

## Fondacos in Sicily, south Italy, and the Crusader states

The last chapter examined the consequences of Christian conquest on commercial spaces – specifically *funduqs* – in the Iberian Peninsula during the period from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries. But this was not the only region of the Mediterranean world where incoming Christian conquerors encountered and embraced these institutions. In 1080, the Norman leader Robert Guiscard granted a *fondaco* in Amalfi, with all of its appurtenances, to the monastery of Montecassino. This grant was confirmed by his son, Duke Roger, a decade later, and continued to be cited in papal documents through the next century.<sup>1</sup> Like the contemporary *funduq* in Valencia, granted to the city's cathedral by Rodrigo Diaz in the 1090s and reconfirmed by his widow Jimena in 1101, this building in Amalfi was evidently a lucrative facility and thus worthy of both donation and repeated notation. In the eastern Mediterranean, Bohemond of Taranto – the crusader son of Robert Guiscard – likewise granted a *fondaco* to Genoese merchants in Antioch in 1098, shortly after his capture of this city. Possibly this gift reflected the continuation of privileges that Genoese merchants had already enjoyed under Muslim rule (as would later be the case in post-conquest Seville). This Genoese *fondaco* in Antioch was the first of many similar facilities that would be granted to western merchant communities in crusader cities during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The value of these *fondacos* is demonstrated by their proliferation. This chapter will

<sup>1</sup> Grants by Robert and Roger were recorded in the *Chronicle of Montecassino* by Leo Marsicanus and Peter Deacon, ed. Hartmut Hoffman, MGH, *Scriptores* 34 (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1980) 439, 475; also *PL*, CLXXIII, 795C and 833A. Perhaps Robert Guiscard's marriage to the Lombard princess Sikelgaita accelerated his recognition and assimilation of local institutions. On this *fondaco*, see Henry M. Willard, "The *Fundicus*, a Port Facility of Montecassino in Medieval Amalfi," *Benedictina* 19 (1972) 253–61. Papal documents from 1097 to 1208 mention this *fondaco* (Willard, "The *Fundicus*," 257; also *PL*, CLXII, 147A (Paschal II in 1105), 1252B (Calixtus II in 1122), CC, 77D (Alexander III in 1159), CCXV, 1597A (Innocent III in 1208). By 1280, this *fondaco* no longer belonged to Montecassino, although it was still associated with the abbey (R. Filangieri di Candida [ed.], *Codice diplomatico amalfitano* [Trani: Vecchi, 1951] 177). It is likely that this *fondaco* was destroyed along with much of the lower town of Amalfi by a devastating storm in 1343 (Willard, "The *Fundicus*," 261).

examine the evolution of the *funduq* under Christian rule in Sicily, south Italy, and the Crusader states, and will survey the ways in which this Muslim institution was adapted to suit the fiscal, commercial, and regulatory needs of new Christian administrations in these regions.

#### CHRISTIANIZING THE *FUNDUQ* IN SICILY AND SOUTHERN ITALY

Muslim *funduqs* in Sicily and Spain were probably very similar in the period before the eleventh century. Arabic sources provide considerably better data on Andalusi *funduqs*, however, since socio-economic materials from Muslim Sicily are notoriously scarce. Even Ibn Ḥawqal, who left a detailed description of Palermo in 973, meticulously listed its various markets but mentioned no *funduqs* in the city. On the other hand, since he explicitly remarked on the lack of *funduqs* and markets in the neighboring suburb of Khalisa, this may imply their presence in Palermo.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, there has been no archeological work to confirm the existence or evolution of particular hostelries under either Muslim or Christian rule.<sup>3</sup>

Sicily came under Christian rule during the second half of the eleventh century, when it was conquered by Norman forces led by the brothers Robert and Roger Guiscard. At the same time, the Normans also wrested parts of southern Italy from Byzantine and Lombard control, and thus linked these two realms. Both the Arabic *funduq* and Greek *foundax* were probably established in south Italy at this time, and it is possible that some version of the *fondaco* was also familiar through early trading contacts between Amalfi and Egypt.

There is little evidence for the process of assimilating these institutions under early Norman rule. However, it is well established that the Norman court, chancery, and treasury incorporated Byzantine and Muslim institutions and administrative forms, as well as ones imported from northern Europe.<sup>4</sup> It is unlikely that the astute administrators of the Norman court, many of whom were Greeks and Muslims well acquainted with earlier practice, would have overlooked the potential revenues from *funduqs* in

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Ḥawqal, *Kitāb ṣurat al-'ard*, 119.

<sup>3</sup> Geneviève and Henri Bresc have remarked on the need for archeological work in linking Christian Sicilian *fondacos* with earlier counterparts ("*Fondaco et taverne de la Sicile médiévale*," in *Hommage à Geneviève Chevrier et Alain Geslan. Etudes médiévales*, ed. Joëlle Burnouf et al. [Strasbourg: Centre d'archéologie médiévale de Strasbourg, 1975] 101–102). I am also grateful to Jeremy Johns for his advice on this question.

<sup>4</sup> On links between Fāṭimid administrative models and the Norman court, see Jeremy Johns, *Arabic Administration in Norman Sicily* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

their realms. Certainly, Robert Guiscard's grant of the *fondaco* in Amalfi to Montecassino, in 1080, indicates an early recognition of the value of such facilities. Other patrons also cited them among grants to religious houses. A slightly later grant to Montecassino by Duke William in 1114 conceded another *fondaco* in the port area of Salerno, with all of its appurtenances. Its location "ad portam maris" suggests income accruing from lodging and trade.<sup>5</sup> In 1143, George of Antioch, the chancellor to Roger II, included two *funduqs* in Palermo among gifts to the newly established church of Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio.<sup>6</sup>

*Fondacos* appear more clearly in Christian Sicily and south Italy during the second half of the twelfth century, by which point the institution took several familiar forms, serving not only as a hostelry for merchants and other travelers, but also as a warehouse, customs-house, and commercial exchange. These functions had links to Arabic prototypes, as is evident in the geographer al-Idrīsī's formulaic description of Palermo in the 1150s. Writing under the patronage of Roger II, al-Idrīsī must have been intimately familiar with the buildings and topography of the Norman capital, yet he wrote of it using precisely the same terms ("with many mosques, *funduqs*, bath houses, and shops for merchants") with which Muslim geographers traditionally described Islamic cities throughout the Mediterranean sphere.<sup>7</sup>

When the Muslim traveler Ibn Jubayr arrived in Sicily in the 1180s, on his way home to Spain from the Near East, the island had already been under Norman rule for over a century. Nevertheless, Ibn Jubayr described Sicilian *funduqs* in much the same terms as those he had recently encountered in Egypt and Syria, and he lodged in *funduqs* in Messina, Termini, and Palermo.<sup>8</sup> In each city, he remarked that he spent the night "in one of the *funduqs*," implying that there were a number of such hostelries. In Palermo, he added that the *funduq* in which he lodged was the one "used by the Muslims." It is unclear from his comment whether this was required by Norman authorities, not unlike the practice in Christian *fondacos* in Muslim cities and later in the Muslim *fondechs* in the Crown of Aragón, or if it was according to the preference of the Muslim merchants themselves, reflecting the regional, religious, and occupational segregation long common in *funduqs* in the Islamic world.

<sup>5</sup> Tommaso Leccisotti (ed.), *Le Colonie cassinesi in Capitanata*, IV: *Troia* (Montecassino: Miscellanea Cassinese, 1957) 87.

<sup>6</sup> Johns, *Arabic Administration*, 110. Since George of Antioch had lived in both Syria and the Maghrib (*ibid.*, 80–86), he would have been familiar with *funduqs* in the Muslim world and with the common practice of including commercial buildings in *waqf* endowments for mosques.

<sup>7</sup> Al-Idrīsī, *Kitāb nuzhat*, 591.

<sup>8</sup> Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 327, 331, 333; *Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, 343, 347, 350.

There is also other evidence of twelfth-century *fondacos* in Palermo and elsewhere. In December 1183, at about the same time that Ibn Jubayr visited the Norman capital, a text recording the gift of a garden to the monastery of Santa Maria della Grotta in Palermo described it as bordered on one side by a “fundaci olagiorum.”<sup>9</sup> The meaning of this name is debatable; it may have been a privately owned *fondaco*, or hostel, but more likely it was a *fondaco* for olive oil, or perhaps for traders in olive oil, very like similar facilities in Muslim towns and later in Christian Iberia. A decade later, in Messina, a grant made by the Emperor Henry VI in 1195 mentioned a property as located “ante fundacum magnum.” This must have been a recognizable landmark, though its function, and whether it was *the* large *fondaco* or merely a large *fondaco*, remain obscure.<sup>10</sup>

The Greek term *foundax* also appears in documents from Palermo from roughly the same period, testifying not only to the multicultural context of the city, but also to the ongoing potential for overlap and influence between Arabic, Greek, and Latin usage. The exact function of these facilities is unclear, and perhaps use of the term *foundax* simply reflects a Greek notary’s on-the-spot translation of *funduq* or *fondaco*. Certainly, these buildings appear similar to other contemporary *fondacos* in Palermo in terms of their perceived value and physical structure.<sup>11</sup> A *foundax* appeared in a donation text from Palermo in 1153, when it was granted to a monastery by a married couple and their son. More than a simple building, this was a complex enclosing several houses, a well, and an orchard – perhaps comparable to the earlier *fondacos* and appurtenances (*pertinentiis*) given to Montecassino by Robert Guiscard and his heirs. A second document, dated 1196, mentioned the sale of part of another *foundax* in Palermo.<sup>12</sup>

Although Norman rulers recognized the value of *fondacos*, their administration and control of these facilities was unsystematic and often ineffectual.<sup>13</sup> In 1190, for example, a *fondaco* appears in a series of four letters sent by Tancred to Nicholas, archbishop of Salerno, disputing possession of this structure. In June, the king wrote requesting that the tithe on wine

<sup>9</sup> C. A. Garufi (ed.), *I Documenti inediti dell’epoca normana in Sicilia* (Palermo: Società Siciliana per la Storia Patria, 1899) 195–196.

<sup>10</sup> D. Clementi, “Calendar of the Diplomas of the Hohenstaufen Emperor Henry VI concerning the Kingdom of Sicily,” *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* 35 (1955) 141.

<sup>11</sup> Although there is no reason to link these twelfth-century facilities in Palermo to the grain *foundax* established in Constantinople in the 1080s, the word *foundax* survived in twelfth-century Byzantine Greek usage.

<sup>12</sup> S. Cusa (ed.), *I Diplomi Greci ed Arabi di Sicilia* (Palermo: Stabilimento Tip. Lao, 1868) 87–88 (no. 171); 31–33 (no. 92).

<sup>13</sup> See comments in David Abulafia, “The Crown and the Economy under Roger II and his Successors,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 27 (1983) 1.

and food that was customarily paid to the church in Salerno should be rendered to the royal fisc in exchange for an earlier debt of 50 gold *tari*. At the same time, Tancred also required that Nicholas hand over a *fondaco* held by the church, which was located in the main square of Salerno, with all of its shops, buildings, and apartments.<sup>14</sup> Like other roughly contemporary *fondacos*, this facility apparently encompassed a complex of buildings, including spaces for commerce and lodging. It must have been a valuable asset and was probably of substantial size. The property had originally been given to the Salernitan church, but the king now wished its return to the crown. Apparently the archbishop dragged his feet over the exchange, forcing Tancred to dispatch further missives in August and October.

Tancred's letters confirm that in Sicily and south Italy, as in Iberia and the Muslim world, the *fondaco* was considered a lucrative royal asset. Norman kings and their administrators recognized its potential, as did later Hohenstaufen and Angevin rulers, and the institution appears in royal legislation and tax codes (as well as private contracts) with increasing frequency in the thirteenth century and later.

When the young Hohenstaufen emperor Frederick II attained his majority, he immediately set to work to revise and reinstate Sicilian legislation that had fallen into disarray, and to regain control over feudal holdings lost since the end of Norman rule and during his own minority. It is at this point that the Sicilian and south Italian *fondacos* come more clearly into view in our sources. Although the institution had been under Christian rule for a century and a half, its true process of christianization and assimilation dated to the thirteenth century. Like his contemporary, James I, Frederick took pains to bring administrative and fiscal facilities, including *fondacos*, under more direct administration by the crown. He established a set number of royally administered *fondacos*, and reclaimed several Norman royal facilities that had fallen into clerical or private hands. Although the legislation of Frederick II and his successors often cited Norman precedent, it demonstrated a much more dominant and proprietary royal attitude toward fiscal institutions in the realm. As described by David Abulafia, Frederick's new regulations for *fondacos* "brought order and standardization to what had previously been an ill-organized structure of control."<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> "Fundicum pertinens Salernite ecclesie, quod est in platea maiori Salerni, cum omnibus apotegis et edificiis et tenimentis suis": H. Zielinski (ed.), *Tancredi et Willelmi III regum diplomata* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1982) 10–12 (doc. 4), 13–15 (doc. 5), 20–21 (doc. 7), 22–23 (doc. 8). This must have been a different *fondaco* from the one noted in the port area of Salerno in 1114.

<sup>15</sup> David Abulafia, *Frederick II: A Medieval Emperor* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1992) 216. Also on Frederick II's *fondaco* policies, see G. Paolucci, "Le finanze e la corte di Federico II di Svevia," *Atti della Reale Accademia di Scienze, Lettere e Belle Arti di Palermo* 3rd series, 7 (1904) 16–27.

This work began during the 1220s, with the Diet of Capua (1221), and continued with the promulgation of the *Constitutions of Melfi* (*Liber Augustalis*) in 1231 and after, a legal compendium combining earlier Norman legislation with a unified imperial vision and the elegant vocabulary of Roman legal tradition. Additions to the *Constitutions of Melfi* in 1246 included a chapter relating to *fondacos* and their administration (“de fundicariis,” book I, title LXXXIX), regulating traffic and taxation of iron, steel, salt, and other commodities passing through Sicilian *fondacos*.<sup>16</sup> These particular items were often the subject of regalian monopolies, and, as we have seen, were similarly associated with *fondacos* in Castile and other regions. Elsewhere, Frederick also noted merchants selling textiles in royal *fondacos* (“fundicis nostris”) in 1241.<sup>17</sup> Other legislation likewise emphasized the emperor’s ambition to fix prices, regulate *fondacos*, and control their revenues. In May 1231, two royal chamberlains were dispatched to repossess a large *fondaco* on Ischia and another smaller *fondaco*, both of which had been part of the royal domain in the time of the last Norman ruler, William III.<sup>18</sup> A few months later, in August 1231, a list of tariff revisions concluded with a list of official *fondacos* for storing and taxing goods, of which there were to be four in Messina, two in Syracuse, and the same number “as there currently are” (“sicut est”) in Palermo.<sup>19</sup>

Frederick II’s pragmatic legislation documents the *fondaco* as a commercial and fiscal enterprise of the crown, specifically concerned with the control of certain commodities. Title 89 in the *Constitutions of Melfi* even added that once a merchant had placed his goods in a *fondaco*, as required, then he was free to seek his own accommodation in the city. Nevertheless, a broad set of earlier regulations promulgated in October 1232 indicates that *fondacos* in Frederick’s realm had functioned as sites for both lodging and commerce. According to these rules, the custodians of *fondacos* must

<sup>16</sup> This text has been edited a number of times, most recently see (Frederick II), *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II. für das Königreich Sizilien*, ed. Wolfgang Stürner, MGH (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1996) 264–266; also (Frederick II), *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II. Von Hohenstaufen für sein Königreich sizilien*, ed. Hermann Conrad, Thea von der Lieck-Buyken, and Wolfgang Wagner, II (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1973) 136–137; and (Frederick II), *Historia diplomatica Friderici Secundi, sive constitutiones, privilegia, mandata, instrumenta quae supersunt istius Imperatoris et filiorum ejus*, ed. J. L. A. Huillard-Bréholles (Paris: Henri Plon, 1852–1860) IV, 211–212. My thanks to James Powell for his advice on this section.

<sup>17</sup> E. Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita saeculi XIII et XIV. Urkunden und Briefe zur Geschichte des Kaiserreichs und des Königreichs sizilien*, 1 (Innsbruck: Neudr. d. Ausg., 1880; repr. Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1964) 655 (doc. 853).

<sup>18</sup> “Revocent ad demanum curie fundicum Iscle et fundicum parvum domne Trocce, sicut ipsa fundica fuerunt in demanio tempore regis Guillelmi”: Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 612 (doc. 781).

<sup>19</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 616–617 (doc. 790).

not only provide scales for weighing goods, and charge established fees for their use, but they must also supply beds, lights, blankets, and firewood to their merchant guests.<sup>20</sup> Likewise, a decree to the royal *fondaco* in Naples in September 1231 had referred to “guests who lodge in the *fondacos* of others when our royal fondacos (*fundici nostri*) are full.”<sup>21</sup> Thus, it appears that merchants were supposed to stay in royal hostels whenever beds were available, and that there were also privately run *fondacos* to accommodate any commercial overflow. There are clear parallels here – in both proprietary language and lodging regulations – with contemporary legislation in the crown of Aragón. Private *fondacos* in Sicily could also be appropriated for lodging by royal order, as later when a certain Balduccius, a *fundicarius* in Palermo, was required to stable several horses in his *fondaco* “according to the usage of *fondacos* for lodging and the requisition of the court” in 1298.<sup>22</sup> This type of regulation in the thirteenth century suggests that Ibn Jubayr’s comment in the late twelfth century regarding the *funduq* “used by the Muslims” in Palermo did refer to a legal requirement that Muslim travelers lodge in this facility.

#### FONDACOS FOR FOREIGN MERCHANT COMMUNITIES

Just as Muslim merchants and travelers may have lodged in a particular *fondaco* in Palermo, northern Italian merchants also sought to have *fondacos* in Sicilian cities under Norman and early Hohenstaufen rule. These facilities were apparently similar to Genoese, Pisan, and Venetian *fondacos* elsewhere in the Mediterranean world during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, but there are no data to show whether Christian merchants had once had such facilities in Muslim Sicily.<sup>23</sup> In 1116, however, a document from Roger II, in Greek, granted land in Messina to two Genoese merchants for building – or perhaps rebuilding – an *ospition*, or lodging-house. This appears to have been a personal grant to these individuals, rather than a concession to Genoa, but it indicates the presence of Genoese traders on the

<sup>20</sup> Richard of San Germano, *Chronicon*, in L. A. Muratori (eds.), *Rerum Italicarum scriptores* (Milan: Typi Societatis Palatinae, 1723–1751) vii, 1030. Also in G. Del Re (ed.), *Cronisti e scrittori sincroni della dominazione normanna nel regno di Puglia e Sicilia* (Naples: Stamperia dell’Iride, 1868; repr. Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1975) 11, 76.

<sup>21</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 620 (no. 793).

<sup>22</sup> Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, 11, 3 (doc. 1).

<sup>23</sup> Although there were surely Muslim *funduqs* on the island before the eleventh century, the Norman conquest took place before the earliest reference to a Christian mercantile *fondaco* anywhere in the Mediterranean. The earliest reference is from 1098 in Antioch (see final section of this chapter).



island, even if not a *fondaco* per se.<sup>24</sup> Venetian merchants were also present, and apparently had a church in Palermo by the 1140s, though there was no specific mention of a Venetian *fondaco*.<sup>25</sup>

In 1162, however, the German emperor Frederick I suddenly promised Genoa the standard package of concessions – the rights to consuls, reduced taxes, exclusive access, and a “street for their merchants with a church, bath, *fondaco* and oven” – in return for Genoese help in wresting Syracuse and other cities from Norman control. At the same time, he offered similar concessions and incentives to Pisa.<sup>26</sup> This promise must be understood in the context of imperial political ambitions, and Frederick Barbarossa never had the opportunity to fulfill this pledge. However, the date of the promise and list of facilities are strikingly similar to those of contemporary grants to Italian merchants in other cities around the Mediterranean in the middle of the twelfth century. The familiar reiteration of church, bath, oven, and *fondaco* suggests that the list originated in standard Genoese demands, based on precedents in Iberia, Byzantium, and the Muslim world, rather than in a package of imperial incentives imported from a northern context.

By the late twelfth century, Italian merchants were well established in Sicily and south Italy, where they gained advantageous trade concessions from the new Hohenstaufen rulers in return for their later support of the German takeover from Norman rule. North Italian interests were concentrated in eastern Sicily and south Italy, particularly along routes through the Straits of Messina, and they do not appear to have either requested or received *fondacos* in Palermo. Instead, Genoese, Pisan, and Florentine merchants had establishments in Messina by the last decade of the century, and Italian consuls appear in Messina in 1189.<sup>27</sup> In 1191, Henry IV promised Pisa a street with houses for the use of Pisan merchants, apparently renewing concessions granted by Tancred.<sup>28</sup> By 1194, rivalry between Genoese and Pisan merchants in Messina even led to violence, as Pisans attacked and took possession of the Genoese *fondaco* of St. John, and looted a number

<sup>24</sup> Cusa (ed.), *I Diplomi greci ed arabi*, 359–360 (no. 33); David Abulafia, “Pisan Commercial Colonies and Consulates in Twelfth-century Sicily,” *English Historical Review* 93 (1978) 70.

<sup>25</sup> Abulafia, “Pisan Commercial Colonies,” 71.

<sup>26</sup> *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, 1 (no. 236) cols. 207–210; Lisciandrelli, *Trattati e negoziazioni* (no. 53); (Frederick I), *Friderici I. Diplomata*, ed. H. Appelt, MGH Diplomata (Hanover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 1979) 200, 222. Also F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicilie* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1907) 11, 296–297. Shortly before this, in 1156, Genoa had concluded a treaty with the Norman king William I, promising neutrality.

<sup>27</sup> Abulafia, “Pisan Commercial Colonies,” 68, 75, 78.

<sup>28</sup> “Rugam unum com domibus convenientem Pisanis mercatoribus”: MGH, *Legum sectio IV*, ed. L. Weiland (Hanover, 1893) 474 (no. 333).



of private houses belonging to Genoese traders.<sup>29</sup> These actions mirrored events in Constantinople, where Pisans had sacked the Genoese *fondaco* thirty years before, and demonstrate the degree to which the *fondaco* buildings were seen as the heart of commercial activity and communal identity abroad in the later twelfth century. However, the fact that Genoese houses were attacked in 1194, as well as their *fondaco*, makes clear that Christian merchants in Sicily were not confined to lodging within one building, as in Muslim cities, but were permitted to own houses and other real estate. A diploma in the name of Frederick II, dated December 1200, confirmed this access to a variety of properties, since it granted houses (each designated *domum*) to the Genoese in three Sicilian cities (Messina, Trapani, and Syracuse), together with rights to trade in the royal *fondaco* (“fundicum nostrum”) in Naples.<sup>30</sup>

Northern Italian merchants continued to do business in the *fondacos* in Sicily and southern Italy throughout Frederick II's reign, although at times relations were strained, especially with the Genoese. In 1220, Genoese merchants lost their privileges in the region for a period, including their rights to the Margaritus palace in Messina, which had been given to them in 1200 (possibly as a replacement for the *fondaco* taken over by the Pisans in 1194).<sup>31</sup> Pisans, however, remained allies of the emperor and continued to traffic in Messina. A contract written in San Gimignano in 1232 concerned local merchants trading pepper in Messina and mentioned that they went to the Pisan *fondaco* in the city. Ten years later, in 1243, another contract from San Gimignano was sent to the Pisan *fondaco* in Naples, a city where Florentines also had a *fondaco* of their own.<sup>32</sup> These data lend veracity to a tale in Boccaccio's *Decameron* which begins “In Messina there once lived three brothers, all of them merchants who had been left very rich after the death of their father, whose native town was San Gimignano . . . in one of

<sup>29</sup> Caffaro, *Annali Genovesi*, II, 48.

<sup>30</sup> (Frederick II), *Historia diplomatica*, I, 66; Imperiale di Sant' Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, III, 183–186 (doc. 72). See also J. M. Powell, “Medieval Monarchy and Trade: The Economic Policy of Frederick II in the Kingdom of Sicily,” *Studi Medievali* 3rd series, 3 (1962) 447.

<sup>31</sup> Caffaro, *Annali Genovesi*, II, 171. This building had probably belonged to Margaritus of Brindisi, admiral of the Norman fleet from 1184 to 1194, before he was captured by Emperor Henry VI. The emperor then gave the building briefly to the Genoese in 1200, until relations broke down. Genoese trading activities in the *regno* were restored in 1245. The Constitutions of Capua, in 1220, revoked all concessions granted since the death of William II in 1189, including Genoese privileges gained during Frederick II's minority. See J. M. Powell, “Genoese Policy and the Kingdom of Sicily,” *Mediaeval Studies* 28 (1966) 346–349, and Powell, “Medieval Monarchy and Trade,” 500–502.

<sup>32</sup> R. Davidsohn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler & Sohn, 1900) II, 305 (no. 2324) June 7, 1232, 306 (no. 2327) Nov. 4, 1243. Another document from June 1242 (Winkelmann [ed.], *Acta Imperii inedita*, 681 [doc. 897]) also mentioned Pisan merchants selling wood and vegetables in the *fondacos* in Naples.

their *fondacos* (*in uno lor fondaco*) the three brothers employed a young Pisan named Lorenzo, who planned and directed all of their operations . . .”<sup>33</sup>

By the second half of the thirteenth century, as in Iberian cities at the end of the century, the *fondaco* dropped from the list of desirable assets granted to foreign traders in Sicily and southern Italy. Instead, the *loggia* appeared in its place. In 1259 and 1261, Manfred granted the Genoese *loggias* in Messina, Syracuse, Naples, and other towns, and added that wherever they had a *loggia* they might also have consuls who would have jurisdiction over the Genoese community.<sup>34</sup> Likewise, although merchants from Marseille already had a *fondaco* in Messina in 1269, early in the reign of Charles of Anjou, the king permitted them to build *loggias* in Messina, Trapani, Palermo, Syracuse, and Naples during the later 1270s.<sup>35</sup> Other sources confirm this shift in terminology under Angevin and Aragonese administration during the later thirteenth century, mentioning *loggias* in Sicily and south Italy belonging to merchants from Genoa, Amalfi, Pisa, Venice, Montpellier, and Narbonne.<sup>36</sup> In 1286, two years after Catalan merchants received a *loggia* in Seville, King James of Sicily requisitioned a house in Messina on the grounds that it was built too close to the “logiam Cathalanorum” – a facility recently commissioned by the same king – and thus might harm the business affairs of the *loggia*.<sup>37</sup>

This evidence from Sicily and south Italy shows a pattern in the adoption of the *loggia* similar to that in Spain (see chapter 5). Functionally, the late thirteenth-century *loggia* was not unlike the earlier *fondaco*, in the sense of being a lodging and business facility associated with a particular national community, administered by consuls, and often under royal oversight. However, the chronological succession of the two terms indicates a

<sup>33</sup> G. Boccaccio, *The Decameron*, Fourth Day, fifth story, 4–5 (Novara: Istituto geografico de Agostini, 1962) 1, 436, trans. G. H. McWilliam (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972) 366. Although Boccaccio was using the term *fondaco* more in its fourteenth-century Tuscan sense – as a branch of a privately owned commercial firm, with its own manager (see chap. 9) – his contemporary audience would have appreciated the verisimilitude of his setting. Boccaccio was familiar with his subject, since he had himself been an apprentice in a commercial firm in Naples as a young man.

<sup>34</sup> “In quacumque civitate regni habent logias genuenses possint habere suos consules”: Q. Sella (ed.), *Pandetta delle gabelle e dei diritti della curia di Messina* (Turin: Stamperia Reale, 1870) 93; *Liber Iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, 1 (no. 944) cols. 1346–1349.

<sup>35</sup> Georges Lesage, *Marseille angevine* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1950) 100–101.

<sup>36</sup> “Logiam Amalfie maritime Panormi,” 1287 (Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, 1, 118–119 [no. 185]); “apothecam suam sittam retro logiam Ianue,” 1287 (*ibid.*, 124 [no. 194]); “Actum Neapoli prope logiam Pisanorum,” 1294 (F. Artizzu [ed.], *Documenti inediti relativi ai rapporti economici tra la Sardegna e Pisa nel medioevo* [Padua: Casa Editrice Dott. Antonio Milani, 1962] 1, 32 [no. 23]); “logiam Pisanorum Panormi,” 1298 (Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, 11, 160 [no. 160]); *loggias* of merchants from Montpellier and Narbonne, 1300 (Sella [ed.], *Pandetta delle gabelle*, 136, 138).

<sup>37</sup> La Mantia (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, 323.

pervasive and conscious shift in terminology that went hand in hand with changes in the political, religious, and commercial context.

#### FONDACOS AND THE ROYAL FISC

Despite the increasing prevalence of *loggias* for foreign merchants, *fondacos* continued to flourish as private warehouses and official commercial facilities in Sicily and south Italy. The differentiation between the two is evident in a contract written by the Palermitan notary Adamo de Citella in 1299 describing a house as being “behind the Pisan *loggia* in Palermo and between a house on one side and the *fondaco* of Bonfilii de Lampo on the other side.”<sup>38</sup>

As in Castile, christianization had brought an increased focus on commodities, storage, sales, assessment, and taxation rather than lodging. The *Constitutions of Melfi* had laid down rules for the sale and resale of salt, iron, steel, and other exported goods (though not foodstuffs) brought through royal *fondacos* and handled by royally appointed officers (called *fundicarius* or *fundegarius*). A tariff list for Naples, from 1231, ruled that “all goods that are brought for sale into the realm either by men of the realm or by foreigners, either by land or by sea, must be brought to the [official] *fondacos*” in order that toll might be paid. The text continued by establishing different tolls for linen, silk, and other imported goods, indicating that Muslim merchants were to pay higher fees than their Christian counterparts.<sup>39</sup> Other items also came through the *fondacos*, including wood, a variety of textiles, tiles, olive oil, grapes, vegetables, hemp, flax, wheat, and barley.<sup>40</sup> The spectrum of these commodities was similar to the range of items associated with *funduqs* in the Islamic world and *alhóndigas* in Castile, where these facilities also served as warehouses, emporia, and points for weighing and taxation.

In Sicily and south Italy, the tax in question was the *ius fundici*, one of the many commercial tolls collected by the crown. This tariff was paid by the buyer of imported goods at the time of a sale (usually 2.5 or 3 percent

<sup>38</sup> Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, II, 160 (no. 160).

<sup>39</sup> Winkelman (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 616–617 (no. 790).

<sup>40</sup> In July 1231, Frederick required that one-twelfth of the harvest of grain, vegetables, flax, and hemp must be brought directly to royal warehouses (Winkelman [ed.], *Acta Imperii inedita*, 615 [doc. 787]). Later, in June, 1242, Pisan merchants were mentioned coming to the *fondacos* in Naples for wood and vegetables (*ibid.*, 681 [doc. 897]); during 1286 and 1287, Simon de Pactis, a *fundicarius* in Palermo, was regularly involved in transactions of wheat, barley, tiles, and grapes (Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, I, 28, 35, 65, 67, 79, 87–90, 170); Pegolotti mentioned oil stored in *fondacos* in Apulia in the early fourteenth century (Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 163).

of value), while another tax, the *ius dogane* (at the same rate), was paid by merchants carrying and selling imported and exported goods. The *ius fundici* was thus explicitly connected with sales of imported items, and was paid only at the point when goods were sold and left the *fondaco* (hence the aphorism “you pay the *fondaco* tax once, but the customs tax a hundred times”).<sup>41</sup> This supports the conclusion that the facilities themselves were primarily viewed as warehouses and emporia.

As with other commercial regulations, these taxes were regularized and increased under the watchful oversight of Frederick II and his successors.<sup>42</sup> Instructions issued in 1231 for tax-collectors in Trani and Barletta explained that “foreigners who sell goods pay *ius dohane* on the sale, and if they buy other goods with the money received for these sales, then they pay *ius fundici*.” Local people who bought goods “in a *fondaco*” were also to pay *ius fundici*, as were other merchants, including “Muslims of the realm, who are to pay the *iura fundici et dohane* just as Christian merchants.” However, “both citizens and foreigners who bring goods to a *fondaco* and are unable to sell them, may carry them away without any payment of the *ius fundici*” since no transaction had occurred.<sup>43</sup> This text exempted certain goods (oil, cheese, wine, and meat) from these regulations, on the grounds that special rules applied to them, but later tax statutes included these items. Particular merchant groups might also obtain exemptions from time to time, as when Manfred released merchants from Fermo from payment of the *ius fundici* and other imposts in 1264.<sup>44</sup> Legislation promulgated by Charles of Anjou, in about 1275, established taxes paid by buyers for various types of merchandise, including oil, cheese, iron, steel, silk, and salted meat (but specifically not live animals) that owed the *ius fundici*. Rates were set in ounces of gold (Sicilian *tari*) paid according to the weight of the goods, which was assessed using the official scales in the *fondaco*.<sup>45</sup> This system was still in place in the early fourteenth century, when Pegolotti recorded rates and tariffs from all over the Mediterranean in his handbook of merchant practice (written 1310–1340). Pegolotti listed the *doana* and *fondaco* among names for taxes “per tutta Cicilia e per tutto il regno di Puglia,” explaining also that “whenever merchandise is sold” in Apulia or Naples, foreigners

<sup>41</sup> “Uno essere il fondacho, e cento le dohane”: Abulafia, “Crown and Economy,” 9.

<sup>42</sup> For further details, see W. A. Percy, “The Revenues of the Kingdom of Sicily under Charles I of Anjou, 1266–1285 and their Relationship to the Vespers,” Ph.D. dissertation (Princeton: Princeton University, 1964) 285–7. Also W. A. Percy, “The Indirect Taxes of the Medieval Kingdom of Sicily,” *Italian Quarterly* 85 (1981) 73–85.

<sup>43</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 619 (doc. 792).

<sup>44</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 419 (doc. 505).

<sup>45</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 759 (doc. 999).

must pay one rate for *fondacaggio*, while local traders were charged another rate.<sup>46</sup>

The appearance of the *ius fundici* in Sicily and south Italy, and these clear records of its application, present intriguing possibilities for illuminating undocumented procedures in an earlier period. Taxes on sales in *fondacos* presumably increased the later retail price of certain goods, but because sellers were required to do business through these depots, *fondaco* sales continued to flourish. This phenomenon, by which prices were kept artificially higher than those in an open market, was also a peculiar characteristic of early Muslim *funduqs*. For example, the ninth-century jurist Yahyā b. 'Umar (writing not in Sicily, but across the straits in Tunisia) complained that prices were higher in *funduqs* than in the *sūqs*.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps a similar tax structure and inflation was at work over a long period in both the Maghrib and Sicily, and the thirteenth-century *ius fundici* was simply a continuation of an earlier Muslim tariff on goods passing through *funduqs*.

The administration of state *fondacos* in Sicily and south Italy, the provision of lodging and storage facilities, and the collection of the *ius fundici* were entrusted to royal officers. These officials, called *fundicarii*, were among the administrative positions reorganized by Frederick II in his reform policies, and special emphasis was placed on the requirement that these be trustworthy and upright men, who were faithful to the crown. The revenues flowing through *fondacos* in Sicily, as elsewhere, could be very tempting and royal legislation sought to prevent corruption either among the *fundicarii* or any others doing business within the royal *fondacos*. All transactions in the *fondacos* and goods passing through had to be thoroughly documented in writing in order to avoid the possibility of abuse, double-taxation, or evasion of the system. This was established in the *Constitutions of Melfi*, and repeated, in varying forms, in later legislation.<sup>48</sup>

When Charles of Anjou took control of Sicily in 1266, he was faced with the task of realigning the institutional and administrative infrastructure to suit his own political and fiscal agenda.<sup>49</sup> Like other rulers before and during the thirteenth century, he was concerned with the needs of his treasury, and according to Jean Dunbabin, "he inherited a system geared to the enrichment of the ruler by the exaction of customs dues and by the

<sup>46</sup> Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 15, 161–162.

<sup>47</sup> Al-Wansharīsi, *Mi'yār*, vi, 426.

<sup>48</sup> (Frederick II), *Die Konstitutionen Friedrichs II*, book 1, title LXXXIX; Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 655 (doc. 853). Compare James I's contemporary ordinances in the realms of Aragón.

<sup>49</sup> On these and other Angevin economic methods, see John Pryor, "Foreign Policy and Economic Policy: The Angevins and the Economic Decline of Southern Italy, 1266–1343," in *Principalities, Powers, and Estates. Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Government and Society*, ed. L. O. Frappell (Adelaide: Adelaide University Union Press, 1979) 43–55.

imposition of monopolies.<sup>50</sup> *Fondacos* were a critical element in this system, and a contemporary chronicler specifically listed the office of *fundicarius* among those positions up for evaluation and reappointment under the new regime.<sup>51</sup> Charles likewise instituted revised statutes for the *fondacos* (“*novi statuti super iure fundici*”) around 1275, perhaps in an effort to appease local traders. According to these rules, no merchant should be forced to do business in a particular *fondaco*, but if he decided to move his goods

from one region to another within the kingdom, where there is a *fondaco*, he ought to offer a pledge of security to the *fundegarius* [*sic*] of the place or of the *fondaco* from which he removes the aforesaid merchandise, that he is bringing these to another land or place, where there is an established royal *fondaco* (“*ubi sit fundicus regius constitutus*”), and he must bring from here to the *fundegarius* of that place letters guaranteeing the nature of the goods brought from here for sale.<sup>52</sup>

Precautions of this type are confirmed in Pegolotti’s merchant handbook, which carefully explains measures taken in Naples to ensure that if the *fondacaggio* had been paid in one *fondaco*, it would not be collected again in another.<sup>53</sup>

In contrast to the explicit documentation from the crown of Aragón concerning the *fondech* and its administrators, there is very little indication of what a *fundicarius* in Sicily or south Italy received in return for his labor. There are no explicit references to tax-farming, although such an arrangement was possibly intended in a diploma dated 1200, given in the name of Frederick II (then aged six) to Genoa, granting rights to one of the royal *fondacos* in Naples in return for 10,000 ounces of gold, to be paid in installments over the next five years.<sup>54</sup> This *fondaco* may have lodged Genoese merchants, and was presumably for their commercial use, but the Genoese may also have purchased the right to collect taxes from other merchants using the facility. Somewhat later, in 1238, when Frederick II wrote to Thomasio de Acco, his *magister camerarius* in Abruzzo, he noted that for reasons of both utility and profit (“*valde forum utile et lucrosum*”) “it pleases us that . . . the *fondaco* in Sulmona where local people and foreigners bring goods . . . shall be in your hands so that you can look after

<sup>50</sup> J. Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship, and State-Making in Thirteenth-Century Europe* (London: Longman, 1998) 163.

<sup>51</sup> This passage occurs in the anonymous supplement to the chronicle of Niccolò Jamsilla, *De rebus gestis Frederici II imperatoris ejusque filiorum Conradi et Manfredi Apuliae et Siciliae regum*, in Muratori (ed.), *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, VIII, 609. Also in Del Re (ed.), *Cronisti e scrittori*, II, 675.

<sup>52</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 759 (doc. 999).

<sup>53</sup> Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, 184.

<sup>54</sup> “. . . in Neapoli, fundicum nostrum quod est in porta Morizini, cum introitibus et exitibus, et omnibus finibus suis”: Imperiale di Sant’ Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, III, 183–186 (doc. 72).

it in the best interests of the court.” Frederick then went on to instruct that the *fundicarii* and other royal officials must be prepared to render an account of their expenses to the court.<sup>55</sup> As well as being in the interests of the ruler, this arrangement was presumably also – to some degree – in the best interests of Thomasio, though the document does not state any salary or percentage of profits, nor is there any reference to a fee paid by Thomasio for the office. Later a letter written by Charles, Prince of Salerno, to the keepers of *fondacos* in Naples, in 1284, ordered that they render money for the income of Beatrice, daughter of Manfred, to pay for her food and maintenance.<sup>56</sup> It is again unclear where this money would have been assigned under normal conditions (presumably at least part of it went to Charles), or whether the *fundicarii* were losing income that they might otherwise have claimed for themselves.

#### PRIVATE FONDACOS

Some *fundicarii* were appointed by the crown to oversee royal facilities, but others seem to have been private individuals running *fondacos* for their own profit. These buildings could be acquired through sale, or held as a lease. An endowment deed from 1143 noted that a *funduq* in Palermo had been purchased by George of Antioch from its Muslim owner, Ḥasan ibn Nāsikh.<sup>57</sup> Data on private transactions are rare from the Norman period, but this reference suggests that a number of commercial buildings probably passed from Muslim into Christian hands through sale from one individual to another. Later, they continued to be transferred between Christians.

During the thirteenth century, despite the efforts of Frederick II to reclaim royal property that had fallen into private hands, many *fondacos* in Sicily and south Italy were still small establishments run by ordinary people. For example, a complicated legal case from Messina, in 1239, concerned the division, upkeep, and repair of a *fondaco* held by two owners. One, Jean Chipulla, had received half of the building from his father-in-law, while the other owner, a widow named Rose, had purchased her half of the property. Evidently, a *fondaco* could be bought, sold, or given in gift like any other freehold real estate. At the time of the dispute, the eastern side of the property, inhabited by Jean, included several rooms, some fairly large with windows overlooking the street, and a kitchen. Meanwhile, the western half

<sup>55</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 635 (doc. 818).

<sup>56</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 595–596 (doc. 755).

<sup>57</sup> Johns, *Arabic Administration*, 110.



of the building, belonging to Rose, had fallen into disrepair – a situation that created dissension between the two owners.<sup>58</sup> As well as belonging to private people, some *fondacos* came into the possession of religious houses and orders, as seen in grants from the Norman period, and in the fact that the Templars possessed a *fondaco* in Messina in 1270.<sup>59</sup>

As in Christian Iberia and the Muslim world, these smaller facilities provided lodging, storage, and commercial space at a less prominent or lucrative level than the state-sponsored *fondacos*. Owing to their private nature, these individual *fondacos* rarely appear in legislative texts or official documents, except in passing, as in the 1231 decree mentioning “guests who lodge in the *fondacos* of others” in Naples when the royal *fondacos* were full.<sup>60</sup> Private papers and contracts, on the other hand, are filled with references to *fondacos*, and show that these buildings served as shops, ateliers, and residential housing.<sup>61</sup> In one such example, a document from 1299 recorded that a young man in Palermo had been declared unfit for military service after his father brought witnesses to the *fundacum* in which the family lived, in order to view the invalid “lying on his bed in the aforesaid *fundaco*.”<sup>62</sup> Possibly, as in newly conquered Iberian cities, the title *fondaco* was a hold-over from an earlier time, and current Christian usage had little to do with the name. Yet analysis of the data does show consistent trends in the application of the term *fondaco*, while other evidence (such as the shift from *fondaco* to *loggia*) indicates that Christian occupants were perfectly capable of changing a name that was no longer appropriate.

In many cases, private *fondacos* are merely cited by chance, as in sales contracts for other properties which mention that they are adjacent to *fondacos*. A document written by the notary Adamo de Citella in 1299, for example, recorded the acquisition of a garden and seven houses in Palermo bordered by the “fundacus Pucii de Riccomanno et fundacus Francisci de Pagano.” In other texts, as when Adamo de Citella recorded the sale of a *fondaco* itself, or listed a *fondaco* among the assets included in a dowry, it is

<sup>58</sup> Léon-Robert Ménager, *Les Actes latins de S. Maria di Messina (1103–1250)* (Palermo: Istituto Siciliano di studi Bizantini e Neollenici, 1963) 150–158. This *fondaco* was located in a part of Messina where many foreigners lived. It bordered on a street belonging to the Pisan community, and was also near buildings owned by people from Amalfi and Ravello.

<sup>59</sup> Besc and Besc, “*Fondaco et taverne*,” 95. Compare with other thirteenth-century *albóndigas* and *fondechs* granted to military orders in Iberia.

<sup>60</sup> Winkelmann (ed.), *Acta Imperii inedita*, 620 (no. 793).

<sup>61</sup> Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, II, 218–219 (doc. 278). The same notary also recorded similar situations in other contracts: I, 82–83 (doc. 116), I, 202–203 (doc. 335), II, 160 (doc. 160). Another privately held *fondaco* was recorded in Naples in 1293 (Artizzu [ed.], *Documenti inediti*, I, 30 [doc. 22]).

<sup>62</sup> Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, II, 199–200 (doc. 252).

clear that these buildings were of considerable value and merited individual attention.<sup>63</sup>

A number of Adamo de Citella's texts mention specific business activities, trades, and artisanal work taking place in the private *fondacos* of Palermo, including sales of leather and rabbit skins, smithing, and the production of tiles.<sup>64</sup> This last must have been especially common, since both tile-makers (*celamidarii*) and their tiles (*celmidis*) appear many times in contracts written between 1286 and 1299. Some related to *fondacos* in which tiles were manufactured, while others concerned the sale of tiles in *fondacos*.<sup>65</sup> In February 1286, a tile-maker promised delivery of 4,000 tiles to Simon de Pactis, a *fundicarius*, to be delivered next April at the *fondaco* where he worked. Another sale a year later, involving different people, specified that 2,000 tiles would be delivered in the *fondaco* where the seller (another *celamidarius*) worked ("ipsas celamidas dare in fundico quo ipse venditor laborat"), while a sale for another 2,500 tiles in April 1299 specified that they should be delivered "in fundico dicti emptoris."<sup>66</sup> These transactions all show that *fondacos* were sites for busy and profitable private business in thirteenth-century Palermo. Later records collected by Henri Bresc indicate that the institution continued to be common in Sicily during the later middle ages, when it retained the sense of lodging-house, tavern, and even brothel, especially in rural areas.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>63</sup> Sale contract: Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, I, 134 (doc. 215), dated March 1287; dowry lists: *ibid.*, I, 45–46 (doc. 49), January, 1287, I, 208–209 (doc. 345), July 1287, II, 356–357 (doc. 459), June 1299.

<sup>64</sup> In 1287, Adamo de Citella mentioned a *fondaco* belonging to a leather worker (*corridaturus*) (*Imbreviature*, I, 208–209 [doc. 345]) and a sale of rabbit skins in another *fondaco* (*ibid.*, I, 90–91 [doc. 132]), both in Palermo. A contract from 1307 recorded the rental of part of a *fondaco*, also in Palermo, to a farrier for the exercise of his trade (H. Bresc, "In ruga que arabice dicitur zucac . . ." Les Rues de Palerme [1070–1460], in *Le Paysage urbain au moyen âge: Actes du xie Congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public* [Lyon, 1980] [Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon, 1981] 174).

<sup>65</sup> Rental of a *fondaco* in Palermo for making tiles, March 1287 (Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, I, 110 [doc. 169]; sale of a *fondaco* for making tiles, February 1299 (*ibid.*, II, 196–197 [docs. 248, 248a]). The Latin word is a Sicilian version of the Greek *ciaramira*, a type of tile (*ibid.*, I, 272). A connection between *fondacos* and the making of tiles may also be referred to in the "Novis statutis super iure fundici," promulgated by Charles of Anjou, around 1275, which mentioned a tax on dyestuffs and tiles ("iura tintorie et celendre") in conjunction with the *ius fundici* (Winkelmann [ed.], *Acta Imperii inedita*, 760 [doc. 999]). The connection between *fondacos* and tiles (and, by extension, kilns) might also stem from the long-held association between *fondacos* and ovens.

<sup>66</sup> February 1286: "ipsas celamidas dare in fundico in quo ipse laborat" – in this case, it is unclear whether the buyer or seller worked in a *fondaco* (Adamo de Citella, *Imbreviature*, I, 87 [doc. 125], I, 80–81 [doc. 112] February, 1287, II, 276–277 [doc. 356] April, 1299). Another similar contract was drawn up in February, 1287 (*ibid.*, I, 88–89 [doc. 128]).

<sup>67</sup> Bresc and Bresc, "Fondaco et taverne"; also H. Bresc, *Un Monde méditerranéen. Economie et société en Sicile 1300–1450* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1986), I, 359, 368.

These data from Sicily and south Italy, spanning the Norman through the Angevin regimes, make clear that all three types of *fondacos* – royal, communal, and private – flourished in this region. The various functions which these facilities might fulfill all had parallels not only in earlier Muslim models, but also with contemporary *fondacos* elsewhere in newly Christian realms in the western and eastern Mediterranean.

#### FONDE AND FONDACO IN THE CRUSADER STATES

As in Iberia and Sicily, the *funduq* was quickly incorporated into Christian administrative policies in the Crusader states. Both *fondacos* administered by the crown and *fondacos* belonging to Italian city-states appeared under crusader rule, and in many ways these resembled their counterparts elsewhere in the Mediterranean world. There are also limited references to facilities devoted to the sale of particular products, as in other regions, including a *fondaco* for fruit noted in Latakia in 1172, one for sugar in Tyre (1209), and another for wine in Antioch (1231).<sup>68</sup>

These similarities make it tempting to understand crusader *fondacos* in light of those in other newly Christian territories. However, there were several important differences, most notably the prominence of the Italian merchant communities and the complex relationship between their *fondacos* and those belonging to the crown. There is also the fact that *fondacos* in crusader cities are among the earliest examples of the christianized form. Thus, although some cross-Mediterranean influence is probable, especially through mercantile connections, chronology suggests the largely independent development of crusader forms from models of the *funduq* and *fondaco* in the *Dār al-Islām*. Differences may also stem from the distinct context of the Crusader states, especially the relatively greater power of Italian merchant groups in crusader port cities, and the lesser familiarity of European crusaders with indigenous Muslim institutions. Like their Norman contemporaries in Sicily, but unlike kings in Castile and the Crown of Aragón, early rulers of the Crusader kingdom came from northern Europe, and had no prior exposure to Islamic forms of urban and fiscal administration. Nevertheless, they learned rapidly, and were quick to adopt

<sup>68</sup> “Fundo fructus”: *Cartulaire général de l’Ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem*, ed. J. Delaville Le Roulx (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1894–1906) 1, 303 (doc. 437); “fontica de çucarò”: Morozzo della Rocca and Lombardo (eds.), *Documenti del commercio*, 11, 52 (doc. 513); “funde del vin”: *Cartulaire général*, II, 428 (doc. 2001). All of these items were commodities traded between Europe and the Near East. Large quantities of sugar, especially, were produced in the Latin kingdom for export to Europe (see Edna J. Stern, “The Excavations at Lower Ḥorat Manot: A Medieval Sugar-Production Site,” *Atiqot* 42 [2001] 277–308).

and adapt institutions of obvious utility. As in other christianized regions, some existing *funduqs* apparently retained both their name and function under the new administration. In other cases, Muslim buildings shifted to new uses, as with one Fāṭimid hostelry converted into an infirmary by the Hospitalers.<sup>69</sup>

Scholars of the Crusader kingdom have already devoted considerable attention to the commerce and fiscal institutions in the Latin east. Their work indicates the diversity and flexibility of administrative terms, which included the Latin *funda* and vernacular *fonde*, as well as the more common cognates *fondaco*, *fonticum*, *fundicum*, and so forth. Sometimes these words were used to indicate specific buildings or administrative facilities, but at other times they were loosely applied to a number of different things, both physical and conceptual. This imprecision has created subsequent debate and disagreement, demonstrating the difficulty of pinning down solid and consistent meanings. It seems reasonable to assume that this terminological variety arose from the complex linguistic, religious, and economic mix of peoples in the Crusader states, which brought together – among others – French nobles, Sicilian Normans, northern Italian merchants, and local Muslims. Each group would have brought its own understanding and idioms to the development of crusader institutions, but there is no reason to believe that the resulting diverse vocabulary (that so easily confuses modern scholars) presented any actual obstacles to pursuing business in Acre or Antioch in the twelfth or thirteenth century. Recent scholarship has likewise debated the origins of certain taxes and economic institutions in the Crusader states, seeking to determine whether they derived from European or Muslim fiscal traditions.<sup>70</sup> In the case of the crusader *fonde*, the answer becomes quite complex, since foreign experiences of the institution (particularly those brought by Normans, Genoese, and Venetians) mingled with indigenous versions.

Jonathan Riley-Smith has provided a useful summary of the spectrum of meanings for *fonde* and *fondaco* in Latin Syria, noting facilities ranging from those under royal control, for example the twelfth-century *funda regis* in Acre, to the warehouses owned by Italian merchant communities. Some *fondes* were very similar to contemporary *funduqs* and *khāns* under Islamic administration, providing space for lodging, storage, and sales. Many of

<sup>69</sup> Z. Goldman, "Le Couvent des hospitaliers à Saint Jean d'Acre," *Bible et Terre Sainte* 160 (April 1974) 15.

<sup>70</sup> See, for example, Paul Sidelko, "Muslim Taxation under Crusader Rule," in *Tolerance and Intolerance. Social Conflict in the Age of the Crusades*, ed. Michael Gervers and James Powell (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2001) 65–74.

these seem to have been held by the crown, as well as by nobles, private individuals, military orders, or western merchant groups. Other *fondes* were markets for specific types of goods (wine, fruit, etc.), or buildings containing many different shops under one administration.<sup>71</sup> As in Spain, Sicily, and the Islamic world, *fondes* and *fondacos* in the Crusader states served as points for the sale, taxation, and control of commercial goods. There is little evidence, however, that they functioned as official depots for royal monopolies (for example, on grain or salt), as in some other conquered regions. Although many *fondes* were not directly administered by the crown, it is clear that royal administrators still tried to keep watch over these commercial spaces and their revenues.

#### ROYAL AND LORDLY FONDES

A royal *fonde* first appeared in charters from the reign of Baldwin I (1118–1131), and references to similar official facilities continue to appear until the late thirteenth century. The idea was surely derived from royal *funduqs* (*fanādiq al-sultān*) in the contemporary Muslim milieu. The *fonde* was one of two royal institutions that oversaw commercial activities in crusader cities. It was associated with markets and the sales, while the other, the *cathena*, generally dealt with exported goods. However, as Joshua Prawer has pointed out, “the relations between the *cathena* and the *funda* are not always clear.”<sup>72</sup> According to Jonathan Riley-Smith, most goods coming into crusader cities were brought by law to the royal *fondes* for storage, weighing, trade, and taxation. Certain western merchant groups had obtained exemptions from this requirement, and conveyed their goods to their own *fondacos* for sale and storage. Riley-Smith noted a distinction – at least in Acre – between the royal *fonde en amont* in the main city and *fondacos* around the port (collectively called *fonde en aval*) belonging to Italian communities. Buyers, including western traders, who wished to purchase items from the royal *fondes* had to come to these facilities to make their

<sup>71</sup> J. Riley-Smith, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174–1277* (London: Macmillan, 1973) 70–75, 95–96; also Riley-Smith, “Government in Latin Syria,” 115–116. Also Joshua Prawer, *The Crusaders’ Kingdom. European Colonialism in the Middle Ages* (New York: Praeger, 1972) 407–415.

<sup>72</sup> Prawer went on to note that “one would assume that the *cathena*, certainly a market and not only a customs house, catered to export only, and the *funda* to local commerce. This is not quite certain. If the Syrian weavers of Tyre were freed by royal decree from a fee at the *cathena* which they would otherwise have paid at the Venetian *fonde*, relations were more complicated than meets the eye” (Prawer, *Crusaders’ Kingdom*, 413). See also R. B. Patterson, “The Early Existence of the *Funda* and *Catena* in the Twelfth-century Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem,” *Speculum* 39 (1964) 474–477.

purchases, and the goods were taxed at the time of sale.<sup>73</sup> Taxes on a wide variety of goods sold in the *fonde* were listed in meticulous detail in the thirteenth century, and may have resembled the *ius fundici* in Sicily or earlier Muslim commercial levies.<sup>74</sup> Royal facilities were administered either directly or through tax-farms, and they were sufficiently lucrative for it to become common to grant out their revenues.

When Ibn Jubayr arrived Acre in 1184 from Damascus, he described a commercial facility that was almost certainly the royal *fonde*:

We were taken to the custom-house, which is a *khān* prepared to accommodate the caravan. Before the door are stone benches spread with carpets, where are the Christian clerks of the customs with their ebony ink-stands ornamented with gold. They write in Arabic, which they also speak. Their chief is the *ṣāhib al-dīwān*, who holds the contract to farm the customs . . . All the dues collected go to the contractor for the customs, who pays a vast sum (to the government). The merchants deposited their baggage there and lodged in the upper story. The baggage of any who had no merchandise was also examined in case it contained concealed (and dutiable) merchandise, after which the owner was permitted to go his way and seek lodging where he would. All this was done with civility and respect, and without harshness or unfairness.<sup>75</sup>

The fact that Ibn Jubayr used the term *khān* rather than *funduq* is not significant, since these two terms were virtually synonymous in Syrian Arabic at this time. What is clear is that this *khān* had an official status and was run as a tax-farm by the government. It was a place where incoming goods were assessed and taxed, and where arriving merchants were encouraged – but not required – to lodge. The fact that it was staffed by Arabic-speaking Christians, under the oversight of a *ṣāhib al-dīwān*, and that business was conducted in Arabic, speaks of institutional continuity from the Muslim period, even after nearly a century of Christian rule. Ibn Jubayr's description was probably characteristic of state-run *fondacos* not only in the Latin east but also elsewhere in the medieval Mediterranean world.

A later passage from the thirteenth-century *Livres des assises de Jerusalem* confirms that both local and western scribes ("escribein Sarasinois ou Fransois") were employed in *fondes* in crusader cities. Although this section

<sup>73</sup> Riley-Smith, "Government in Latin Syria," 109–122; also Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, 74, 95–96. Riley-Smith described a relationship whereby European imported goods were sold in the western *fondacos*, where no tax was paid on sale, but the crown had the opportunity to collect tax on them if they left through the city gates. If western merchants wished to buy certain eastern goods, however, they were obliged to visit the king's *fonde* and pay tax on their purchases.

<sup>74</sup> *Les Livres des assises et des usages dou reyaume de Jerusalem*, ed. E. H. von Kausler (Stuttgart: A. Krabbe, 1839) I, 274–287.

<sup>75</sup> Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 302–303; *Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, 317–318.

of the text refers to facilities held by lords, and thus not directly controlled by the crown, their structure was no doubt similar. The author was particularly concerned that the lucrative transactions taking place in the *fonde* might tempt its employees to theft and embezzlement:

If it happens that there is a Saracen or Frankish scribe in the lord's service in the *fonde* . . . and that scribe robs the lord of his rights or conspires with merchants or villeins to rob the lord and divide the proceeds with them, or keeps for himself the dues paid in the *fonde* . . . and he does this by false accounting or bookkeeping . . . if that scribe can be proved guilty of this larceny, either by evidence of his books or by that of the merchants, of allowing export without the payment of dues or of diminishing the half of the dues that ought to be given to the lord in favor of the other half, or in favor of the third which is paid in cash (*en diniers*), without the knowledge of his *bailli* or the lord . . . [then he will be hanged].<sup>76</sup>

This passage not only describes the possible fiscal misdeeds of accountants, but also provides clues to the structure of *fonde* administration. As with royal facilities, and like *fondacos* elsewhere in the Christian Mediterranean, this *fonde* was farmed by the lord in return for a percentage of its profits either in cash (one-third) or in kind (one-half). The reference to a *baillius* suggests that this was the person who held the farm, and who employed the scribes and other staff working in the building.

#### FONDACOS FOR WESTERN MERCHANTS

Western traders had communal *fondacos* in several crusader ports, usually located in their own city quarters, where they brought goods from abroad and did business. These merchant communities made money from the sales that took place in their *fondacos*, and from the rents and other fees derived from their real-estate holdings in crusader cities. The western *fondacos* were themselves royal or noble concessions, negotiated though diplomatic exchange. Some were explicitly granted in return for naval or other assistance, whereas others may have been farmed to European communities. The latter is suggested in a reference – admittedly in a Venetian, and thus possibly hostile, source – to the Pisan *fondaco* in Tyre “which they purchased from the king” (“fonticum Pisanorum quod emerunt a rege”).<sup>77</sup>

<sup>76</sup> *Les Livres des assises*, 1, 344–345. Translation from Riley-Smith, *Feudal Nobility*, 55. The text varies slightly in describing the payment of the third of revenues. One version – preferred by Riley-Smith – indicates that this was paid in cash (“li paia en diniers”), the other (“li paia derieres”) perhaps that this was paid at a later date.

<sup>77</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 385.



Western merchant communities from Venice, Pisa, and Genoa held considerable power in the Crusader states, more than in other newly Christian regions, and in consequence their demands and rewards were greater than elsewhere. Italian ships provided vital transport, supplies, commerce, and naval support to the Crusader kingdom, and its rulers repaid Italian efforts with unprecedented grants of land and commercial privileges. As well as obtaining buildings or complexes called *fondacos* in Acre, Tyre, Antioch, Beirut, Jaffa, and Latakia, some western merchant communities were awarded whole city quarters (even as much as a third of the city), with houses, churches, baths, warehouses, shops, plazas, streets, and other amenities.<sup>78</sup> As in other regions, *fondacos* soon became part of a standard package of concessions, as is evident from the promises of Philip Augustus, made to the Genoese in 1190 but never granted, of a church, *fundicum*, oven, bath, and street in any Muslim town that they helped to conquer for the French crown.<sup>79</sup>

Western traders were eager to obtain these concessions, since political and economic developments in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had increased the activity and value of markets in Syria and Palestine. Precious eastern goods such as spices and silk came overland to eastern Mediterranean ports through Syria, Iraq, and the Persian Gulf, as did more local products including sugar, cotton, and flax. In the thirteenth century, the arrival of the Mongols caused initial economic disruption in the region, but the subsequent extension of their empire and advent of the *pax mongolica* improved overland links between Syria and the East – at the expense of Egyptian and Red Sea traffic. Western traders were routinely excluded from inland markets in Egypt and North Africa, where overland traffic was controlled by local merchant groups. In Syria, however, Europeans seem to have had greater mobility, and gradually came to traffic not only in crusader cities such as Acre and Antioch, but also in the inland markets of Muslim Damascus and Aleppo. Ibn Jubayr remarked that “one of the astonishing

<sup>78</sup> A list of charters and treaties granted to Italian city-states may be found in J. L. La Monte, *Feudal Monarchy in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem 1100–1291* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1932) 261–275. See also Robert Kool, “The Genoese Quarter in Thirteenth-century Acre: A Reinterpretation of its Layout,” *Atiqot* 31 (1997) 189–200. On the broader context of Italian activities in the Crusader kingdom, see Marie-Louise Favreau-Lilie, *Die Italiener im Heiligen Land: vom ersten Kreuzzug bis zum Tode Heinrichs von Champagne (1098–1197)* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1989).

<sup>79</sup> (Philip Augustus), *Recueil des Actes de Philippe Auguste roi de France*, ed. F. Delaborde (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1916) I, 448; also *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, I, cols. 355–356 (doc. 362). The advance grant of these particular concessions has strong similarities to promises made by Alfonso VII of Castile to Genoa in 1146, in return for their assistance in the conquest of Almería, and by Frederick I to Genoa in 1162 in regard to Sicilian conquests.

things . . . is that though the fires of discord burn between the two parties, Muslim and Christian . . . yet Muslim and Christian travelers will come and go between them without interference.” Muslim caravans traveled through Christian territory between Egypt and Damascus, or between Damascus and Acre, “and likewise not one of the Christians was stopped or hindered” in Muslim territories.<sup>80</sup>

It has often been assumed that the power and success of western merchant communities in the Latin east allowed them to dominate the economic life of crusader cities, and to demand whatever privileges they wished – often at the expense of royal revenues. Certainly, the national *fondacos* granted to western merchant groups in Acre and other crusader cities were subject to many fewer restrictions than their counterparts in Muslim ports, and they appear more successful and independent than those in Christian Spain and Sicily. Nevertheless, these Italian *fondacos* did not funnel all commercial revenues away from royal coffers. Instead, the royal *fonde* collected taxes of its own and existed in symbiosis with the western *fondacos*. Latin rulers were well aware of the benefits – indeed, the necessity – of maintaining the presence of western traders in crusader markets, but they were by no means blind to their own opportunities for profit.

Relations between the various commercial spaces were complex, but not chaotic. However, any attempt to discern a regular pattern is impeded by the frequency with which individual groups arranged exclusive deals with the crown for tax exemptions, trading rights, and other privileges. As elsewhere in conquered territories, incoming Christian rulers in the Latin east struggled to adapt local institutions to their preconceived administrative models, and attempted to preserve crown income while at the same time placating demands on all sides for special grants and concessions. The result was functional, though not elegant.

Thirteenth-century data from Acre and other crusader cities indicate that both royal and foreign facilities profited from the revenues of trade and merchant activity.<sup>81</sup> In the early 1240s, receipts to the crown totaled 50,000 pounds of silver a year, a sum that derived from many sources, including commercial tariffs, rents, and tax-farms, as well as from the royal *fonde* in Acre.<sup>82</sup> Income from the latter was sufficient for rulers to grant out significant portions as stipends and concessions to vassals, royal relatives,

<sup>80</sup> Ibn Jubayr, *Rihla*, 287, *Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, 300–301. Accounts of atrocities and bloodshed in other contemporary sources suggest that Ibn Jubayr’s personal observations were not universal.

<sup>81</sup> Joshua Prawer has argued that the national *fondacos* in Acre took precedence over the royal *fonde* (Prawer, *Crusaders’ Kingdom*, 412), but both appear to have been important in their separate spheres.

<sup>82</sup> Riley-Smith, “Government in Latin Syria,” 109.

and other recipients.<sup>83</sup> In April 1229, for example, Frederick II granted 3,000 bezants annually from the royal *fonde* in Acre (“funde nostre Acconis”) in exchange for another property.<sup>84</sup> In comparison, an accounting of annual Venetian income from rents on real estate in Acre in 1244 (not counting other revenues) totaled nearly 3,500 bezants, plus returns of just under 200 bezants a month for rental of rooms in the *fondaco* and other lodgings during the sailing season.<sup>85</sup>

### Antioch

As in Castile and Aragón, western merchants gained concessions in crusader cities shortly after their conquest. The earliest of these appears to have been the Genoese *fondaco* in Antioch granted by Bohemond of Taranto in 1098, but there were also Genoese and Venetian quarters in Acre not long after that city’s capture in 1104.<sup>86</sup> The Genoese *fondaco* in Antioch is especially noteworthy as the earliest known example of its type, dating half a century before *fondacos* for Christian merchants were first documented in Spain (in 1146), Fāṭimid Egypt (in 1154), or Tunis (probably in 1157). In this regard, it is significant that Bohemond, unlike most other leaders of the First Crusade, would already have been familiar with the institution of the *funduql/fondaco* from living in recently conquered Norman Sicily and south Italy.

The form and language of Bohemond’s grant – giving the Genoese community a church, *fondaco*, well, houses, and a plaza – was similar to later concessions.<sup>87</sup> The constellation of facilities in Antioch is not identical to those granted elsewhere (a bath and oven are notably lacking) but the

<sup>83</sup> R. Röhricht, *Regesta regni Hierosolymitani* (Oeniponti: Libr. Acad. Wagneriana, 1904; repr. New York: Burt Franklin, 1962) I, 122 (no. 465), 161 (no. 608), 166 (no. 628), 175 (no. 657), 261 (no. 989). In some cases, revenues from the royal *fonde* and *cathena* in Acre were granted to Italian cities, as to Pisa in 1188 (*ibid.*, 180, no. 674). In other cases, revenues went to military orders. For example, Bohemond IV assigned the Hospitalers 500 bezants annually from a *fonde* in Latakia in 1205, and another 316 bezants from the *fonde* of Tripoli in 1231 (*Cartulaire général*, II, 48 [doc. 1215], II, 428–429 [doc. 2002]).

<sup>84</sup> (Frederick II), *Historia diplomatica*, III, 117–131. Also Röhricht, *Regesta*, I, 263 (no. 1002), 264 (nos. 1004 and 1008), 265 (no. 1012). The total sum was 6,400, with 3,200 coming from the royal *cathena* and another 3,000 from the *fonde* (“et alia tria milia bisancios sarracenos in redditibus funde”). The remaining 200 may have been omitted in error. The text continues with careful provisions and calculations to cover the event that either *fonde* or *cathena* took in insufficient revenues in a given year.

<sup>85</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden* II, 390–397.

<sup>86</sup> Slessarev, “*Ecclesiae Mercatorum*,” 192; D. Jacoby, “Crusader Acre in the Thirteenth Century: Urban Layout and Topography,” *Studi Medievali* 3rd series, 20 (1979) 26, 30.

<sup>87</sup> Imperiale di Sant’ Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, I, 11–12 (doc. 7).

familiar wording suggests that this was an early version of what would soon become a standard list in *fondaco* grants in both Muslim and Christian contexts. However, the inclusion of thirty houses with the grant indicates that there was no compulsory residence in this *fondaco*, unlike counterparts in Muslim cities.

It is impossible to determine the model for this earliest documented example of a *fondaco* granted to an Italian merchant community. Bohemond might have been influenced by examples in Sicily, or perhaps the Genoese had requested concessions that they already enjoyed elsewhere, maybe in Sicily or Spain, or even in Antioch itself. Equally likely, this *fondaco* was directly adapted from a Muslim facility already functioning in the city. These certainly existed, since somewhat later in 1140, Raymond of Poitiers would grant another building in Antioch to a monastery with the explicit comment that this had been “called *funeidec* in Arabic.”<sup>88</sup> It intriguing to recall that this early *fondaco* appeared in precisely the region where *pandocheions* had been most common in late antiquity, and where the institution had been first adopted into Arabic.

Genoese privileges in Antioch were reconfirmed in 1127 by Bohemond II, who also extended them rights to another *fondaco* and street in the port of Latakia at the same time.<sup>89</sup> By 1140, Venice had gained similar grants of houses and a *fondaco* in Antioch, and these were regularly renewed, along with Venetian rights to self-jurisdiction of their community in the city, during the later twelfth century.<sup>90</sup>

### *Acre*

Although Antioch was an important market, particularly for trade coming overland through Anatolia, western merchants were much more eager to obtain privileges in Acre, the most important commercial port in the Latin kingdom. Although the harbor at Acre was not deep enough for large ships, it was better than any others further south (including Jaffa, the primary port for Jerusalem) and was thus well located to serve the capital and the central Crusader kingdom. Italians never established bases in Jerusalem itself, or in other inland crusader towns. Because of its strategic importance, the region

<sup>88</sup> Röhricht, *Regesta*, 1, 48 (no. 195). *Funeidec* transcribes the Arabic diminutive form, thus “the little *funduq*.”

<sup>89</sup> Imperiale di Sant’ Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, 1, 57 (doc. 47). This grant was renewed again in 1169 (II, 102 [doc. 49]). In Latakia, as in Antioch and other conquered cities, Muslim *funduqs* may have been converted into various types of Christian property. A grant made by Bohemond III in 1185, for example, gave a building in Latakia “*quae etiam vetus funda vocabatur*” to the Church (Röhricht, *Regesta*, II, 42 [no. 642a]).

<sup>90</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, I, 102–103, 134, 149, 176.

around Acre (and also around the port of Tyre, to the north) was directly under royal control, as was the territory surrounding Jerusalem, while most other areas of the Latin kingdom had been granted out as feudal estates. Grants to Italian merchant communities in Acre and Tyre were thus made at the behest of the king.

Acre came into Christian hands in 1104, and later became the political heart of the Crusader kingdom after the recapture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187. Although Acre returned briefly to Muslim control in the same year, it was retaken by Conrad of Montferrat during the Third Crusade in 1190, and remained Christian for another century until 1291, when it was among the last crusader territories conquered by Mamlūk armies. An early fourteenth-century map of Acre, showing the layout of the city in about 1285, still marked various foreign quarters and *fondacos* arranged in a semi-circle around the harbor area.<sup>91</sup>

Western merchants in Acre lived either in their own houses or, if their residence was relatively brief, they rented rooms in their communal *fondacos*. The frequent grant of houses to Genoese, Venetians, and others shows that most resident merchants both preferred and were permitted to live outside the *fondacos*.<sup>92</sup> Indeed, many royal grants to Christian merchant groups in Acre did not even mention a *fondaco*, citing instead only houses and other facilities. For those communities that had a *fondaco*, it seems that this was generally used for consular offices, as rented lodgings for transient merchants during the sailing season, or as space for storage, sales, and other transactions.

Each European merchant colony in Acre and other crusader cities was under the rule of a consul, or in the case of the Venetians, a *baille* (or *baillius*), who held legal jurisdiction over members of the community, oversaw the financial affairs of the *fondaco*, and appointed officers and administrators. At least on paper, many of the duties of Italian consuls in crusader cities were not unlike those of their counterparts in Islamic ports. Consuls and *bailles* in Acre, such as the Pisan “consul Accon et totius Syrie” in the late twelfth century, generally had broad powers of oversight over lesser consuls and colonies throughout the Levant.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>91</sup> This map shows a distinctly Venetian bias, reflected in the relative sizes of different buildings and features. One large building in the Venetian quarter has been identified as the Venetian *fondaco*. Although the foreign compounds were located near the harbor, they did not have direct access to it (Jacoby, “Crusader Acre,” 2, 6, 30).

<sup>92</sup> Prawer estimated that the actual number of resident foreign merchants was never very great, probably not more than several hundred in each community (*Crusaders' Kingdom*, 92–93).

<sup>93</sup> Prawer, *Crusaders' Kingdom*, 89; D. Jacoby, “L'Expansion occidentale dans le Levant: les Vénitiens à Acre dans la seconde moitié du treizième siècle,” *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977) 231–233; Otten-Froux, “Les Pisans en Egypte et à Acre,” 165.

The *fondacos* in Acre also had other staff, but this group of people would not have formed the closed and close-knit group characteristic of *fondacos* in Muslim towns. Instead, merchants and staff were free to come and go throughout the city, and could lodge where they pleased. In 1244, the Venetian *fondaco* in Acre housed several officers, including the *plazarius*, Johannes Gastaldio, who received his small room as part of his salary, together with money and a clothing allowance. Another room in the *fondaco* was inhabited by a priest (*sacerdos*), who presumably served as chaplain for the Venetian community. His duties were probably less extensive than those of a priest like Tealdus, in the Genoese *fondaco* in Tunis, since there was no scarcity of Christian clerics in Acre.<sup>94</sup> As in *fondacos* elsewhere, notaries would also have pursued their trade in the building, recording the sales, partnership arrangements, loans, and other business that took place in the *fondaco*.

The Venetians were the first to obtain rights in Acre, six years after the conquest of the city. This grant was enlarged in 1123, when the *Pactum Warmundi* granted tax exemptions and jurisdictional privileges, extensive territorial holdings in Tyre (a third of the city) and in Acre, access to baths, ovens, churches, streets, plazas, and mills in these cities, and the right to use their own weights and measures for sales of wine, oil, and honey within the Venetian community. The privilege of their own weights and measures applied to sales between Venetians within their own quarter. Any purchases outside the community were conducted with royal weights and measures and owed tax at the royal *fonde*.<sup>95</sup> Although some restrictions were added when Baldwin II reconfirmed the grant in 1125, the *Pactum Warmundi* became the standard model for later Venetian and other Italian commercial negotiations in the Latin east.<sup>96</sup>

Genoese, Pisan, and other western merchant communities also had property in Acre in the twelfth century, although the evidence is less plentiful than for Venetian holdings.<sup>97</sup> Shortly after Acre's conquest, Genoa received

<sup>94</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 392. Another priest ("unos de sacerdotibus") lived in a house adjacent to the *fondaco* (393).

<sup>95</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, I, 84–89; this grant was also described in detail by William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done beyond the Sea*, trans. Emily Atwater Babcock (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943) I, 553–555.

<sup>96</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, I, 90–91; J. Prawer, "I Veneziani e le colonie veneziane nel regno latino di Gerusalemme," in *Venezia e il Levante fino al secolo xv*, ed. Agostino Pertusi (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1973) 1.2, 637; Jacoby, "L'Expansion occidentale," 226.

<sup>97</sup> Merchants from Marseille also had concessions in Acre, while smaller European trading centers more frequently did business under the auspices of larger communities. See Hans E. Mayer, *Marseilles Levantehandel und ein akkonensisches Fälscheratelier des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1972) 176, 178, 215, etc. Abulafia, "Levant Trade."

rights to a city quarter from Baldwin I, in gratitude for their naval help in taking the city, but with no specific mention of a Genoese *fondaco*. Even at the end of the century, when Conrad of Montferrat reconfirmed privileges to the Genoese in Acre in 1192 (this time in thanks for their help in retaking the city from the Ayyūbids during the Third Crusade), privileges included rights to “buy and sell in the [royal] *fundico* and *cathena*” only.<sup>98</sup> In contrast, the Pisans received charters in 1168, 1182, and 1187, the latter two granting ovens, baths, mills, houses, and – explicitly – a “fundacum Pisanorum.”<sup>99</sup>

Both royal and national *fondacos* became more prominent in Acre in the thirteenth century, as the city took on greater importance following the loss of Jerusalem in 1187. The conception of the *fondaco* itself may also have become more institutionalized, after a century of evolution under Christian control in the Latin east, Spain, and Sicily. Certainly, when Frederick II became regent in the Holy Land in 1228, ruling for his son Conrad after the death of his wife, Queen Yolanda of Jerusalem, he seems to have regularized the system of crusader *fondacos*, and may have imported a Sicilian administrative understanding of the institution to add to the eastern Mediterranean model.

A long list of revenues from the *fondaco* and from other Venetian properties in Acre drawn up for the *baillius* Marsiglio Ziorzi in 1244 reveals details of size, layout, and profits. This shows the *fondaco* as a complex of buildings, containing a variety of different houses, rooms, chambers, stables, and storage areas.<sup>100</sup> Venetians could also own private property in the city, as is demonstrated in sale documents for real estate.<sup>101</sup> The *fondaco* itself was Venetian property, and thus the responsibility of the commune. In 1286, the Venetian senate authorized the shipment of seventy-two tons of worked stone and pitch for repairs to their *fondaco* and other buildings in Acre, indicating not only that these properties were still very much an ongoing concern, but that the commune was liable for their upkeep and repair.<sup>102</sup> A decade earlier, in 1277, Venice received permission to buy – or to build – a *fonde* for commercial transactions in Tripoli.<sup>103</sup> These references contrast

<sup>98</sup> *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, 1 (no. 401) cols. 400–401. Riley-Smith doubts whether there was ever a Genoese *fondaco per se* in Acre (“Government in Latin Syria,” 119). In contrast, a parallel grant in Tyre, in 1190, specifically mentioned *fondaco eiusdem* (see below).

<sup>99</sup> Müller (ed.), *Documenti sulle relazioni toscane* (docs. 23, 31); D. Jacoby, “L’Evolution urbaine et la fonction méditerranéenne d’Acre à l’époque des croisades,” in *Città portuali del Mediterraneo, storia e archeologia. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Genova, 1985*, ed. Ennio Poleggi (Genoa: Sagep Editrice, 1989) 97.

<sup>100</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 389–398.

<sup>101</sup> Jacoby, “L’Expansion occidentale,” 229.

<sup>102</sup> Jacoby, “L’Expansion occidentale,” 230; Jacoby, “Crusader Acre,” 36.

<sup>103</sup> Emmanuel Guillaume Rey, *Recherches géographiques et historiques sur la domination des Latins en Orient* (Paris: Typ. Lahure, 1877) 49.



with the contemporary situation in Muslim cities in the thirteenth century, where the Ayyūbid, then Mamlūk, government was mainly responsible for the construction and maintenance of the Venetian and other western *fondacos*.

### *Tyre and other cities*

Venetian *fondacos* also flourished in Tyre by the later twelfth century. Although the *Pactum Warmundi* had granted Venetian merchants considerable privileges in this city, there was no specific mention of a *fondaco* in that city until 1175, when Doge Sebastiano Ziani appointed a new procurator over the Venetian quarter, with rights over *fonticis*, as well as baths, ovens, measures, and other assets.<sup>104</sup> By 1243, the Venetians continued to enjoy all of these amenities, including two *fondacos*, houses, baths, oven, gardens, and streets. As in Acre, these properties rendered considerable income to the Venetian community.<sup>105</sup> The first of the two *fondacos*, which contained the Venetian scales, was the place where goods were sold (“in quo venduntur mercimonia”) and it produced annual revenues of 1,900 bezants; the second *fondaco*, curiously noted as containing musical instruments, was worth only 500 bezants per year.<sup>106</sup> Other Italian communities, including Genoa and Pisa, also had colonies in Tyre. In 1187, Conrad of Montferrat confirmed Pisan rights to their own *fondacos* (together with houses, ovens, and baths) in Tyre and Jaffa, and three years later granted the Genoese rights to “buy and sell in their own *fondaco*” in Tyre.<sup>107</sup>

The importance of particular cities, and the privileges that western merchants received in their markets, varied considerably over time with the fluctuations of politics, warfare, and the commercial ascendancy of different merchant groups. Nobles, as well as kings, sought to foster Italian and French commercial business in their cities, often as part of a broader strategy for power. In 1221, for example, John of Ibelin, lord of Beirut, granted extensive privileges to Venetian merchants in Beirut, and two years later he also gave merchants from Marseille access to a *fondaco* in the same city.<sup>108</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, I, 168.

<sup>105</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 351–389.

<sup>106</sup> “Cum tubis et zallamellis, vocinis et tanburis et alijs instrumentis ad ludendum”: Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 385.

<sup>107</sup> Pisa: Müller (ed.), *Documenti sulle relazioni toscane*, 26–29 (docs. 23, 24). Genoa: *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, I (no. 374) cols. 357–359. However, by September 1195, a further document mentions Genoese buying and selling “in fundico et cathena” in Tyre, a phrase similar to the arrangements in Acre in 1192 (*Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, I [no. 410] cols. 411–412).

<sup>108</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 233; Mayer, *Marseilles Levantehandel*, 191–192.

The concessions to Venice were both a play for regional power on the part of Ibelins and an acknowledgment of Venetian strength in the eastern Mediterranean in the wake of the Fourth Crusade. John's grant included the right for Venetians to sell all types of merchandise (including sugar, wool, incense, pearls, soap, and other goods) free of taxation in their *fondaco*. Likewise, they were permitted to export goods from the *fondaco* without tariffs. This list of eastern and local commodities sold tax-free in the Venetian *fondaco* in Beirut contrasts with the more restrictive system imposed by the royal *fondes* in other crusader cities, and may represent a strategic bid for commercial advantage on the part of the lord of Beirut. It was worth the sacrifice of some tax revenue to lure Venetian traffic away from Acre and Tyre, since the increase in commercial activity through Beirut would fill Ibelin coffers. The political and economic ramifications of the Fourth Crusade affected Genoese fortunes more negatively. Although King Leo of Armenia had granted them churches, houses, and *fondacos* in several cities in 1201, he reduced these concessions, notably omitting *fondacos*, in 1215.<sup>109</sup>

Despite this plentiful data showing *fondacos* held by the king or granted to western merchant groups, there is relatively little information on other types of *fondacos*. Some were evidently controlled by local lords, such as John of Ibelin or Philip of Montferrat. In 1269, for example, the latter made a grant of property in Tyre located between "ma fonde et la fonde de Pize."<sup>110</sup> As in Castile and the realms of Aragón, other *fondacos* belonged to military orders or to the Church. Thus, a summary of tithes owed to a church in the Hospitaller fortress of Margat in 1193 included revenues from a local *funda*.<sup>111</sup> Nearly a century later, we find several facilities in episcopal hands. In 1263, for example, a letter of Pope Urban IV confirmed the exchange of property between two bishops, including a *fundico* and other real estate in Tyre.<sup>112</sup> Likewise, the bishop of Amalfi farmed out revenues from a *fondaco* owned by the metropolitan church in Tripoli in 1267.<sup>113</sup> However, there is no evidence of *fondacos* controlled by ordinary citizens in crusader cities. This contrasts with the situation in Spain and Sicily, where charters, *repartimientos*, and contracts indicate quite a number of *fondacos* in private hands, apparently used for residence, manufacturing, and small-scale business.

<sup>109</sup> Imperiale di Sant' Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico*, III, 190 (doc. 75); *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, I (no. 514) cols. 574–576.

<sup>110</sup> *Cartulaire général*, III, 202 (doc. 3346).

<sup>111</sup> *Cartulaire général*, I, 595–596 (doc. 941).

<sup>112</sup> (Urban IV), *Les Registres d'Urban IV (1261–1264)*, ed. Jean Guiraud (Paris: A Fontemoing, 1904) 22–23 (doc. 1019).

<sup>113</sup> Charles Kohler, "Documents inédits concernant l'Orient Latin et les croisades (xii<sup>e</sup>–xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle)," *Revue d'Orient Latin* 7 (1900) 28–32.

Commercial *loggias* also appeared in crusader cities, where they seem to have existed simultaneously with *fondacos* during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. A privilege from Baldwin IV, for example, granted revenues from both a *fonde* in Ascalon and a *loggia* in Acre, “where they sell bread,” in 1180.<sup>114</sup> Although the *loggia* would gradually replace the *fondaco* in many other regions by the early fourteenth century, a definitive shift from *fondaco* to *loggia* would never occur in the Latin east, where the last outposts of Christian control were retaken by the Mamlūks in 1291.

*Loggias* and *fondacos* are not clearly differentiated in thirteenth-century sources. For example, there was a *logiam* listed as part of the Venetian *fondaco* in 1244, and a document drawn up “sub logia Venetorum” in Acre in 1277 may have meant only that the notary preferred to write in the shade.<sup>115</sup> Nevertheless, a list of Venetian property and privileges in Tyre, also dating to 1277, specifically cited possession of a *loggia* (but no *fondaco*), together with a church and bell-tower, rights of free and secure trade, judicial freedom, and other concessions.<sup>116</sup> In 1249, similarly, an inventory of Genoese real estate in Acre had listed houses, a bath, mill, oven, shops, storerooms, and gardens, as well as a “palatium logiae communis,” but no *fondaco*.<sup>117</sup> In both cases, this association of the *loggia* with the commune itself suggests an official and representational capacity along the lines of the earlier *fondaco*. At the other end of the Mediterranean, also in 1249, the Genoese sought rights to a communal *alhóndiga*, houses, a church, and oven in Seville from Ferdinand III. By this date, therefore, the two terms appear to have been synonyms, though they would grow increasingly distinct over the next half century.

Mamlūk victories in the later thirteenth century against both the Mongols and the remaining Latin territories ushered in a new political and commercial regime in the Near East, as did the reassertion of Byzantine power in 1261. Trade routes changed in Egypt and Syria, along with government policies regulating facilities for merchants and other travelers. After the fall of Acre in 1291, *fondaco* buildings in the city probably continued to function, since there is archeological and textual evidence of

<sup>114</sup> Röhricht, *Regesta*, II, 37 (no. 591). In 1149, the Order of the Hospitalers had exchanged rights to a bath-house in Acre for the rights to a *loggia* situated across from a church belonging to the Order. This seems to refer to a particular building rather than to a commercial exchange (D. Jacoby, “Les Communes italiennes et les ordres militaires à Acre: aspects juridiques, territoriaux et militaires [1104–1187, 1191–1291],” in *Etat et colonisation au moyen âge et à la Renaissance*, ed. Michel Balard [Lyon: La Manufacture, 1989] 200).

<sup>115</sup> Tafel and Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden*, II, 392; Röhricht, *Regesta*, II, 97 (no. 1413c).

<sup>116</sup> Röhricht, *Regesta*, I, 366–367 (no. 1413).

<sup>117</sup> Röhricht, *Regesta*, I, 310 (no. 1182); Kool, “Genoese Quarter,” 199.

their evolution into Muslim *khāns*, but their western merchant inhabitants were long gone.<sup>118</sup> Eventually, however, Italian merchants would return to establish new *fondacos*, now under the close supervision of Mamlūk administrators, not only in Beirut and other port cities, but also in Damascus and Aleppo.

The presence of Christian *fondacos* in the Crusader states, and elsewhere in the Near East in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, would leave its mark on Muslim commercial life in the later middle ages. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the roles of the *funduq*, *fondaco*, and *khān* shifted and solidified in the Mamlūk period in response to the changing economic and political climate in the Mediterranean world. Rulers and administrators, whether Christian or Muslim, were always quick to commandeer commercial space whenever it would profit their political agenda or economic ambitions. By 1300, with the changing balance of power in the Mediterranean, mercantile spheres also became more geographically distinct. While European merchants gained dominance in maritime traffic, Muslim rulers and traders controlled the overland routes linking ports in North Africa and the Near East with distant sources of luxury goods. In response, commercial facilities in these port cities, including *fondacos*, were increasingly regulated and became ever more important as the critical interface between the two religious, political, and economic spheres.

<sup>118</sup> In Acre, the Mamlūk Khān al-Ifranġ was located on the same spot as the earlier Venetian *fondaco*, and part of the building's structure dates to the crusader period. Its Arabic name (*ifranġ*, meaning "Frankish") suggests a European heritage. The Pisan *fondaco* in Acre has been associated with the Khān al-Shūna, and the later Khān al-'Umdān is on the location of the Court of the Chain (Jacoby, "Crusader Acre," 32, 24; A. J. Boas, *Crusader Archaeology. The Material Culture of the Latin East* [London: Routledge, 1999] 36; P. Pierotti, *Pisa e Accon. L'Insediamento pisano nella città crociata. Il porto. Il fondaco* [Pisa: Pacini Editore, 1987]).