 *bezants* and 20 *carcie*. These reductions are unexplained and cannot be attributed to the individual's age.

The fifth group of people includes men who were exempt from paying fees, and this time the reasons are clear. Chiriacho (no. 19), 45 years old, and Chiriacho (no 1), 70, are the eldest *parici* in the village. Regulations stipulated that fee be reduced or abrogated for men over 45. Staurino (no. 3) and Zorzin (no. 30) were also exempt from paying. The latter was a *mistargo*, a landless person. As was the case in both Byzantium and the medieval West, peasants without land were exempted from taxes. *Mistargo*i in Cyprus used to work on the estates of a noble or the state and were paid. In the case of Zorzin in Kato Koutrafas, his pay, which was 15 *bezants*, came out of the taxes paid by the other *parici*. On folio 5^v there is a reference to a salary of 2 *mistargi*. Bearing in mind that Zorzin (no. 30) had been paying the full amount every year but due to a special agreement he was not paying this at the time of the census, it could be assumed that he was the second *mistargo*. On the other hand, Chiriaco (no. 28) was not mentioned in the list and there is no other possible explanation than that he rather than Zorzin (no. 30) was the second *mistargo*.

13.4.2 *Other duties paid by males*

The second section of the document related to taxes is, as mentioned above, a small table listing six main exceptional duties, under the title ‘Appaltati del dicto casal Chato Chutrafa et altro’. The last word, ‘altro’, probably denotes that the duties are also relevant to other settlements in the vicinity. As a matter of fact, the village of Ano Koutrafas is mentioned on the last folio where the summary of the revenues is. These taxes were paid by the men as a group.

The first two duties in the list refer to premises owned by a lord, in this case the *Real*, that were offered for communal use. The first one concerned the *chanuta butada*, the tavern or the general store of the area, where *parici* were able to sell products.⁴²⁷ The document states that for using the tavern to sell or trade their products they had to pay 25 *bezants*. Unfortunately, there is no other data regarding the tavern, its location or whether it was used by inhabitants of other villages or not. The second fee mentioned concerned the local mill. Using the communal mill to grind grain cost the community a duty of 60 *bezants*.

The third tax was paid by only two of the village’s *parice*. As noted earlier, Madalena (no. 8) and Mangu (no. 21) were the only widows in Kato Koutrafas. The list shows that these two *chire*, the *done vedue*, had to pay a *vedovado* of 4 *bezants* each. The amount of money owed by them is the same as the tax for widows applied in several other settlements around the island during the Venetian period.

The last tax listed in the table was one of the *parici*’s most important duties during the Venetian period. Scholars have shown that the *marzason*, the tax on the animals *parici* owned, was one of the heaviest taxes they had to pay. The document contains no further reference to this fee, but it may be estimated at 75 *bezants*, a rather small amount, probably paid jointly by all the *parici*.

13.5 **Marathasa**

The duties Florio Bustron mentions for Marathasa are slightly different. As explained above, the last part of the document, folios 73^r to 75^r, concerns fiscal obligations and exemptions for certain groups of Marathasa’s *parici*. These folios can be divided into four different sections. The first is the main description of the poll tax; the second concerns forced labour; the third concerns reductions in the duty payable by *parici* of a certain age; and the last section refers to a few exceptional duties.

⁴²⁷ Nicolaou-Konnari, ‘Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική’, p. 79.

13.5.1 Main Taxes

On folio 73^r Florio and Peratis listed the main fiscal obligations of Marathasa's male *parici* according to their age. Firstly, they describe the *catepanagium* paid by individuals between 15 and 18 years of age under the heading 'Il modo che intrano ditti parici in la parichia'. The amount owed at age 15, the first year of a *parico*'s tax-paying life, was 1 *bezant* and 8 *carcie*, an extremely small sum. However, only one year later at the age of 16 the fee was 6 *bezants* and 2 *carcie*, then 6 *bezants* more at 17, and six more again at 18. By the age of 19 a *parico* had to pay 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie*.

Following this information, given in the form of a table, a breakdown of the 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie* is provided. As the writer explains, 6 *bezants* and 8 *carcie* were for the *stratia*. The other fees were 1 *bezant* for chickens, 3 *carcie* for pullets, another 3 *carcie* for the forest rangers, 2 *carcie* for the herders and 8 *carcie* for sumac. An interesting amount of 2.5 *carcie* was paid by each male for the *aporia*, a contribution to the poor of the parish. The remaining 18 *bezants* were paid for the *appalto della angaria*. In an effort to be more precise the writer gives an extended explanation of the *appalto della angaria*, in the form of a note next to the table. He explains that in order to be exempted from 26 days working on land cultivated with grain, the *parico* had to pay 22 *carcie* per day, which amounted to 12 *bezants*; for 26 days work in the sugar-cane fields, it was 11 *carcie* per day, which amounted to 6 *bezants*; finally, he gives the amount payable for full exemption from the *angaria*, which was 18 *bezants*.

In addition to the above, the *parici* had to work 52 days per year on the lord's land. Also, *parici* and *francomati* were forced to guard the vineyards from 25th March until the end of June. In order to do so, they were exempted from working 13 days in the sugar-cane fields. In addition, the owner of the vineyard had to pay them. Other minor taxes mentioned in the documents were for the water mill, called Sotiros o cambotis, owned by the landlords, and the processing of leather. Surprisingly, the *parici* did not pay for the two taverns in the area as was the case in Kato Koutrafas.

13.5.2 Age-related reductions in duty

On the verso of folio 73, there is a list of reductions in duty for *parici* of a certain age. The reductions began at the age of 41, when the *parico* was required to work 50 days instead of 52. This number decreased gradually until the age of 60, at which point the *parico* no longer had to participate in forced labour. Similarly, starting from the age of 45, a sum of money paid in cash decreased by 12 *carcie* every year until the age of 55, but the reduction stopped there.

A note inscribed under the table of the *catepanazo* on folio 73^r stands out. The writer notes:

‘et nota che servendo il parico le sue giornate 52

s’ e con suetado a scomputar in la segaglia a carci 24 il giorno per zorni 26 8 13· et in la calama per giornj 26 a carci 12 per giorno 8 6/12 et restano di pagare il parico in contadi 8 6/14,5.’

Two possible explanations could be given here. Firstly, all the *parici* were obliged to provide 52 days of labour a year, of which 26 had to be on land cultivated with grain and 26 in sugar-cane fields. Those who wanted to commute their *angaria* (*appaltati della angaria*) had to pay 18 *bezants* in addition to the 8 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie* owed as taxes. The rest had to work 52 days. In this case, a *parico* was paid 13 *bezants* (or the equivalent in kind) for the 26 days on land cultivated with grain and 6 *bezants* and 12 *carcie* (or the equivalent in kind) for the 26 days in the sugar-cane fields. An additional amount of 6 *bezants* and 14.5 *carcie* was paid in cash, which was gradually reduced starting from the age of 46 and stopping at the age of 60. Therefore, a *parico* in Marathasa received a yearly payment of 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie*, either in cash or in kind, until the age of 60. He was obliged to pay 8 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie* as taxes per year, therefore, he was left with 18 *bezants* as an annual income which could be used for food and other expenses. This is an extremely small sum, taking into consideration that a *parico* had also other fees to pay. On the other hand, his annual revenues could be increased, given that he was able to trade his products at market and sell a part of his own production. Brunehilde Imhaus agrees that the *parici* received a small wage while working on the lord’s fields and compares this to the case of the *rustici de angaria* mentioned by Jean Richard in Psimolofó. In that case, *parici* were paid twenty *denier* per day for men and ten for women and children (around half a *bezant*) in addition to their daily food (bread) and drink. The payment was made for the harvest, which needed work in 1,332 days in total manpower to be completed.⁴²⁸ Unfortunately, there is no specific mention of how many people were working in the fields during these days in Psimolofó, but it can be assumed that the total number could be equivalent to the one of the villages in Marathasa. Moreover, the tax paid for the paupers could imply that the *parici* of Marathasa were in a better financial position than other *parici*.

On the other hand, the note may be interpreted in a completely different way. The Marathasa *parici* were obliged to provide 104 days of forced labour per year, fifty-two on land with grain and 52 in fields with sugar cane. Due to the poor productivity of the location, the

⁴²⁸ Richard, ‘Le Casal de Psimolofó’, pp. 134 and 135.

number of days was reduced to 52. Therefore, all the *parici* over the age of 18 were obliged to pay the *appalato della angario* along with the other fees and the total amount was 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie*. Out of this amount, 19 *bezants* and 12 *carcie* represented the work for 52 days while the remaining 6 *bezants* and 14.5 *carcie* would be paid in cash. The days of work and the amount paid gradually decreased after the age of 41 and 46 respectively. Therefore, by the age of 60 a *parico* would have stopped working but he had to continue paying the amount of 18 *bezants*.

Information drawn from a number of reports by Venetian officials could support either hypothesis. On several occasions Venice tried to alleviate the dire living conditions of the lower social stratum by offering them money or grain.⁴²⁹ Hence, it is plausible that a wage was paid to the *parici* of Marathasa, a place with only a few workable fields, for their *angaria*. On the other hand, reports usually refer only to a *parico*'s fiscal obligations, especially the levy paid in kind or in cash to the landlords for using the land; as was the case in Kato Koutrafas, the *parici* of Marathasa paid 26 *bezants* and 2.5 *carcie*.

13.5.3 Special Cases and Tax Exemptions

Unlike the obligated *parici* described above, there were several groups of them who did not have to pay the same taxes as everybody else: e.g. widows, priests and *xenotelis*.

As in Kato Koutrafas, the Marathasa widows, who appear in the document next to the name of their deceased husbands, had to pay 4 *bezants*. The author of the census notes that this fee was originally stipulated in the 1515 *pratico*. Unfortunately, there is no other mention of this in the document, but, as stated for Kato Koutrafas, widows paid the same amount of 4 *bezants*. Florio also mentions the case of a priest's widow; these women were exempt from the *vedovado*, unless they remarried after their husband's death, when they had to pay the same amount as the others.

Another group of people whose duties differed were the priests. The document explains that priests were exempt from forced labour, which was customary at the time. They had to pay a one-off fee of thirty-six ducats and then the main tax as usual which was twenty-six *bezants* and two and a half *carcie*. People working in the service of monasteries in the area were another part of the population that was exempt. As mentioned above, the settlements of Marathasa were surrounded by important places of worship, including the monasteries of Kykkos, Trooditissa and Trikoukies, all dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Some of Marathasa's *parici* were in the

⁴²⁹ Arbel, 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική', p. 514; Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 124, 286, 'helymosine de parici'.

service of these monasteries rather than the local lord. Though there is no further information regarding these *parici*, it may be assumed that they worked on a weekly basis in the grounds of the monasteries. Seven of these men appear to have been exempted from duties to the Chadits and Frasenges, while Franco (no. 383) was a monk paying fees to the monastery.

The final group with specific duties were *xenotelis*. It can be presumed that the lords of Marathasa and the owner of Peristerona, a settlement near Kato Koutrafas, had a special arrangement between them. Seventy-three men, *parici* from Marathasa transferred to Peristerona. These individuals paid a tax of two *bezants* to the lord of Peristerona. However, they had to complete the fifty-two days of compulsory labour on the lord of Marathasa's property.

Lastly, a further group worth mentioning were the disabled. Florio and Peratis do not speak of them in these last *folios*, but people who had a valid reason for not being able to work may have been exempt from paying taxes. For example, Loys (no. 227) and Argiros (no. 71) had both injured their right hand and were unable to work; and Zias (no. 419) appears to have been deaf.

13.6 Conclusions

The taxes and duties mentioned in the documents reveal an area worth exploring. The sources provide a great deal of information concerning fiscal obligations throughout the Venetian period. These obligations appear to have been very similar to those mentioned during the Frankish period, as is the case in the *Apokope* and in the Psimolofos document. In an effort to maintain the *modus vivendi* in the *Stato da mar*, the Venetians adopted several taxes and obligations inherited from previous rulers. Therefore a few practices and customs were kept unaltered over time, but others were significantly changed. Despite the instructions given by the Council of Ten and the Venetian government of Cyprus, taxes and duties were not the same for all the *parici* but were determined by the landlord. Depending on the productivity of the location, the season and the needs of production, the number of days of forced labour could be decreased or increased accordingly. In both Marathasa and Kato Koutrafas, *parici* were obliged to pay a significant amount of money. As will be described below, their income from agricultural production in addition to a possible wage paid by the lord for the days worked or the *angaria*, could have enabled them to pay their fiscal obligations.

14 Crops and Agriculture

A village, including the families and the space within it, is frequently considered by scholars as an independent economic unit. Settlements were clustered around a central point, usually the church. The surrounding land, which was the property of the lord and strips of land rented or owned by peasants, was also part of this unit. Moreover, pastures and where applicable forest can also be considered part of the village. Life in the village revolved around the agricultural activities. In fact, both dependent peasants and free tenants were farmers who relied on what the land produced. Each task performed was based on the agricultural calendar. The peasants usually worked on their rented fields, but they also worked cooperatively on the land of the local lord. Each period of the year was reserved for specific activities, such as ploughing, sowing and harvesting. The latter appears to have been the most time-consuming. For heavy tasks animals, such as a pair of oxen or a mule, were generally used. Some of the peasants were able to own livestock which were a valuable asset for the family. Others used to use the animals owned by the lord on a rota basis. Besides these tasks, peasants also participated in other activities such as fishing, tree-felling and mining.

Life in a rural settlement on Cyprus during the Latin period must have been similar to that in many rural settlements in the medieval West. As mentioned by Richard, the settlement of Psimolofos and the daily activities performed there were very similar to what went on in a contemporary village in France. The documents from Knodara, Morfittes and Dichoria dated to 1354-56 presents almost the same picture. Farming appears to have been the main activity for the local population working on the lord's land. Part of the income for each estate came from agricultural production and more specifically from grain cultivated in the fields. In both documents barley and wheat are the main crops cultivated. These types of grain appear to have been basic necessities, as they are the main source of gluten, an important ingredient in bread. The production was kept mainly for personal consumption; nonetheless *parici* had to provide their lord with part of it as well. Agricultural practices did not change during the Venetian period on the island. The documents from Marathasa and Kato Koutrafas support this assumption.

14.1 Occupations

Regardless of the physical features of each area, agricultural goods were vital not only to the rural population but also to the townspeople. Good harvests were necessary for the island's lower social stratum, putting food on the table and also giving them a chance to make

money through trade.⁴³⁰ Therefore, the majority of the rural population took an active part in working the land and in other farming activities. *Parici* were engaged in a wide range of activities such as ploughing, sowing, harvesting and milling. Common agricultural activities were part of the labour they owed their lord, but it seems there was also some payment for the tasks performed. As an example, in the document of Psimolofó the *rustici de angaria*, who were both adults and children, used to work in the fields during the harvest and were paid by the landlord for each day worked. The wage for men was twenty *deniers* per day while the payment for women and children was ten *deniers* per day. The lord was also obliged to provide them with bread and mead. Once the task was completed, over Christmas, the lord offered a pig as a reward. Eleven *parici*, probably those who were landless, those known as *mistargi*, were employed as farmhands on the lord's land.

Other than farming, a number of occupations were necessary for the proper functioning of an estate and some *parici* were engaged in these activities. On the estate owned by Walter of Brienne there were taverns and a barn, managed by the locals.⁴³¹ In Psimolofó, there were several locals employed as lord's household staff assisting in daily tasks. Besides the officers, such as the adjudicator Basile Bougas and the scrivener, who were apparently *francomati*, locals were employed as the officer's servants. In addition there were others working as household servants while some tended the animals, such as a shepherd, a cowman and a swineherd. There was also one carter who was assisted by his son. To assist in the agricultural production, the lord also employed some watchmen to guard the mill and the pulses. All of them were paid in money and kind, based on the work performed. Last but not least, there were some local craftsmen such as builders, a carpenter, the blacksmith and the baker.⁴³²

Unfortunately, none of the documents examined has explicitly provided information on the *parici's* jobs, as was the case in the document from Psimolofó. Nonetheless, some assumptions can be made based on the information provided in regard to agricultural production and taxation. Another indication would presumably be the naming patterns in each area, since habitually a person's surname often indicated his occupation too. Agriculture and pastoralism could be presumed as the main occupations of the population under examination in Kato Koutrafas and Marathasa. Based on the taxes paid, grains, mainly wheat and barley, were cultivated in both areas and *parici* were obliged to pay a sum in kind. Other than that, there are references to pulses, which must also have been cultivated. Men were mainly farmers

⁴³⁰ Nicolaou-Konnari, 'Greeks', p. 37.

⁴³¹ Poncelet, 'Compte du domaine de Gautier de Brienne', p. 6.

⁴³² Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolofó', pp. 130-132 and 135-136.

working on their private fields as well as on their lord's land. Some may also have been shepherds. Taxes owed for domestic animals are also recorded in both MR2 and KK documents. Therefore, it could be assumed that some of them were grazing their own or the lord's animals in the meadows of the area. As mentioned above, the small settlement of Mantres, next to Kato Koutrafas could have been, as is implied by its name, such a place. In fact, it is still a location used as a sheepfold today. Unlike Marathasa and Kato Koutrafas, for which there is some indication of agricultural production, there is no relevant information regarding Aradippou's *parici*. Thus, no clear conclusions could be drawn. It seems probable that inhabitants had jobs related to the harbour and the salt lake next to which the settlement was located.⁴³³ Nevertheless they must also have been working on the land in order to provide their families with essentials.

Other than agriculture and pastoralism, some *parici* probably worked as local craftsmen. In the MR2 document there is mention of leather processing. Tanning, an occupation frequently performed by Jews, was very popular during the Latin period in Cyprus. There is also a similar reference in the document from Psimolofu.⁴³⁴ In the Venetian period especially there was a significant trade in textiles and leather, since a great number of such products were exported to other countries. Given that many people were employed to tan animal hides in Nicosia, it may be assumed that the same happened in rural areas as well. This activity could well have been performed in the Marathasa area owing to the fast-flowing streams needed for this process. There were other small craftsmen in the areas under examination too, such as carpenters like the Pelecano family. The name Comodromo, meaning the mender, appears in both the Marathasa and Aradippou areas. A family called Zangari, shoemaker, is recorded in Aradipou, while the biggest family in Kato Koutrafas was the Plasti family, meaning the moulder. A water mill found in the Kato Koutrafas area means there must have been a person responsible for milling the grain produced in the area. According to MR2 a mill, called *Sotiros o cambiotis*, was also available in the area. The fact that Milonas, the Greek word for a miller, is recorded as a family name seems to confirm the existence of this profession in Marathasa. There is also a mention of a water 'machine' in the area, probably a water mill. It can be presumed that some of the *parici* were in charge of this activity as well.

⁴³³ A. Panopoulou, 'Αλυκάριοι – εργάτες – αγρότες. Συνθήκες εργασίας και σχέσεις εξουσίας στις αλυκές της βενετοκρατούμενης Πελοποννήσου', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019, pp. 271- 299.

⁴³⁴ Richard, 'Le Casal de Psimolofu', p. 132.

Other people must have worked as traders and in the island's taverns, as was the case in Knodara.⁴³⁵ Both the MR2 and KK documents mention *canute* in the settlements of Livadi, Plati and Kato Koutrafas. Unfortunately, there is no relevant information about women's occupations. As was the case in western European and Byzantine societies, women worked in the fields and in the family business. Of course, the majority of them were also occupied with household duties (cooking, cleaning, raising children etc.) but received no acknowledgment for this. In addition, as was the case in Psimolofu, some *parici* were in charge of guarding the fields in Marathasa. According to the document some of them were vineyard and forest guardians who watched over the fields from 25th March – 30th June.

14.2 Production and Diet

A look at the local staple diet is essential in order to show the way of life of the island's lower social stratum. Unfortunately, the documents examined have not provided explicit data concerning daily life in rural areas during the Venetian period. Nevertheless, corresponding studies have been carried out in regard to other Venetian colonies and some assumptions could thus be made with regard to Cyprus. Despite local traditions, procedures and recipes were almost the same in each location. The local population continue to observe customs from the Byzantine past but also adopted new trends from the Venetian tradition. There is a long list of dishes and recipes showing the common diet of the rural population during the Venetian period.

The most important agricultural product in every Venetian colony was grain. Barley and wheat were used on a daily basis, especially in the diet of the rural population. Several types of bread such as white, black, flatbread, biscuits and pies were regularly found on a farmer's table. Rural populations used to bake the bread in traditional wood ovens, while in the towns bread was baked in bakeries.⁴³⁶ Bread was consumed at every meal while stale or oven-dried bread was added to broths and soups. Other than being used for bread and biscuits, grains were also used in the production of traditional pasta, especially for celebrations.⁴³⁷ As can be seen from the documents, the individuals mentioned cultivated barley and wheat, while a tax related to production was mentioned in both the MR and KK documents. Hence, it can be assumed that these products were included in the daily diet here just as in other locations.

⁴³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁴³⁶ D. E. Vlasi, 'Η καθημερινή ζωή', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, p. 367.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

Another important product in almost every part of the Venetian overseas territories, was wine. Vineyards and wine-making had been very common in the Mediterranean world since the Byzantine period. Local lords and the Venetian authorities invested in that profitable merchandise, increasing their wealth especially from the trade in wine. *Malvasia* and moscato were amongst the most popular wines in Europe and were dispatched to almost every other country across the continent. Vinification appears to have been a common occupation for the rural population and the wine produced, whether white or red, would accompany lunch or dinner at the family table.⁴³⁸ As was the case in the settlements of Marathasa that were examined, the peasants cultivated vineyards, making use of grapes and their products in every possible way. Sweets made from must are commonplace in these locations. Moreover, raisins appear to have been one of the most important exports during this period. This important super food was mainly produced in the Ionian islands and the trade appears to have been vital, especially in the last centuries of the Venetian occupation.⁴³⁹

Beside grains and wine, there is a long list of agricultural products. Vegetables, fruits and pulses were very common as part of a meal. Lentils and chickpeas were cultivated on land, both private and commonland, in between sowings, while almost every household had a small vegetable garden. In the space surrounding a village and its lands, there were other gardens cultivated with fruit and nut trees. One of the most popular and profitable trees was the olive. Production of olives and above all oil was very important in that period. Olive oil was an integral part of the Mediterranean diet, but it was also used in small-scale enterprises, such as soap-making. For that reason, Venice tried to retain control of the trade in oil, especially after the loss of Apulia, the main exporter of that product in Italy. Oil was produced in many Venetian overseas possessions, such as Crete, Cyprus and the Ionian islands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴⁴⁰ Four olive groves were mentioned in the KK document.

Equally important in the daily diet were meat and dairy products. According to travellers and references to traditional recipes, meat of all kinds was almost always part of a meal. As regards the rural population, meat was consumed on a lesser scale, but it was still in

⁴³⁸ Ch. Gasparis, 'Παραγωγή και εμπορεία κρασιού στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη 13^{ος}-14^{ος} αι.', *Πρακτικά Διεθνούς επιστημονικού Συμποσίου: «Οίνος παλαιός ηδύποτος», Το κρητικό κρασί από τα προϊστορικά ως τα νεότερα χρόνια*, A. K. Milopotamitaki (ed.), Heraklion, 2002, pp. 225-236; Vlasi, 'Η καθημερινή ζωή', pp. 371-372.

⁴³⁹ Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 222.

⁴⁴⁰ S. Ciriaco, 'Βενετική οικονομία και εμπόριο κατά τους νεότερους χρόνους: Η περίπτωση της κερκυραϊκής ελαιοπαραγωγής', *Κέρκυρα, μια μεσογειακή σύνθεση: νησιωτισμός, διασυνδέσεις, ανθρώπινα περιβάλλοντα, 16^{ος}-19^{ος} αι., Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου*, Κέρκυρα 22-25 Μαΐου 1996, Corfu, 1998, pp. 101-118; Karapidakis, 'Οικονομία και εμπόριο', pp. 243-244.

their diet. Beef and poultry were served in many ways. Besides the usual processing, meat was also consumed as cold cuts, dried and salted. Peasants also went hunting and therefore small game birds might also be part of the meal on a seasonal basis. Lastly, dairy products such as milk, butter, yogurt and cheese were also part of the daily diet. Traditional cheese products such as *hallumi*, *mizithra* and *anthotyro* were produced in every Venetian territory.⁴⁴¹

14.3 Leasing contracts in the Stato da mar

As already mentioned, the rural population was inescapably attached to the land. Whether a dependent peasant or a free tenant, individuals were responsible and liable for a certain parcel of land their whole lives. Despite the dissimilarities between the various Venetian possessions, owing to the fact that they had all been under Byzantine administration at some point, the procedures followed and the customs concerning land owning, and the corresponding responsibilities were, as a general rule, the same. Land was given to the local nobility as a *pronoia* in order to administer it. It was on this land that the rural population, both free and unfree, who were working on the land and paying the corresponding taxes, lived. The new Venetian government in each location kept the previous system for the most part but they also imported new institutions, which were related to the dominant social system in Europe, feudalism.⁴⁴² Depending on the location, the peasants could be categorised according to their master, who could be a noble, the State or the Church, depending on their holdings or *stasis*. In larger dominions such as Crete and Cyprus there were both free tenants, who constituted the majority of the rural population, and unfree peasants. The latter might or might not have a piece of land to cultivate, whether they were the *parici* or *villani* of a noble, the State or the Church, while sometimes they had two masters simultaneously.⁴⁴³ In smaller Venetian possessions such as Coron and Modon the local *rustici* belonged mainly to the State.⁴⁴⁴ Another differentiation between the dependent peasants was the way they acquired their lands. Documents and contracts related to land leasing relate to two different forms of concession. The first was the indeterminate time contract. Under that, a *parico* or *villano* held the land for life. The land could be bequeathed to the peasant's descendants. This type of contract which was frequent in Crete and Corfu was called *goniko*. Any unclaimed land after the death of the peasant was

⁴⁴¹ D. Jacoby, 'Cretan Cheese: A Neglected Aspect of Venetian Medieval Trade', in A. Kittel and T. Madden (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, Urbana-Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 1998, pp. 49-68; reprint. in D. Jacoby, *Commercial exchange across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy*, Variorum Reprints, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005, VIII; Vlasi, 'Η καθημερινή ζωή', pp. 368-371.

⁴⁴² Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, p. 485; Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη*, pp. 38-40; Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, p. 220.

⁴⁴³ For example, the rural population in Kefalonia. See Zapanti, *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571*, pp. 220-221.

⁴⁴⁴ Hodgetts, *The Colonies of Modon and Coron*, p. 284.

given back to the owner and then was distributed to a landless tenant or to another peasant.⁴⁴⁵ The second type was the contract for a set amount of time. There are several subcategories within this type of contract. In general, the peasant was required to cultivate the land for a specific period of time, either a few months or a few decades. Under this contract the two parties would usually agree on specific terms, such as the type of cultivation and production, the method of payment and how any surplus was to be disposed of. This type of contract has usually been referred to by scholars as a labour covenant.⁴⁴⁶

14.4 Methods of Cultivation

Several of the regulations and local customs from the Lusignan period regarding the island's administration were unclear to the Venetian governors. Fortunately, a few administrative officers, including Florio Bustron, were commissioned to clarify the majority of the island's proceedings. In his outstanding report, the *Ordine della Secreta*, Florio mentions amongst many other things the island's agricultural practices. He divides grain production into wheat and barley and gives information on how each was harvested. He explains that harvests differed depending on the type of land used. For instance, sowing one *modio* of wheat could provide a harvest of six *modia* in a meadow, eight *modia* on arable land and five *modia* in a *traconi*, a rocky, non-arable area. Similarly, sowing one *modio* of barley could give a harvest of eight *modia* in a meadow, twelve *modia* on arable land and six *modia* on a rocky plot.⁴⁴⁷ This interesting information has been extremely useful for this thesis, complementing the notes of the KK manuscript. In addition, Florio details the agricultural calendar for wheat, barley and sugar cane. He explains that wheat was sowed in October, November and December, harvested in May and June, and threshed in July; barley was sowed in October and November, harvested from April to June and threshed in late June. Sugar cane was different: it was sowed in March and April and harvested in December. There is no mention of the cultivation of pulses or vegetables, but since there were few restrictions, it may be presumed that they were grown regularly. Nor is there any relevant information on fallow periods, although one may safely suggest that land remained inactive periodically. Furthermore, Florio does not give any details about cultivation and harvesting methods. However, in view of the data provided by other documents and travellers, it appears that ploughs were used in local agriculture. Denis Possot

⁴⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 284; Asdrachas, 'Φεουδαλική πρόσοδος και γαιοπρόσοδος στην Κέρκυρα', pp. 375-377; Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη*, pp. 132-142.

⁴⁴⁶ Gasparis, *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη*, pp. 140-167.

⁴⁴⁷ Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, pp. 572-573.

visiting Cyprus in 1532, described the implement locals used for turning the soil, a plank with jagged stones pulled around by a mule.⁴⁴⁸ Sometimes the mule was replaced by an ox.

14.5 The case of Kato Koutrafas

One of the most important things to investigate is the location of a settlement and the surrounding land. Such an investigation could bring to light new information regarding the area's agriculture and crop production; knowing how much of the latter went to each family could make it possible to estimate a household's income. Comparing this income to the taxes the family had to pay might shed new light on the revenues left to the *parici* to live off, and thus on their everyday quality of life.

Unfortunately, this information is not provided in the extant documents. Data in the available documentation is scattered. Though there are frequent references to local goods, they are mostly just general estimates, which means that it is difficult to examine agricultural production in a specific area in any detail. Moreover, despite the efforts of archaeological research and projects, only vague evidence relevant to Venetian Cyprus has been brought to light, and this thesis has considered archaeological evidence for both the Frankish and Venetian periods jointly. Even if precise information were available, the situation would not have been the same for every location. Since the geography of a place is a key factor in workload and efficiency, agricultural production would have differed from one settlement to another. Another impediment is the fact that population data can sometimes be misleading: as explained above, even the comprehensive documents examined for this thesis do not give precise population figures for each area. For example, MR2 gives names of people who had originated from a settlement but who had died, while AR refers only to *parici* from Aradippou who had moved away. The Kato Koutrafas document is undeniably the most valuable. Drafted almost two hundred years after the document from Psimolofo, the KK document has a very similar structure. Given the purpose of the census and the information it provides, several conclusions may be drawn. The manuscript provides a great deal of information regarding agricultural production. The first section of the survey, the description of the settlement, contains valuable information about its agricultural production. The manuscript's first page describes the boundaries of the settlement at the time. Though this description is in places hard to decipher, the TAESP team came to the conclusion that the village's location and boundaries were almost the same then as they are today.

⁴⁴⁸ B. Arbel, 'The Triumph of the Mule in Sixteenth-Century Cyprus', in B. Arbel, *Studies on Venetian Cyprus*, Collected Studies, III, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2017, pp. 241-248.

The second part of the MR document concerns the land that belonged to the village. The scribe distinguishes four different types of land around the settlement. The first was arable land that could be worked or cultivated (*lavoradi*) and was irrigable (*beueradi*); this occupied 660 *modia*, 260 of which were *de despoticho*, i.e. belonged to the lord, and 400 of which were *de villani*, i.e. belonged to the *parici*. This land can be located in the centre of the area, next to the Elias river. In fact, this area of the settlement is the only flat land. The second type was workable land that was not irrigable (*Terreni lavoradi che non se beverano*). This again was divided into land that belonged to the lord (40 *modia*) and land that belonged to *parici* (100 *modia*). As there are no more details on this land, no further conclusions can be drawn. Presumably these few *modia* of cultivated soil were located either next to the irrigable land or elsewhere in the plain. The third type of land mentioned was uncultivated land, some workable (230 *modia*), some non-workable (408 *modia*). Unfortunately, there is no other information on this land, but it may be presumed that it was located to the south-east, not far from the main settlement. The last type of land that the survey lists was rocky ground in the mountains unsuitable for crop-growing. This land accounts for the majority of the hilly settlement (1387 *modia*). However, it may have been used to grow fruit trees or for grazing, as is the case today.

Based on the information on the families in the area contained in the survey together with Florio Bustron's notes on agriculture in the *Ordine della Secreta*, a few examples of crops can be given. The two main types of cereals on the island were wheat and barley. Ignoring all other crops grown on the island, Florio refers extensively only to the production of cereals and sugar cane. There is no information regarding the agricultural products of Kato Koutrafas; consequently, we can only have an idea of the settlement's produce based on a calculation of the cultivation of wheat and barley per family. Twenty-three peasant families in the area, and more specifically the male heads of each family, worked on 2825 *modia* of land, 1030 of which were workable, and the rest not fertile. 300 *modia* were *despoticho*, belonging to the owner of the settlement, at that time the Venetian Government; the remaining 730 *modia* belonged to the twenty-one families of *parici*, since there is mention of two *mistargi*. By comparing these figures with the information in the 1532 report sent to the Council of Ten, which gives the price of wheat and barley, tables 40 and 41 were produced.

As the tables show, a family in Kato Koutrafas could earn up to thirty-one and a half ducats (around 314 *bezants*) per year selling harvested grain; their income may have been larger if other products such as dairy, fruits and vegetables were sold too, and maybe even additional products grown in the mountainous areas. However, these calculations are non-specific since the numbers derive from the division of the total produce by the twenty-one families. The larger

a male *parico*'s family was, the more land he owned; hence, a father of five like Chiriaco tu Vasili tu Plasti (no. 2) presumably owned more land than Zorzin tu Lefteri (no. 10), who was childless. The total amount of 34.76 *modia* of land per family appears very generous in comparison to the 3 or 4 *modia* per person owned by peasants in the area of Pendagia, located in the vicinity.⁴⁴⁹ As regards agricultural production, it can also be presumed that a family might have not sold their crops but kept them for their own consumption. Bread and other food made of grains, such as *trachanas*, were common in the daily diet. In addition, a part of this income was spent on paying taxes. Whatever the case may be, it is certain that agriculture did not earn *parici* very much money.

⁴⁴⁹ A. Aristeidou, 'Η εκμίσθωση γης, προσωπογραφικά στοιχεία και τοπωνύμια στην περιοχή της Πεντάγυιας κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXIX, 2003, pp. 90-98.

15 Conclusions

“... Le tirannie et stratii fatti a poveri parici dalli governatori et balii sono sta’ causa di far una regulation in quel Regno, con la qual sta’ posto freno a ditte tirannie, oltre che li malfattori balii sono sta’ castigati e veramente i ditti parici sono sta’ angherizadi oltra ’l dover et sono in estrema desperation. Della qual materia non sarò tedioso riservandomi quando fia ’l bisogno darne piena information...”⁴⁵⁰

“... Et qui eccito la bontà della Serenità Vostra a considerar come debbiano star quelli vostri poveri parici obligati a tante opere ogn’anno, a tanti dinari et al lavorarvi tanti terreni, senza che habbino commodo di reclamar nelli loro bisogni...”⁴⁵¹

Two Venetian counsellors, Alvise da Ponte in 1553 and Antonio Zane in 1557, describe Cypriot *parici* as being accustomed to hardships and poverty. According to their accounts, in the last years of Venetian rule in Cyprus the local population, and especially the group of the *parici*, were exploited by the landlords and, despite their best efforts, their living conditions remained unaltered.

This description instigated my research into the socio-economic aspects of the lives of the *parici*. The two counsellors cited above were sent to assist the local government with the island’s administration during the final years of Venetian rule. In order to justify their decisions, actions, and suggestions, they may have been biased and, therefore, the information they give perhaps does not always reflect the real conditions experienced by all the *parici*. This hypothesis, which is supported by the contradictive information provided by ‘El Prattico dele Marathasse Real’, which I studied for my Master’s thesis, led to my extending my research to some other documents. Despite the publication of the complete edition of the *prattico* by Brunehilde Imhaus in 1984,⁴⁵² several pieces of information, provided by the manuscript and vital to any study of this population, were omitted or misplaced in this first edition. A new, more comprehensive approach to the document directed my attention to some areas worthy of further investigation, while the letter sent to the *Real* by the owners of Marathasa was an important supplement to the information contained in ‘El Prattico dele Marathasse Real’. Besides the outstanding data recorded in it, *El Prattico delle Marathasse Real* is noteworthy

⁴⁵⁰ Birtahas, *Venetian Cyprus (1489-1571)*, p. 182.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

⁴⁵² Imhaus, ‘Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien’, 1984.

for a few other reasons. Produced by Florio Bustron, one of the most important writers of the period, the document constitutes a model of a *catastico*, as described by the same author in his *Ordine della Secreta*.⁴⁵³ Florio, who had been appointed to conduct the census by the authorities and the local lords, carefully collected all the data needed, entrusted this information to Peratis, the scribe, and instructed him how to compose the *pratico*. He also added a few pieces of missing information, and most importantly, wrote the final paragraph verifying the end result.

Two more similar documents, which have been hitherto unedited, the *pratico* concerning the *parici* of Aradippou and the survey conducted for Kato Koutrafas, have been valuable additions to what I hope is an objective study of Cypriot society under Venetian rule. The former, which was created by at least two anonymous scribes, provides the researcher with extraordinary data concerning the local population. Despite the illegible writing, the document revealed otherwise unknown information about the region of Aradippo and more specifically, the relations between the local lords, the owners of the fief, Eugenio Synglitico and his sons, and the *parici* residing in the area. Reviewing the *pratico* led to further information concerning social life in the area, but most importantly to conclusions about the process followed with regard to the enfranchisement or relocation of a *parico* and his family.

The last document examined, the *pratico* of Kato Koutrafas, which is earlier than the other three, was of similar value to this research. Though it was known to scholars, this significant exemplar of an administrative document was rather neglected. Written by Francesco Zacharia and verified by three very important men, Piero Urri, Giacomo de Negron and Hugo Lusignan, the manuscript provides a researcher with a comprehensive picture of the settlement during that period. Being very well structured, it leads the reader from the description of the boundaries to the land owned by the estate and the most significant buildings in the village. It also records the population residing in the area and the revenues earned by the estate, both from taxes and the profit from the agricultural production. Despite some minor errors, the document could be an extremely valuable source for the area, especially when examined conjointly with the archaeological evidence. Other than that, this study has profited enormously from the data extracted from it concerning the economy of the area and especially the description of land and the notes on the income derived from the agricultural production.

Despite their dissimilarities, which mainly concern their structure, since each one was produced for different reasons, the four documents studied in the present dissertation have

⁴⁵³ Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, pp. 540 and 557.

much in common. First and foremost, these important administrative records are excellent samples of the Cypriot bureaucracy of the time. Compiled in the first half of the sixteenth century, the manuscripts offer a significant number of common writing language. In addition, the scribes followed the same practices for documenting each person. The name of a *parico/parica* is usually followed by the names of their ancestors and their family name. Essential to the entry were, in the majority of the cases, the age of the person and the place of origin. Consistency is also apparent in drafting the data relevant to taxes and fiscal obligations. Last but not least, the use of phonetic spelling based on the pronunciation of the Greek Cypriot dialect for the names of people and places together with several other spelling and grammatical errors indicate that the scribes were most probably native Cypriots.

Besides the common scribal and notarial practices that appear in structure, presentation, and language, the documents also show many similarities concerning the content. Both the owners of Marathasa (the Frasenge and Chadit families) and Kato Koutrafas (the state) were interested in the revenues collected from these areas. Consequently, the conductors of both censuses had to record in detail the fees and obligations of the *parici*. Similarly, MR2 and AR were censuses conducted with the purpose of identifying the population that had moved to or away from the settlements surveyed. Therefore, there are several mentions of villages, and their lords, that are located outside the area being surveyed.

However, identifying these settlements and placing them on a map was not an easy task. The majority of the references were just an allusion to a location in relation to a *parico*. Apart from the KK document, none of these manuscripts give any information about the settlements in question. Moreover, even in the case of KK, where the document did provide specific information about the boundaries of the area, the land and the buildings, a spatial analysis would be impossible without a thorough examination of the archaeological data. For the time being, however, the information extracted from the documents studied in this thesis can lead to some safe conclusions about the topography of the areas under examination. For such an analysis an important primary source was used extensively. The map of Leonida Attar, dating to the same period as the manuscripts, was used in conjunction with the four documents. This detailed and extremely accurate map provided the researcher with the necessary information concerning the possible location of each settlement, thus reconstructing a picture of each area in the mid-sixteenth century. The data extracted from the map, and more specifically, from the detailed depiction of a settlement given by using specific icons for each type of settlement, led to some additional information concerning the size of each location. Comparing these depictions to the references to *casalio* and *prastio* made by the scribe in the

MR documents and the number of residents in each area provided the researcher with a clearer understanding of the use of these terms. A *prastio* which, according to Florio Bustron, was a *small village contingent upon a larger village* was in reality a small hamlet or village with up to thirty households. That, at least, is the case in all the *prastii* mentioned by Peratis and Florio Bustron in Marathasa. A *casalio* on the other hand may be considered a village with more than sixty households. In the area of Marathasa examined, there was just one *casalio*, Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon, but there are also references to *casali estranei* such as Galata, which was based on the numbers given for a large village. The number of households and a similar differentiation was also mentioned in a document sent by the Council of Ten in 1512, which concerns the ordination of priests. Unfortunately, the documents for Aradippo and Kato Koutrafa do not provide similar references to other *casalia* and *prastia*. Based on the number of people who originated from Aradippo, but also based on several other documents and the map of Leonida Attar, it can be assumed that Aradippo was a *casalio*. The use of the term in KK, on the other hand, is rather problematic. The settlement is recorded as a *casalio* in the document despite there being only twenty-five households. However, that might be correct, if we take into consideration the size of the settlement including the land, as described in the manuscript.

The identification of each settlement as a *prastio* or a *casalio* and a possible indication of the location on a map opened the way to a new topic of research. Driven by the prominent theory of central places introduced by Walter Christaller and the more recent theory of central flow, the research focused on the relationship between the settlements in a network deriving from the interaction between their populations. Fortunately, the documents provide specific information about the settlements being surveyed, such as family networks established through marriages and economic networks based on agricultural production. The data related to the locations under examination concern three different and distinct areas of the island, allowing the research to be more comprehensive. Kato Koutrafas was, and is to this day, a small inland settlement. It is surrounded by arable and cultivated land, suitable for crops cultivation and pasture. From the sixteenth century onwards the village appears to have been a nodal point, connecting the mountains of the Troodos to the capital Nicosia. During the period under examination the village was a fief of the state. The nine villages in Marathasa, on the other hand, were inherited property owned by lords belonging to two families. Situated in the mountains, fully protected by the physical environment, these nine settlements, which were at some point merged into bigger villages, appear to have constituted an established economic and social network. Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon, the only big village in the area, was the

nodal point connecting the settlements to each other. It was also the only point in the area directly connected to other locations in the vicinity but also to the main road leading to the capital. Thus, it was also the central point of activity. Millicuri and Treis Elies, the other two important settlements on the estate, also served as central points on a smaller scale. The large number of people moving within these nine settlements, but most importantly the significant number of people who had moved away to other settlements, are evidence of a well-established social and economic network. A similar situation is apparent in the data of Aradippo. The settlement, as was the case with Prodromo/San Zuan de Ramon, served as a central point of social and economic activity. The privileged location allowed the settlement to serve as a nodal point leading to the harbour of Salines to the south, the capital Nicosia to the north, the fully developed area of Famagusta in the east and to the forest area and settlements in the west. Based on the data, during the mid-sixteenth century, there are two main areas of social and economic interest. The first encompasses around 20 km. around the settlements and the main villages of interest were Potamia, Anaphotida and Alamino. The second, wider network of the area extended to around 50 to 60 km. and the main villages linked to Aradippo were Menigo and Pendaschinos.

Social aspects of life, including the formation of social networks, was one of the main pillars of my research. Thus, the personal information provided in the documents, such as name, surnames, age and place of origin of an individual, were inevitably the main data used by this author. The variations in the data provided in the areas of concern allowed the classification of each *parico/parica* into a number of groups. First the family tables were created, to which each individual was added based on the family name. The results of each table allowed the creation of family trees, which were then one of the most important sources for exploring family life. The adoption of the same procedure in the creation of family trees for each manuscript led to a more comprehensive approach to the data but it also expedited the research and facilitated the conclusions drawn. Other than family trees, the approach taken to the data included drawing up tables based on age, origin, gender, family status and name. One of the main indicators concerning the *parici's* quality of life was age, the study of which led to several conclusions for each area. The mortality rate, especially in the area of Marathasa, is a case in point. For the purposes of the census, i.e. counting all the *parici* belonging to the estate, the dead were also recorded in the document. According to the data given by the scribe, the number of people dying in the first two decades of their life was extremely low, as only a few of them are recorded as *morto/morta*. This is also supported by the number of *parici* who were still alive in their seventies and eighties. The average age of death is 66 for females and 67 for

males. On the basis of these rates, one may presume that living conditions were not as bad as the Venetian reports describe them to be. In fact, *parici* in Marathasa during the 1540s lived as long as people in Europe in the 1990s. Despite hard work and poverty, probably most *parici* reached old age due to the mild climate and the Mediterranean diet. Similar data were presented in the documents concerning Kato Koutrafas and Aradippo. Unfortunately, they contain no data concerning those who had died before the census was carried out and so there are no specific mortality rates for these locations. Nevertheless, the information given on those who were alive led to similar conclusions concerning their life expectancy. The majority of the population were between 20 and 50 years old, but there were also *parici* over 60 recorded in both manuscripts. The mortality rate for children was also surprising. Data on this matter was extracted only from the Marathasa manuscript. Almost 40% of the population (585 individuals) were children between 1 and 14 years old. The mortality rate in this category was extremely low, below 3%. At first glance, this surprisingly low level could raise suspicions that the conductor of the survey had not included all the deceased children in his document. However, given that he had been instructed to include all the population and given the exceptional work he had done in respect of the rest of the population, any such assumption would seem to be baseless.

Apart from being divided by age, the *parici* were also divided by gender. Adult male individuals in the censuses are examined as heads of household. As the person responsible for paying taxation, a male *parico* is systematically associated with other members of the family, for whom only basic information was given. These connections allowed me to reach several conclusions regarding families. Statistics on marriage and fertility rates show that a *parico's* family in Venetian Cyprus was very similar to a peasant family in medieval Western Europe. People usually married someone of the same social status and from the same village. On the other hand, cases attested in both MR and AR show that marriages with persons from another settlement in the area were also very common. In fact, landlords had to deal with these cases and reach agreements with other lords or the state very frequently. The large number of these marriages made it possible to identify the extended families on both sides. The couple usually stayed in the man's village of origin but there are a few exceptions, especially in the area of Aradippou, with the *parico* moving to the *parica's* village. Calculations made on the basis of the age given for parents and their children demonstrate that couples tended to get married in their twenties. Surprisingly this average age of marriage, similar to the one for peasants in medieval Europe, was higher than the legal age of marriage, especially for girls. Other unexpected findings about marriage concern the numbers of individuals, especially males, who

were married for a second time. This could be an indication of higher mortality rates among females, which could be owing to women dying in childbirth. On the other hand it may have been due to separation and divorce.

Surprisingly, creating a family by having children was not the primary goal for the couples examined. Fertility rates show that many *parici* had their children when they were over twenty-five, while some had children even in their forties. Families, especially in mid-sixteenth century Cyprus, were quite small, since the average number of children per couple was between two and four. There are families consisting of more than seven individuals, but there are very few such cases and they involve the families of older *parici*. Other important data extracted from the censuses concerns illegitimate children. The great number of *bastardi* mentioned in the documents suggests a tendency to have sexual relationships outside marriage, especially between *parici* and free peasants. Even if such a relationship was not socially accepted, it was probably a frequent occurrence since several women had more than one illegitimate child with the same father. The offspring of this relationship was considered by society to be illegitimate and bore the name of his or her mother as a family name. In some cases, the name of the father was known but the mother was still the person responsible for these children. Under-age *bastardi* are always recorded with their mothers, but it can be presumed that the majority of them were raised by relatives, usually the mother's family. The *bastardi* in Marathasa were recorded in a different table, raising the suspicion that they were rejected by society. Still, many other *parici* and *parice*, who had the name of a female as part of their family name, were included in the main population under examination. Therefore, the separate table for *bastardi* and *orfani* appears to have been just an administrative procedure, since taxes were levied based on the children of each household. Other than that, the illegitimate children appear to have been part of the community and there are several cases where a family adopted an illegitimate child, an orphan or even a *vreto*, an abandoned child.

More important information concerning families was revealed through the examination of personal and family names. Taking the family tree as the basis of this enquiry, a few theories have to be explained. The choice of first names was based on the place of origin and its traditions but also contemporary trends. The majority of the population was given the name of a popular Christian Orthodox saint, such as Gianni (John) or Maria (Mary), while a significant number of younger individuals were given more Westernised names such as Jason, Zulio, Angelina and Zambella. To a large extent, names were derived from a close family member, such as the grandparents of the child, a tradition still followed on the island, but most frequently the child was named after a brother or sister of one of the parents. The study of surnames also

yielded valuable information about a family's history. Most of the family names derive from professions, inherited from a male ancestor; other names are related to locations, which might have been the place of origin of the first family member to move to the area. Furthermore, surnames are important from a linguistic point of view, since they are words of the Cypriot dialect transliterated into the Latin alphabet. A large number of them are still in use today, thus demonstrating the continuity of this living dialect.

Another indication about the living conditions of the *parici* is their ability to move around. Evidence of relocation was vital to this thesis, since the data given by the manuscripts concerning the movement of the *parici* allowed me to draw several conclusions about the social and economic aspects of their lives. It appears to have been the case, mainly based on the MR and AR documents, that a large number of individuals moved from one settlement to another. In fact, these moves led the owners of each area to request a census, which eventually resulted in the *pratici* under examination. The reasons behind this relocation varied, but the majority probably moved because of marriage or work. According to the sources, movement within the same area/fief was commonplace, since the labour force for the lord remained unaltered. Surprisingly, though, several *parici* moved to settlements owned by other lords or even the state. Such a move was usually agreed in advance by the lords and the compensation for anyone losing a *parico* in this way was either paid in money or by replacing them with another *parico* of the same age and sex. On the other hand, in some cases, especially in the area of Marathasa, the relocation was not pre-approved by the owner, but the lords involved managed to reach an agreement afterwards, so that the *parico/parica* could remain in his/her new settlement. Last but not least, a few of them were offered the opportunity to move to their lord's house in Nicosia. For them, the quality of life was most probably better than that of their relatives in the rural areas. Many of these *parici* who became urban domestic servants moved in the first two decades of their lives. Based on the documents, the vast majority were girls. Working mainly as domestic servants and living in the capital provided them with new possibilities and opportunities in life. As a result, a significant number of them were enfranchised before their forties.

Besides information concerning families, other important data extracted from the documents concern the island's economy. In fact, the economic aspect of rural life was one of the two main pillars of this research. The information provided by the documents was mainly related to the taxes levied on the population and the forced labour they had to provide. Nonetheless, a more detailed analysis of the data followed by a review of other sources, either precursory or contemporaneous with the manuscripts, led to more information on the rural

economy. One of the most revealing aspects of economic life in the area was land ownership. Each of the areas examined were owned by lords under a different ownership arrangement. Marathasa is an example of inherited fief. Part of the estate, the nine villages in Marathasa, was a private fief that had been owned by the Audet family since the mid-fifteenth century. The fief was given to Antoine and Jean Audet by King Janus in repayment of a debt of 8,000 ducats. Thomas Mansel appears to have owned another part of the area during that period, since he paid around 10,000–13,000 ducats to Marco Cornaro. The estate was reunited after some time. Following the death of Antoine Audet, the fief, including its *parici*, was inherited by his successors, members of the Chadit and Cercasso families. Eventually, the estate passed to Jacomo and Simon Frasenge, who together with their relatives in the Chadit family ruled the area in 1549. Unfortunately, there are no indications as to the value of this estate during that period. As a comparison, another part of greater Marathasa was sold in 1515 to Filippos Palaiologos for 2,000 ducats. Hence, it could be presumed that the area of the nine villages in question could have been valued at between 10,000 and 20,000 ducats. The type of land ownership in Aradippo differs slightly from that of Marathasa. The fief appears to have been private property, owned by Eugenio Synglitico, but it was not an inherited estate. Eugenio, who was actively involved in investing in land, purchased – or to be more precise leased – the area on a long-term lease. The state sold this lease for what was according to the sources, the enormous amount of 10,673 ducats and seven soldi, payable in both money and kind. Thus, it can be assumed that Aradippo was a very profitable fief, both in terms of agricultural production and in revenues deriving from the local population and their fiscal obligations. During this period, Eugenio was the one who benefited from these revenues. Kato Koutrafas on the other hand, had been a private estate owned by the Count of Edessa, but during the period when the census was being conducted it belonged to the state. Consequently the revenues deriving from taxes and the agricultural or other production were given to the public treasury. Based on another document, Filippo Flatro wanted to purchase this estate, but how much he offered in money or kind is not known. Given the size of the fief and the profit raised from its agricultural production, it can be assumed that the value of this estate could not have been more than 2,000 ducats.

Land ownership and the status of each estate was very important when it came to the administration of the area and more specifically to the relationship between the *parici* and their lords. Being purely administrative documents, the manuscripts remain silent on daily communications between the locals and the landowners. Nonetheless, data on payments and more importantly references to enfranchisement could reveal some important facts. The least

informative is the Kato Koutrafas document. There is only one reference to a *francomato* among the males, who could also have served as the person who administered the area on behalf of the state. Of course there were also the priests, who, according to the local agreements, could not be *parici*. Surprisingly though, there are no specific references to their status. Thus it could be assumed that the state was reluctant to give a *parico* his freedom, mainly because they did not want to lose any member of the local workforce. Taking into consideration the size of the estate, the number of enfranchised *parici* in Marathasa was not that high. According to the data, only twelve males, eleven priests and one *jurato*, had paid the relevant number of ducats (30 - 37) in order to be emancipated. In addition to them, there are a small number of *parici* and *parice*, mostly minors, who were enfranchised at the behest of their lord. These low numbers are most probably the result of the type of ownership and the practices followed on the estate. Being a private fief, Marathasa seems to have been vital for its owners. The revenues and profits deriving from the estate were most probably the most important, perhaps even the only income for the Frasenges and the Chadtits. By allowing the enfranchisement of a *parico* they could jeopardise the workforce and hence their profits. Thus, they would have been unwilling to allow anyone to pay the enfranchisement fee unless it was absolutely necessary. Unlike in Marathasa the owner of Aradippo allowed a very large number of *parici* to be enfranchised. The twenty-one individuals paid between thirty and fifty ducats, while the procedure that had to be followed for them to be freed was recorded by the scribe. In addition, another thirty-eight *parici* were sold by Eugenio Synglitico to someone else. The price of a *parico* depended on his/her age and was between twenty-five and sixty-five ducats. The evidence relating to enfranchisements and the sale of members of the local population has allowed me to reach some conclusions. First and foremost, the owner of Aradippo was not in the same position as the owners of Marathasa. Despite the similarity in terms of ownership, since both estates can be considered as private for the time being, there is an important difference. Marathasa had been the property of one family for over a century and had been bequeathed to its then owners. Thus there would have been a continuous relationship between the locals and their lords. Aradippo, on the other hand, was purchased only a few years before the census. Eugenio was actively engaged in buying and selling land. He could not be emotionally attached to the estate and its people and he was only interested in profit. On that account he allowed several enfranchisements, and he sold a large number of people within a few years. In addition, the number of people who were able to pay the relevant fee can also be revealing concerning their economic status. Despite the taxes levied on them and the forced labour they had to provide, there were those who could manage to pay a significant amount of

money in order to be free. This could also be evidence of a thriving local economy and possibly of good living conditions for at least some of the *parici*.

Since one of the main purposes of the censuses was to record fiscal obligations, several taxes paid by each individual are described in detail. The *pratico* of Marathasa, as a model or a template for other *catastici*, provides extensive information on the taxes paid by the local population and on the exemptions given by local lords on the basis of common practices and customs. Florio Bustron, as the surveyor and Peratis as the scribe, carefully recorded all the cases according to the *parici's* age and status, providing the reader with an extensive description of the taxes paid. The *catepanazo*, the basic tax owed by adult males, was paid partially in kind and partly in money. Among other things the *parici* had to pay the *aporia*, a tax included in the *catepanazo*. This type of charge stands out, as it was usually a tax paid for the poor. Thus a *parico* in Marathasa apparently had better living conditions than *parici* living elsewhere and therefore he was obliged to give part of his personal income for those who could not afford to pay. Other than this, there were supplementary taxes, some relating to ownership of a domestic animal, which were all included in the base tax. In addition to the taxes levied on the population, there was compulsory and uncompensated labour on the local lord's land. The number of days owed by the male *parici* was fifty-two, but this was gradually reduced as the *parico* got older. Taxes in the KK document appear to have been very similar, but the way the information was recorded differs. The scribe refers to each type of tax based on agricultural production and local traditions. Apart from the poll tax (*chevage*) that was owed by every male serf, these fees may have been paid by the community as a whole. On average a male *parico* in both settlements had to pay between twenty and forty *bezants*, depending on what the landlord demanded. In both cases there were also those who were exempt. Widows were exempt from this fiscal burden owing to local custom. Similarly those serving the monastery of Kykkos were probably exempt from forced labour while paying taxes to the monastery. There were also those registered as *xenotelis*, meaning a person paying his taxes (τέλος) to another area (*xenos* - ξένος – the foreigner). According to an agreement between the owners of Marathasa and the owner of Peristerona, the *xenotelis* would pay two *bezants* per year to the latter but had to work for fifty-two days on the Marathasa estate. Last but not least are the priests. The custom differs in these two areas. In Marathasa the priests were completely exempt from paying fees and forced labour. In Kato Koutrafas on the other hand, they appear to have paid more than the rest of the male population in base tax, but they must have been exempt from *corvees*.

A comparison of the data given in the documents concerning taxes and forced labour with similar precursory documents from the Byzantine and Lusignan periods in Cyprus was very revealing. The taxes levied on the rural population appear to have been almost the same over time. The continuity of this tax system can be confirmed by the continuous use of the same terminology. The *catepanage* and the *sergentage* or *sergentagium* in Psimolofos was rendered as *catepanazo* and *serzentazo* in Kato Koutrafas and Marathasa. The amount of money paid differed, but the difference is not that great. In addition, compulsory work and extra uncompensated service were present in all cases, as was the requirement to act as a guardian of the forests and vineyards. Taking into consideration the valuable data given by the sources one could easily conclude that their fiscal obligations and forced labour were not always an onerous burden for the population. In reality, there must have been some *parici* families who obviously enjoyed better living conditions than others, since some of them were paying for the poor, while others were able to pay for their freedom or an office.

This conclusion is further supported by the evidence on salaries and the income from agricultural production. Life in a rural settlement of Cyprus during the Venetian period revolved around the cultivation of land, pasture and other agricultural activities. The Kato Koutrafas document, in addition to the contemporaneous work of Florio Bustron on the agricultural methods and practices followed on the island, were very significant sources concerning local production and the profits therefrom. Based on the data related to the size of plots of land, the price of crops and the income derived from cultivated land, a model was created. Based on these figures, a family in Kato Koutrafas could have earned around 500 *modia*, equal to forty ducats a year from the cultivation of barley and wheat. Of course, part of the yield would have been kept for consumption, while another part of the profits would have been paid in annual taxes, leaving a family with a few ducats profit per year. Any remaining crop yield could also have been sold in the local market. Apart from crops, a family had also some domestic animals such as chicken and sheep. Their products were used as part of the daily or weekly diet but were also sold in the local tavern. In the case of Marathasa, a note by the scribe led me to conclude that some *parici* were paid for their service on the lord's land. Paying a wage for workers was not that unusual, especially in an area where there was little cultivated land. A similar practice was followed in the case of Psimolofos, where the *rustici de angaria* were paid around half a *bezant* per day in addition to their daily food. In Marathasa the payment appears to have been twenty-six *bezants* and two and half *carcie* per annum. In addition to agricultural production a *parico* could also earn some money from another job. Evidence provided by the family names in each area show that some *parici* worked as millers,

shopkeepers, craftsmen, carpenters, blacksmiths, menders, etc. This evidence of payments and the rest of the information concerning taxes and other payments sheds ample light on the economic aspect of rural life. Despite the references made by the Venetian officials to poor living standards, there were some *parici* in the rural areas who were in a better position than others. Those *parici* were able to pay their annual taxes and sometimes keep part of the profits. The profits accumulated by a small number of *parici* were potentially used to pay the fee for enfranchisement or to buy a local administrative office. Many of the *parici*, as was the local custom, were providing unpaid services as local guardians or farmers but others were also paid for these jobs. Agricultural production, which depended on the location, appears to have been mainly cereals, fruits and vegetables. Nonetheless, there are also mentions of dairy products, pulses, wine and even meat as part of the local diet. All of the above, in addition to the data given on mortality rates, demonstrates to some extent the good, or at least not dreadful, living conditions of the local population.

In conclusion, the standard of living for the predominantly Greek rural population during the Venetian rule of Cyprus has been described as undoubtedly bad in some ways. Nonetheless, the picture emerging from the study of the censuses is not the same for all *parici* on the island. Quality of life, personal rights and obligations could differ based on the area examined and the landlord concerned. As a result, documentary evidence suggests that some of the *parici*, as the cases of Marathasa, Kato Koutrafas and Aradippou show, were at least able to live a decent life. The same could probably be assumed for the rest of the Cypriot rural population. Nonetheless, a more comprehensive study, using more unpublished documents together with an archaeological survey, would shed more light on the socio-economic aspects of rural life in Venetian Cyprus.

MARINA ILIA

MARINA ILIA

MARINA ILIA

16 Bibliography

16.1 Primary sources

16.1.1 Archival Manuscript Sources

ASV, *Procuratori di S. Marco*, Misti, Busta 132, Document 2.

ASV, *Procuratori di S. Marco*, Misti, Busta 132, Document 3, 'El Pratico dele Marathasse Real'.

ASV, *Consiglio Capi del Consiglio di Dieci*, Lettere di Rettori e di Altre Cariche, Busta 288, Documents 79-80.

ASV, *Consiglio Capi del Consiglio di Dieci*, Lettere di Rettori e di Altre Cariche, Busta 289, Documents 112-118.

MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 45.

MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 46.

MCC, *Fondo Donà dalle Rose*, no. 215.

16.1.2 Published Sources

Aristeidou E. (ed.), *Ανέκδοτα Έγγραφα της Κυπριακής Ιστορίας από το Κρατικό Αρχείο της Βενετίας*, 4 volumes, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1990-2003.

Arvanitakis D., *Οι αναφορές των Βενετών Προβλεπτών της Ζακόνθου (16^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2000.

Arvanitakis D. (ed.), *Κοινωνικές αντιθέσεις στην πόλη της Ζακόνθου: το ρεμπελιό των ποπολάρων (1628)*, Athens, Benaki Museum, 2001.

Attar F., 'Mémoire sur l'île de Chypre', in L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), *Histoire de l'île de Chypre: sous le regne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, vol. III, Paris, A l'Imprimerie imperial, 1861, pp. 519-536.

Beihammer A., *Griechische Briefe und Urkunden aus dem Zypern der Kreuzfahrerzeit: die Formularsammlung eines königlichen Sekretars im Vaticanus palatinus graecus 367*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2007.

Birtahas S. (ed.), *Venetian Cyprus (1489–1571): Reports by the Dominion's Supreme Administrative Officials*, Thessaloniki, Epikentro, 2019.

Cavazzana-Romanelli F. and Grivaud G., *Cyprus 1542: The Great Map of the Island by Leonida Attar*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2006.

Coureas N. and Schabel C. (eds.), *The Cartulary of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom of Nicosia*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1997.

- De Mas Latrie L., *Histoire de l'île de Chypre: sous le regne des princes de la maison de Lusignan*, vol. III, Paris, A l'Imprimerie imperial, 1861.
- Estienne de Lusignan, *Chorographia et breve historia universale dell'Isola de Cipro principiando al tempo di Noè per in sino al 1572*, Bologna, Per Alessandro Benaccio, 1573; reprint. in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), 'Chorographia', *Κυπριολογική Βιβλιοθήκη*, 10A, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2004.
- Estienne de Lusignan, *Description de toute l'isle de Cypre*, Paris, 1580; reprint. in G. Grivaud (introd.) 'Description de toute l'isle de Cypre', *Κυπριολογική Βιβλιοθήκη* 10B, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2004.
- Florio Bustron, *Chronique de l'île de Chypre*, R. L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, *Mélanges historiques*, 5, Paris, 1886; reprint. as 'Historia overo Commentarii de Cipro', in G. Grivaud (ed.), *Κυπριολογική Βιβλιοθήκη* 7, Nicosia, 1998.
- Florio Bustron, *Ordine della secreta di Cipro*, in G. Grivaud, 'Ordine della secreta di Cipro. Florio Bustron et les institutions Franco- Byzantines afferentes au regine agraire de Chypre a l'epoque venitienne', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα II*, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1989, p. 533-492.
- Imhaus B., 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien concernant le Casal du Marathasse 1549', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I*, Nicosia, Ίδρυμα Αρχιεπισκόπου Μακαρίου Γ', 1984, pp. 375-520.
- Poncelet E., 'Compte du domaine de Gautier de Brienne au royaume de Chypre', *Bulletin de la Commission royale d'histoire*, Académie royale de Belgique, 98, 1934. pp. 1-28.
- Richard J., 'Le Casal de Psimolofu et la vie rurale en Chypre au XIV^e siècle', *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome* 59 (1947), pp. 121-153.
- Richard J. (ed.), *Le Livre des Remembrances de la Secrete du Royaume de Chypre, 1468-1469*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1983.
- Sanuto M., *I Diarii*, XXVI, Venice, 1889.
- Tsiknakis K. (ed.), *Οι εκθέσεις των Βενετών Προνοητών της Κεφαλλονιάς (16^{ος} αιώνας)*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008.
- Valderio P., *La guerra di Cipro*, G. Grivaud (ed.), N. Patapiou (trans.), Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1996.
- Λεοντίου Μαχαϊρά, *Χρονικό της Κύπρου: παράλληλη διπλωματική έκδοση των χειρογράφων*, M. Pieris and A. Nicolaou-Konnari (eds.), Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2003.

Τζώρτζης, (Μ)Πούστρους (Γεώργιος, Βο(σ)στρ(υ)ηνός ή Βουστρώνιος), *Διήγησις Κρονίκας Κύπρου*, G., Kechagioglou, (ed.), *Texts and studies in the history of Cyprus 27*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1997.

16.2 Dictionaries

Boerio G., *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*, 2nd ed., Firenze, Giunti, 1993.

Giagkoullis K., *Θησαυρός κυπριακής διαλέκτου: ερμηνευτικό, ετυμολογικό, φρασεολογικό και ονοματολογικό λεξικό της μεσαιωνικής και νεότερης κυπριακής διαλέκτου*, Nicosia, Theopress, 2009.

16.3 Secondary sources

Methods of Estimating Basic Demographic Measures from Incomplete Data, Manual IV, The United Nations, New York, 1967.

Anderson M., *Approaches to the history of the western family, 1500-1914*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Anderson M., 'Historical Demography After the Population History of England', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 15, Population and Economy: From the Traditional to the Modern World, 1985, pp. 595-607.

Apostolopoulos Ch., 'Μια απόπειρα προσεγγίσης των παροίκων της βενετοκρατούμενης Κύπρου με την Οθωμανική Αυτοκρατορία (1551)', in G. K. Ioannides, S. A. Hadjistillis, A. Parageorgiou and I. Theocharides (ed.), *Πρακτικά του τρίτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 16-20 Απριλίου 1996)*, vol. 2: Μεσαιωνικό Τμήμα. Nicosia, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 2000-2001, pp. 669-689.

Arbel B. 'Cypriot Population under Venetian Rule: A Demographic Study', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα I*, Nicosia, Archbishops Makarios III Foundation, 1984, pp. 183- 215; reprint. in B. Arbel, *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000, no. V, pp. 183-215.

Arbel B., 'The Cypriot Nobility from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century: A New Interpretation', in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, London, Totowa, N.J. Cass, 1989; reprint. in Arbel, B., *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice, 13th-16th centuries*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000, no.VI, pp. 175-197.

- Arbel B., 'Greek Magnates in Venetian Cyprus: The Case of the Synglitico Family', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 49, Symposium on Byzantium and the Italians, 13th- 15th Centuries, 1995, pp. 325-337.
- Arbel B., 'The Reign of Caterina Corner (1473-1489) as a Family Affair', *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 26, 1993, pp.67-87.
- Arbel B., 'Η Κύπρος υπό Ενετική Κυριαρχία', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 455-536.
- Arbel B., 'Roots of Poverty and Sources of Richness in Cyprus under Venetian Rule', in Ch. Maltezos, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 351-360.
- Arbel B., *Cyprus, the Franks and Venice*, 13th-16th centuries, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000.
- Arbel B., 'Maritime Trade in Famagusta during the Venetian Period (1474-1571)', in M., J., K. Walsh, T. Kiss and N. Coureas, *The Harbour of All this Sea and Realm. Crusader to Venetian Famagusta*, Budapest, Central European University Press, 2014, pp. 91-103.
- Arbel B., *Studies on Venetian Cyprus*, Collected Studies III, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2017.
- Arbel B., 'The Triumph of the Mule in Sixteenth-Century Cyprus', in B. Arbel, *Studies on Venetian Cyprus*, Collected Studies, III, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 2017, pp. 241-248.
- Aries P., *Centuries of Childhood. A Social History of Family Life*, trans. R. Baldick, London, Jonathan Cape, 1962.
- Aristeidou E., 'Κτηματολογική πρακτική στην Κύπρο για τον καθορισμό συνόρων των χωραφιών κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XIX, 1992, pp. 263-279.
- Aristeidou E., 'Απελευθερώσεις Παροίκων και Αντισηκώματα Απελεύθερων στην Βενετοκρατούμενη Κύπρο (1509-1517)', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXIII, 1997, pp. 115-123.
- Aristeidou E., 'Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στη Βενετοκρατούμενη Κύπρο', in Ch. Maltezos (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 373-386.
- Aristeidou E., 'Άγνωστες απόπειρες για την οργάνωση στάσεων ή εξεγέρσεων κατά την διάρκεια της Βενετοκρατίας', in G. K. Ioannides, S. A. Hadjistillis, A. Papageorgiou and I. Theocharides (ed.), *Πρακτικά του τρίτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 16-20*

- Απριλίου 1996*), vol. 2: Μεσαιωνικό Τμήμα. Nicosia, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 2000-2001, pp. 581-598.
- Aristeidou E., 'Η εκμίσθωση γης, προσωπογραφικά στοιχεία και τοπωνύμια στην περιοχή της Πεντάγυιας κατά την περίοδο της Βενετοκρατίας', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXIX, 2003, pp. 79-113.
- Aristeidou E., 'Διοίκηση και οικονομία', in A. Nicolaou-Konnari (ed.), *Η Γαληνοτάτη και η Ευγενεστάτη: η Βενετία στην Κύπρο και η Κύπρος στη Βενετία*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 2009, pp. 101-119.
- Asdrachas S., 'Φεουδαλική πρόσδοος και γαιοπρόσοδος στην Κέρκυρα την εποχή της βενετοκρατίας', *Τα Ιστορικά*, 2/4, 1985, pp. 371-386.
- Asdrachas S. and Asdracha A., 'Στη φαιουδαλική Κέρκυρα: από τους παροίκους στους vassali angararii', in S. Asdrachas (ed.), *Οικονομία και νοοτροπίες*, Athens, Ermis, 1988, pp. 77-100.
- Baglioni D., *La scritta italo-romanza del regno di Cipro, Edizione di testi di scrittori ciprioti del Quattrocento*, Roma, Aracne, 2006.
- Barber M., *The Military Orders*, Ashgate, Aldershot, 1994.
- Barclay K. and Reynolds K., 'Introduction: Small Graves: Histories of Childhood, Death and Emotion', in K. Barclay, K. Reynolds and C. Rawnsley (eds.), *Death, Emotion and Childhood in Premodern Europe*, London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 1-24.
- Bartusis M. C., *Land and Privilege in Byzantium, The institution of Pronoia*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Bernardes J., 'Family Ideology: Identification and Exploration', *The Sociological Review*, 33(2), 1985, pp. 275-297.
- Birtahas S., *Κοινωνία, πολιτισμός & διακυβέρνηση στο βενετικό κράτος της θάλασσας. Το παράδειγμα της Κύπρου*, Thessaloniki, Vantias, 2011.
- Blackburn R., 'The Old World Background to European Colonial Slavery', *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 54, Constructing Race, 1997, pp. 65-102.
- Boswell J. E., 'Expositio and Oblatio: The Abandonment of Children and the Ancient and Medieval Family', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 89, 1984, pp. 10-33.
- Brouquet S., 'Girls at Work in the Middle Ages', in M. O'Dowd and J. Purvis (eds.), *A history of the Girl*, Cham, Springer International Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 13-31.
- Carlson M., J. and Meyer D., M., 'Family Complexity: Setting the Context', *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654(1), 2014, pp. 6-11.
- Cessi R., 'Venezia ee l'aquisto di Nauplia ed Argo', *Nuovo Archivio Veneto*, 30, 1915, pp. 147-173.

- Chatzakis I., 'Τα «βρετά» παιδιά. Οι ιδιαίτερες διαστάσεις του φαινομένου της έκθεσης βρεφών στη βενετική Κύπρο', *Νόμος*, 13, 2010, pp. 485-503.
- Christaller W., *Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland*, Jena, Germany, 1933.
- Christodoulou M. and Konstantinidis K. (eds.), *A complete gazetteer of Cyprus*, Nicosia, Cyprus Permanent Committee for the Standardization of Geographical Names, 1987.
- Ciriaco S., 'Βενετική οικονομία και εμπόριο κατά τους νεώτερους χρόνους: Η περίπτωση της κερκυραϊκής ελαιοπαραγωγής', *Κέρκυρα, μια μεσογειακή σύνθεση: νησιωτισμός, διασυνδέσεις, ανθρώπινα περιβάλλοντα, 16^{ος}-19^{ος} αι., Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου, Κέρκυρα 22-25 Μαΐου 1996*, Corfu, 1998, pp. 101-118.
- Coulton G., G., *Medieval Village, Manor and Monastery*, New York, Harper, 1960.
- Coureas N., *The Latin Church in Cyprus, 1195-1312*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 1997.
- Dal Borgo M., 'Ανώτεροι αξιωματούχοι στη βενετική Ρωμανία', A. Kolonia (trans.), in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 73-81.
- Darrouzès J., 'Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Chypre (premier article)', *Κυπριακά Σπουδαί*, 17, 1953, pp. 81-102 ; reprint. in J. Darrouzès, *Littérature et histoire des textes byzantins*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1972, XIV.
- Desillas Ch., *Η τράπεζα των φτωχών. Το monte di pietà της Κέρκυρας (1630-1864)*, Athens, Piraeus Bank Group Cultural Foundation, 2006.
- Detorakis Th., 'Η αγγαρεία της θάλασσας στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη', *Κρητολογία*, 16-19, 1983-1984, pp. 103-13.
- Devroey J. P., 'Men and Women in Early Medieval Serfdom: The Ninth-Century North Frankish Evidence', *Past & Present*, no. 166, 2000, pp. 3-30.
- Dewald J. and Vardi L., 'The Peasantries of France, 1400-1789', in T. Scott (ed.), *The Peasantries of Europe: From the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, London and New York, Longman, 1998, pp. 21-48.
- Edbury P. W., 'Οι τελευταίοι Λουζινιανοί (1432-1489)', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt.1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 177-258.
- Edbury P. W., *The Kingdom of Cyprus and the Crusades, 1191-1374*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991; *Το βασίλειο της Κύπρου και οι σταυροφορίες 1191-1374*, A. Nicolaou-Konnari (trans.), Athens, Papademas Publishers, 2002.
- Ellis F., *Peasants Economics Farm Households and agrarian development*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Fedalto G., 'Η Λατινική Εκκλησία στο Μεσαιωνικό Βασίλειο', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 667-732.
- Freedman P., *Images of the Medieval Peasant*, Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Gasparis Ch., *Φυσικό και αγροτικό τοπίο στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη 13^{ος} 14^{ος} αι.*, Athens, Goulandri-Horn Foundation, 1994.
- Gasparis Ch., *Η γη και οι αγρότες στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη, 13^{ος}-14^{ος} αι.*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1997.
- Gasparis Ch., '«Φτωχοί» φεουδάρχες και «πλούσιοι» αγρότες. Η διαστρωμάτωση των τάξεων στη Μεσαιωνική Κρήτη', in Ch. Maltezou, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 293-303.
- Gasparis Ch., 'Μητροπολιτική εξουσία και αξιωματούχοι των αποικιών. Ο καπιτάνος της Κρήτης (14^{ος}-15^{ος} αι.)', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 12, 1998, pp. 171-214.
- Gasparis Ch., 'Παραγωγή και εμπορεία κρασιού στη μεσαιωνική Κρήτη 13^{ος}-14^{ος} αι.', *Πρακτικά Διεθνούς επιστημονικού Συμποσίου: «Οίνος παλαιός ηδύποτος»*, Το κρητικό κρασί από τα προϊστορικά ως τα νεότερα χρόνια, A. K. Milopotamitaki (ed.), Heraklion, 2002, pp. 225-236.
- Gasparis Ch., 'Εμπόριο και φορολόγηση προϊόντων', in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 253-276.
- Gasparis Ch., 'Οι ξένοι του χωριού. Κοινωνικά και πληθυσμιακά χαρακτηριστικά των μεσαιωνικών χωριών της Κρήτης', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019. pp. 25-50.
- Given M. et al., *Landscape and interaction: the Troodos Archaeological and Environmental Survey Project, Cyprus*, with contributions by Hugh Corley, Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2013.
- Goldschmidt W. and Jacobson-Kunkel E., 'The Structure of Peasant Family', *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 73, No. 5, 1971, p. 1058-1076.
- Goody J., *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Goody J., *The European Family: an Historico-anthropological Essay*, Oxford and Malden, Blackwell, 2000.

- Gounaridis P., 'Η Βυζαντινή Κύπρος', in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Κύπρος: Σταυροδρόμι της Μεσογείου*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2001, pp. 12-35.
- Grivaud G., 'Le monastère de Kykkos et ses revenus en 1553', *Studi Veneziani* n. s. 16, 1990, pp. 225-254.
- Grivaud G., 'Villages désertés à Chypre (fin XIIe-fin XIXe siècle)', *Μελέται και Υπομνήματα III*, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1998.
- Grivaud G., 'Les minorités orientales à Chypre (époques médiévale et moderne)', in Y. Ioannou, F. Métral and M. Yon (eds.), *Chypre et la Méditerranée orientale. Formations identitaires, perspectives historiques et enjeux contemporains*, Actes du colloque tenu à Lyon, 1997, Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Université de Chypre, Lyons, Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen, 2000, pp. 43-70.
- Grivaud G., 'Η κατάκτηση της Κύπρου από τους Οθωμανούς', in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 6, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 2011, pp. 1-182.
- Hanawalt-Westman B., 'The Peasant Family and Crime in Fourteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 13, 1974, pp. 1-18.
- Harding V., 'Families in Later Medieval London: Sex, Marriage and Mortality', in E., A. New and C. Steer (eds.), *Medieval Londoners: essays to mark the eightieth birthday of Caroline M. Barron*, London, University of London Press, Institute of Historical Research, 2019, pp. 11-36.
- Harknett K. and Sten-Hartnett C., 'The gap between births intended and births achieved in 22 European countries, 2004-07', *Population Studies*, vol. 68, 2014, pp. 265-282.
- Henry L., 'Historical Demography', *Daedalus*, vol. 97, Historical Population Studies, 1968.
- Herlihy D. and Klapisch-Zuber C., *Tuscans and Their Families: A Study of the Florentine Catasto of 1427*, London, Yale University Press, 1985.
- Herlihy D., *Medieval Households*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1985.
- Herrin J., *Unrivalled Influence: Women and Empire in Byzantium*, Princeton Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Hill Sir G., *A History of Cyprus*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1940-1952.
- Hilton R., 'Reasons for Inequality Among Medieval Peasants', *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, vol. 5, 1978, pp. 271-284.
- Hirsch M., 'Mothers and Daughters', *Signs*, vol. 7, 1981, pp. 200-222.
- Hodgetts C. A., *The Colonies of Modon and Coron under the Venetian Administration, 1204-1400*, PhD thesis, London, 1974.

- Hodgetts C. A., 'Venetian Officials and the Greek Peasantry in the Fourteenth Century', in J. Chrysostomides (ed.), *Καθηγήτρια. Essays presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th birthday*, Athens, Porphyrogenitus, 1988, pp. 481-499.
- Hunter D. G., 'Single Marriage and Priestly Identity A Symbol and its Functions in Ancient Christianity', in L. C. Engh (ed.), *The Symbolism of Marriage in Early Christianity and the Latin Middle Ages*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2019, pp. 111-130.
- Imhaus B., 'Un Document Démographique et Fiscal Vénitien concernant le Casal du Marathasse 1549. Index des parèques', *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί*, 50, 1986.
- Jacoby D., 'Phénomènes de Démographie Rurale à Byzance aux XIIIe, XIVe et XVe siècles', *Études rurales*, n. 5-6, 1962, pp. 161-186.
- Jacoby D., 'Cretan Cheese: A Neglected Aspect of Venetian Medieval Trade', in A. Kittel and T. Madden (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, Urbana- Chicago, University of Illinois Press, 1998, pp. 49-68; reprint. in D. Jacoby, *Commercial exchange across the Mediterranean: Byzantium, the Crusader Levant, Egypt and Italy*, Variorum Reprints, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2005, VIII.
- Jonker M. A. and van der Vaart A. W., 'Correcting Missing-Data Bias in Historical Demography missing data', *Population Studies*, vol. 61, The Population Investigation Committee, 2007, pp. 99-113.
- Karapidakis N., *Civis fidelis: L'avènement et l'affirmation de la citoyenneté corfiote (XVIème-XVIIème siècles)*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main, 1992.
- Karapidakis N., 'Από τις αδελφότητες των καλλιεργητων στο χωρίον', in *Z' Πανιώνιο συνέδριο: Λευκάδα, 26-30 Μαΐου 2002: πρακτικά*, vol. 2, Athens, Etairia Leukadikon Meleton, 2004, 420-422.
- Karapidakis N., 'Οικονομία και εμπόριο', in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 227-251.
- Karras R. M., *Sexuality in Medieval Europe: Doing onto Others*, New York, Routledge, 2005.
- Kazhdan A., 'State, Feudal, and Private Economy in Byzantium', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 47, 1993, pp. 83-100.
- Kelly M. and Grada C. O., 'Living Standards and Mortality Since the Middle Ages', *The Economic History Review*, vol. 67, Wiley on behalf of the Economic History Society, 2014, pp. 358-381.
- Klirides N., *Χωριά και πολιτείες της Κύπρου: για να γνωρίσωμε την Κύπρο μας*, Nicosia, (n.p.), 1961.

- Knitter D. et al., 'Integrated centrality: A diachronic comparison of selected Western Anatolian locations', *Quaternary International*, 312, 2013, p.45-56.
- Knitter D. and Nakoinz O., 'The Relative Concentration of Interaction - A Proposal for an Integrated Understanding of Centrality and Central Places', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 22-39.
- Kokkinoftas K., *Χωριά και Μοναστήρια της Νότιας Μαραθάσας*, Nicosia, (n.p.), 1995.
- Kondylis T., *Το Ναύπλιο και η Βενετία (1388-1540), Μια αναγεννησιακή πόλη στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή*, Athens, Iamvos, 2016.
- Konstantinidou K., «*Το κακό οδεύει έρποντας...*». *Οι λοιμοί της πανώλης στα Ιόνια Νησιά (17^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies of Venice, Venice, 2007.
- Konstantinidou K., *Νοσοκομειακοί θεσμοί στη βενετική Κέρκυρα (17^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.). Για τους Στρατιώτες, του φτωχούς και τα αθώα βρέφη*, Eurasia, Athens, 2012.
- Kowaleski M., 'Medieval People in Town and Country: New Perspectives from Demography and Bioarchaeology', *Speculum*, vol. 89, 2014, pp. 573-600.
- Kreyenfeld M., Andersson G. and Pailhé A., 'Economic uncertainty and family dynamics in Europe Introduction', *Demographic Research*, vol. 2, 2012, pp. 835-852.
- Kyriazis N. G., 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Τρεις Ελιές', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, X, 1934, pp. 190-208.
- Kyriazis N. G., 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Λεμίθου', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, XI, 1935, pp. 69-89.
- Kyriazis N. G., 'Παραδόσεις περί Τρουλλινοῦ καὶ Μαράθου', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, XI, 1935, pp. 133-142.
- Kyriazis N. G., 'Ναογραφία Μαραθάσας. Πρόδρομος', *Κυπριακά Χρονικά*, XI, 1935, pp. 314-320.
- Laiou-Thomadaki A., *Η αγροτική κοινωνία στην ύστερη βυζαντινή εποχή*, A. Kasdagli (trans.), Athens, Cultural Foundation of the National Bank, 1987.
- Lambrinos K. E., 'Η κοινωνική συγκρότηση της υπαίθρου', in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 131-154.
- Lambrinos K. E. (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13ος-18ος αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019.

- Lane F. C., *Βενετία η θαλασσοκράτειρα, Ναυτιλία – Εμπόριο – Οικονομία*, Κ. Kouremenos (trans.), Athens, Alexandria, 2007.
- Luttrell A., ‘Τα στρατιωτικά Τάγματα’, in Th. Papadopoulos (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, pp. 733-757.
- Machairas K.G., *Η Λευκάς επί Ενετοκρατίας 1684-1797*, Athens, Poreia, 2008.
- Maltezu Ch., ‘Νέες ειδήσεις περί Ευγενίου Συγκλητικού εκ των Κρατικών Αρχείων της Βενετίας’, in T. Papadopoulos and M. Christodoulou (eds.), *Πρακτικά του Πρώτου Διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού Συνεδρίου (Λευκωσία, 14-19 Απριλίου 1969)*, vol. 3: Νεώτερον Τμήμα. Ιστορία-Γεωγραφία, Nicosia, Society of Cypriot Studies, 1973, pp. 227-244.
- Maltezu Ch., ‘Το παιδί στην κοινωνία της βενετοκρατούμενης Κρήτης’, *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, 1987, pp. 214-227.
- Maltezu Ch., *Βενετική παρουσία στα Κύθηρα. Αρχαιακές μαρτυρίες*, Athens, Etairia Kithiraikon Meleton, 1992.
- Maltezu Ch., *Τα Κύθηρα τον καιρό που κυριαρχούσαν οι Βενετοί*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2008.
- Maltezu Ch., ‘Η εικόνα της οικογένειας μέσα από τις αρχαιακές πηγές’, in Ch. Maltezu (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 211-225.
- McDougall S., *Bigamy and Christian identity in late medieval Champagne*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.
- McNamara J. A. and Wemple S., ‘The Power of Women through the Family in Medieval Europe: 500-1100’, *Feminist Studies*, No. 3/4, Special Double Issue: Women's History, 1973, pp. 126-141.
- Menardou S., ‘Περί των τοπικών επιθέτων της νεωτέρας Ελληνικής’, *Επετηρίς Εταιρίας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, V, 1928, pp. 283-292.
- Metcalf D. M., *Byzantine Cyprus 491-1191*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, Texts and Studies in the History of Cyprus LXII, 2009.
- Meyendorff J., ‘Christian Marriage in Byzantium: The Canonical and Liturgical Tradition’, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 44, 1990, pp. 99-107.
- Mitchell L. E., *Family Life in the Middle Ages*, Westport, Greenwood, 2007.
- Nicolaou - Konnari A., ‘The Conquest of Cyprus by Richard the Lionheart and its aftermath: a study of sources and legend, politics and attitudes in the year 1191-1192’, *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, XXVI, 2000, p. 25-123.

- Nicolaou-Konnari A. and C. Schabel (eds.), *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden-Boston, Brill, 2005.
- Nicolaou-Konnari A., 'Greeks', in A. Nicolaou – Konnari, and C. Schabel eds., *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2005, pp. 13-62.
- Nicolaou-Konnari A., 'Συνέχειες και ασυνέχειες στη δουλοπαροικιακή πολιτική της βενετικής διοίκησης στην Κύπρο', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019, pp. 51-91.
- Nicolaou-Konnari A., 'Women in Medieval Famagusta: Law, Family, and Society', in G. Grivaud, A. Nicolaou-Konnari, and C. Schabel (eds.), *Famagusta. History and Society*, 2 vols., Mediterranean Nexus 1110-1700. Conflict, Influence and Inspiration in the Mediterranean Area, Turnhout, Brepols, forthcoming.
- Ntokos K. et al., 'Οι Πελοποννησιακές πόλεις και η μεταστοιχείωσή του πληθυσμού τους κατά τη Β' Βενετοκρατία, το παράδειγμα της Τριπολιτσάς', *Eoa kai Esperia*, 5, 2003, pp. 89-146.
- Nystazopoulou-Pelekidou M., 'Η συμμετοχή της γυναίκας στην οικονομία κατά τον Ύστερο Μεσαίωνα (η περίπτωση της Σερβίδας κλώστριας)', *Eoa kai Esperia*, 5, 2003, pp. 147-177.
- Oikonomides N., 'Οι Βυζαντινοί δουλοπάροικοι', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 5, 1983, 295-302.
- Orlando E., 'Η εικόνα της οικογένειας', A. Kolonia (trans.), in Ch. Maltezou (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 2, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 805-833.
- Ostrogorsky G., 'Agrarian conditions in the Byzantine Empire in the Middle Ages', in M. M. Postan (ed.), *Cambridge Economic History from the Decline of the Roman Empire*, vol. 1: Agrarian Life of the Middle Ages, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1966, p. 205-234.
- Panopoulou A., 'Αλυκάριοι – εργάτες – αγρότες. Συνθήκες εργασίας και σχέσεις εξουσίας στις αλυκές της βενετοκρατούμενης Πελοποννήσου', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019, pp. 271- 299.
- Papacostas T., 'Secular Landholdings and Venetians in 12th– century Cyprus', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, vol. 92, 1999, pp. 479-501.
- Papacostas T., 'The Byzantine tradition in late medieval Cyprus: selective continuity and creative diversification', in A. LyMBEROpoulou (ed.), *Proceedings of the 48th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Open University, Milton Keynes 28-30 March 2015*, Routledge, London, 2018.

- Papadaki, 'Η οικογένεια στα Κύθηρα', *Nostos*, 2003, pp. 173-199.
- Papadaki A., 'Τοπικοί αξιωματούχοι και υπάλληλοι', in Ch. Maltezu (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 83-103.
- Papadia-Lala A., *Αγροτικές ταραχές και εξεγέρσεις στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη, 1509-1528: η "επανάσταση" του Γεωργίου Γαδανολέου-Αυσσογιώργη*, PhD. thesis, University of Athens, Athens, 1983.
- Papadia-Lala A., *Ευαγή και νοσοκομειακά ιδρύματα στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies of Venice and the Vikelea Municipal Library of Iraklio-Crete, Venice, 1996.
- Papadia-Lala A., 'Οι φτωχοί στις βενετοκρατούμενες ελληνικές περιοχές. Ορολογία, αντιλήψεις, πραγματικότητες', in Ch. Maltezu, (ed.), *Πλούσιοι και φτωχοί στην κοινωνία της ελληνολατινικής ανατολής: διεθνές συμπόσιο*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 1998, pp. 91-99.
- Papadia-Lala A., 'Θεσμοί κοινωνικής μέριμνας στο βενετοκρατούμενο Ρέθυμνο', in Ch. Maltezu and A. Papadaki, *Της Βενετίας το Ρέθυμνο, Πρακτικά Συμποσίου, Ρέθυμνο, 1-2 Νοεμβρίου 2002*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2003, pp. 35-60.
- Papadia-Lala A., *Ο θεσμός των αστικών κοινοτήτων στον ελληνικό χώρο κατά την περίοδο της βενετοκρατίας, 13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.: μια συνθετική προσέγγιση*, Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2004.
- Papadia-Lala A., 'Ο Ελληνοβενετικός κόσμος (1204-1797), θεσμοί, πολιτισμός, ιδεολογία', in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Οι Ναυτικές Πολιτείες της Ιταλίας Αμάλφη, Πίζα, Γένοβα, Βενετία και η Ανατολική Μεσόγειος*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 197-207.
- Papadia-Lala A., 'Κοινωνική συγκρότηση στις πόλεις', in Ch. Maltezu (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 105-130.
- Papadia-Lala A., 'Γυναίκα και αγροτικός πληθυσμός στη βενετοκρατούμενη Κρήτη. Αποφάσεις του Συνδίκου, Ανακριτή Ανατολής Ottaviano Bon (1613)', in K. E. Lambrinos (ed.), *Κοινωνίες της υπαίθρου στην ελληνοβενετική Ανατολή (13^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)*, Athens, Research Centre for Medieval and Modern Hellenism of the Academy of Athens, 2019, pp. 197-225.
- Papadopoullos T. (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 3, pt.1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995.

- Papadopoulou E., 'Οι πρώτες εγκαταστάσεις Βενετών στην Κύπρο', *Byzantina Symmeikta*, 5, 1983, pp. 303-332.
- Parageorgiou K., *Κυπριακά μοναστήρια από τον 4ο - 21ο αιώνα*, vol. 3, Nicosia, Paletta, 2011.
- Papanicola – Bakirtzis D., 'Βυζαντινή Μεσαιωνική Κύπρος. Πρόσωπο και χαρακτήρας', in D. Papanicola – Bakirtzis and M. Iacovou (eds.), *Βυζαντινή Μεσαιωνική Κύπρος: βασίλισσα στην Ανατολή & Πήγαινα στη Δύση*, Nicosia, The Bank of Cyprus Cultural Foundation, 1997, pp. 13-18.
- Papantoniou G. and Vionis A. K., 'The River as an Economic Asset: Settlement and Society in the Xeros Valley in Cyprus', *Land*, 2018, pp. 40-69.
- Patapiou N., 'Leonardo Donà, *Memorie per le cose di Cipro*: From the City of Shoal Waters to Outermost Karpasia', in J. Chrysostomides and Ch. Dendrinis (eds.), 'Sweet Land...' *Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus*, Porphyrogenitus, Surrey, Camberley, 2006, pp. 209-230.
- Patramani M., 'Λιμοί και λοιμοί στα Κύθηρα. Η στάση των βενετικών αρχών και του πληθυσμού (16^{ος}-18^{ος} αι.)', *Ανθη Χαρίτων*, 1968, pp. 569-619.
- Pavlidis A. (ed.), *Μεγάλη Κυπριακή Εγκυκλοπαίδεια*, vol. 9, Nicosia, Φιλόκυπρος, 1988.
- Pieridou A., 'Τύποι και συνθέσεις από κυπριακές τοιχογραφίες του 15ου και 16ου αιώνα', *Κυπριακαί Σπουδαί*, XII, 1948, pp. 1-25.
- Postles D. A., 'Personal Naming Patterns of Peasants and Burgesses in Late Medieval England', *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 12, 1991, pp. 29-56.
- Raftis J. A., *Pathways to Medieval Peasants*, Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.
- Ragkou K., 'The Economic Centrality of Urban Centers in the Medieval Peloponnese: Late 11th–Mid-14th Centuries', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 279-301.
- Rautman M. L., *Daily Life in the Byzantine Empire*, Westport, Conn, Greenwood Press, 2006.
- Ravegnani G., 'Βυζαντινή Βενετία', in N. G. Moschonas (ed.), *Οι Ναυτικές Πολιτείες της Ιταλίας Αμάλη, Πίζα, Γένοβα, Βενετία και η Ανατολική Μεσόγειος*, Athens, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 2008, pp. 180-193.
- Reyerson K. L., *Women's Networks in Medieval France: Gender and Community in Montpellier, 1300-1350*, Cham, Springer International Publishing, Palgrave Macmillan.

- Richard J., 'Une famille de 'Vénitiens blancs' dans le royaume de Chypre au milieu du XVeme siecle: les Audet et la seigneurie du Marethasse', *Rivista di studi Bizantini e Slavi I*, Miscellanea Agostino Pertusi I, 1981, pp. 89-129.
- Richard J., 'Η Σύσταση και οι βάσεις του Μεσαιωνικού βασιλείου (1192-1205)', in Th. Papadopoulou (ed.), *Ιστορία της Κύπρου*, vol. 4, pt. 1, Nicosia, Archbishop Makarios III Foundation, 1995, 1-19.
- Rudt de Collenberg H., 'Les Lusignan de Chypre', *Επετηρίδα του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών*, X, 1979-1980, pp. 85-319.
- Sarris P., 'Large Estates and the Peasantry in Byzantium c. 600-1100', *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, vol. 90, 2012, pp. 429-450.
- Schabel C., 'Religion', in A. Nicolaou – Konnari, and C. Schabel (eds.), *Cyprus: Society and Culture 1191-1374*, Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2005, pp. 157-218.
- Scott T. (ed.), *The Peasantries of Europe: From the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Centuries*, London and New York, Longman, 1998
- Shagrir I., *Naming Patterns in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, Oxford, Publications of the Unit for Prosopographical Research, 2003.
- Shagrir I., 'Franks and Normans in the Mediterranean: A Comparative Examination of Naming Patterns', *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 30, 2015, pp. 59-72.
- Sindbæk S. M., 'Networks and nodal points: the emergence of towns in early Viking Age Scandinavia', *Antiquity*, 81, 2007, pp. 119-132.
- Skinner P., "'And Her Name Was...?' Gender and Naming in Medieval Southern Italy', *Medieval Prosopography*, vol. 20, 1999, pp. 23-49.
- Skoufari E., *Cipro veneziana (1473-1571). Istituzioni e culture nel regno della Serenissima*, Rome, Viella, 2011.
- Skoufari E. (ed.), *La Serenissima a Cipro. Incontri di culture nel Cinquecento*, Rome, Viella, 2013.
- Steel L., 'Watery Entanglements in the Cypriot Hinterland', *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 101-116.
- Stone L., 'Prosopography', *Daedalus*, vol. 100, Historical Studies Today, 1971, pp. 46-79.
- Stylianou A. and Stylianou J., *The History of the Cartography of Cyprus*, Nicosia, Cyprus Research Centre, 1980.

- Tsiknakis K. G., ‘Ο ελληνικός χώρος στη διάρκεια της βενετοκρατίας’, in Ch. Maltezu (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 21-69.
- Vionis A. K. and Papantoniou G., ‘Central Place Theory Reloaded and Revised: Political Economy and Landscape Dynamics in the Longue Durée’, *Land*, 8, 2019; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 1-21.
- Vlassi, ‘Η καθημερινή ζωή’, in Ch. Maltezu (ed.), *Βενετοκρατούμενη Ελλάδα: προσεγγίζοντας την ιστορία της*, vol. 1, Athens and Venice, Hellenic Institute of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Studies in Venice, 2010, pp. 357-387.
- Webb J. M., ‘Shifting Centres: Site Location and Resource Procurement on the North Coast of Cyprus over the Longue Durée of the Prehistoric Bronze Age’, *Land*, 7, 2018; reprint in A. K. Vionis and G. Papantoniou (ed.), *Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes Political Economies and Natural Resources in the Longue Durée*, MDPI, 2019, pp. 70-100.
- Wertheimer L., ‘Children of Disorder: Clerical Parentage, Illegitimacy, and Reform in the Middle Ages’, *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, vol. 15, 2006, pp. 382-407.
- Youngs D., *The Life-Cycle in Western Europe c1300-1500*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2006.
- Zapanti S., *Κεφαλονιά, 1500-1571 : η συγκρότηση της κοινωνίας του νησιού*, Thessaloniki, University Studio Press, 1999.

MARINA ILIA

