

## CHAPTER 4

# Slaves

The slave trade was of major importance in the eastern Mediterranean in the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries, with the main markets in the coastal towns of Anatolia, in Pera, on Crete, Chios, Cyprus, Rhodes and Naxos. Naxos in particular was an important slave market where Turks sold those they had captured in their raids which extended all over the Aegean.<sup>1</sup> The trade was not restricted to Anatolia and the islands but spread across the Mediterranean to Egypt and further to western Europe as far as Catalonia, with slaves from the markets of the eastern Mediterranean appearing in cities such as Genoa and Venice. Of the Latin merchants involved in this trade, the Genoese were extremely active,<sup>2</sup> channelling slaves from the Black Sea through to the Mamluk sultanate and largely dominating the slave trade in the eastern Mediterranean. The Venetians were also heavily involved, as were various other Latins such as merchants from other Italian cities, the Hospitallers, Catalans, Anconitans, merchants from Marseilles and other parts of France. The Turks too traded in slaves and Turchia had flourishing slave markets. However, the activities of the Turkish merchants could not be compared with those of the two main protagonists: Genoa and Venice.

Turchia appears to have had slave markets active from the beginning of the fourteenth century onwards. Various Venetian notarial deeds give enactments of slave sales conducted in Crete in the first part of the century in which the vendor had originally bought the slave in Turchia.<sup>3</sup> Menteşe

<sup>1</sup> C. Verlinden, 'Le recrutement des esclaves à Venise aux XIV<sup>e</sup> et XV<sup>e</sup> siècles', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 39 (1968), 88.

<sup>2</sup> Several of the merchants trading in slaves in Constantinople in the 1430s were Genoese: Bernardo Bonavita, Baoder, *Libro*, col. 178, p. 358; Polo Doxia, *ibid.*, col. 49, p. 99, col. 135, p. 272; Lodovigo Guazego, *ibid.*, col. 135, p. 272; Paris Ganbon, *ibid.*, col. 288, p. 578.

<sup>3</sup> 1301.x.7: Verlinden, 'Recrutement', p. 86, Rugerius de Rugerio, who in August 1301 sold a slave bought from the Turks, sold in October of the same year a female Greek slave whom his son had bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1301.v.15 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Benvenuto de Brixano, notaio in Candia (1301–1302)*, ed. T. Morozzo della Rocca, *Fonti relativi alla storia di Venezia*, Archivi notarili (Venice, 1950), no. 119, p. 46, Hemanuel Vergici, active in April and May 1301 selling slaves bought from the Turks, sold a slave in May of that year whom he had bought with him from Turchia; 1301.vi.6 = Benvenuto de

and Aydın both had slave markets. Ibn Battuta, who travelled in Anatolia in the early 1330s, bought a young Christian girl in Theologos for 40 *dinars*<sup>4</sup> and Demetrius Kydones, the Byzantine statesman who lived from c. 1322 to 1400, refers to the slave markets there.<sup>5</sup> Sultanhisar (Nyssa), inland from Balat, had a slave market, or at least slaves were sold there, for in 1303 a Greek female from Kadi Kalesi (Ania), close to both Theologos and Sultanhisar, was bought there from the Turks.<sup>6</sup> Slaves were also exported from Foça to Sicily.<sup>7</sup> Under the Ottomans too Balat (Palatia) was an exporting port for slaves.<sup>8</sup> There were also markets at Antalya and slaves were exported from there and from Alanya (Candelor). In 1313 a female slave who had been bought at Antalya by an inhabitant of Rhodes was manumitted in Rhodes.<sup>9</sup> Fethiye (Meğri, Makri) too apparently was a slave market at an early date, for in 1300 two inhabitants of Candia contracted to take cloth to Meğri to sell it there and then with the money from the cloth to buy three females whom they were to send back to Crete.<sup>10</sup> Slaves were also sold in Saruhan and Karası<sup>11</sup> in great numbers for according to al-'Umarī, an official in the Mamluk chancery in Cairo who wrote, among other things, an account of Anatolia and who died in 1349, the constant inflow of prisoners of war ensured that slaves in the principality of Karası were very numerous, attracting merchants who arrived daily and lived off this traffic in slaves.<sup>12</sup> Kydones refers to the slave markets of Magnesia.<sup>13</sup>

Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 172, p. 65; 1303.vii.16 in C. Verlinden, 'La Crète, débouché et plaque tournante de la traite des esclaves aux XIVe et XVe siècles' in *Studi in onore di A. Fanfani* (Milan, 1962), vol. III, p. 609, a Greek slave whom the son of the seller had bought in Turchia sold in Candia; 1304.xii.12 : Verlinden, 'Recrutement', 87, Francesco Catalano sold a female Greek slave he had bought when he was in Turchia; 1304.vi.4 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 611, sale of six Greek slaves whom the seller had bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1304.x.12 in *ibid.*, p. 612; 1304.x.7 in *ibid.*, p. 612, sale of seven slaves bought from the Turks in Turchia; 1312.ix.25 : ASV Not. Martino Doto in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', 89, manumission of a Greek slave from Rhodes, originally bought in Turchia. In 1330 a Greek, bought in Turchia, was freed in Crete, 1330.vi.28 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 626. In 1331 three women and their three children, originally from Negroponte, were sold in Candia. They had been sent from Turchia by the agent of the seller: 1331.iii.26 in *ibid.*, p. 626.

<sup>4</sup> Ibn Battuta, *Voyages*, p. 309.

<sup>5</sup> Kydones, Demetrius, *Oratio pro subsidio Latinorum*, ed. J. P. Migne *Patrologica Graecia*, vol. CLIV, col. 981/982.

<sup>6</sup> 1305.v.27 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 613.

<sup>7</sup> 1439.iii.5 = Badoer, *Libro*, col. 304, p. 610, col. 248, p. 499: 'per ser Tomà Spinola dal banche, i qual me fexe scriver Piero Chapelo per segurtà fata a Zuan Mozenigo da Modon e Aluvixe Falier, zoè a ser Tomà Spinola per so nome, su teste chargade per i diti su la nave patron Zuan Bonifatio, di poi che l'averà fato vela de le Foie finchè la serà zonta in Zezilia, a 9 per col. fo de perp. 200'.

<sup>8</sup> Pilotti, *L'Egypte*, p. 60.

<sup>9</sup> 1313.v.25 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 622.

<sup>10</sup> 1300.iii.2 = Pietro Pizolo, *Pietro Pizolo, notaio in Candia*, vol. I (1300), ed. S. Carbone, *Fonti per la Storia di Venezia*, Archivi notarili (Venice, 1978), no. 140, pp. 70–1.

<sup>11</sup> Kydones, *Pro subsidio Latinorum*, col. 981/982; S. I. Kourouses, *Μανουήλ Γαβαλάς εἵτα Ματθαῖος μητροπολίτης Ερέσσου (1271/2–1355/60)* (Athens, 1972), p. 236.

<sup>12</sup> Al-'Umarī, 'Voyages', p. 367.

<sup>13</sup> Kydones, *Pro subsidio Latinorum*, col. 981/982.

Markets also existed in Bursa and on the southern shores of the Black Sea. Slaves were taken from the Crimea to Sinop and Samsun and to Bursa.<sup>14</sup> As the Ottoman empire grew so did the locations of Turkish-controlled slave markets. Gelibolu was an important market to which Christian slaves were brought from the European part of the Ottoman empire and from where they were exported.<sup>15</sup> In the 1430s slaves were sold in Üsküp and Edirne and in the area of Belgrade.<sup>16</sup>

Many of the slaves sold in the markets of Turchia and on the Aegean islands during the fourteenth century were Greek Christians, captured by the Turks and traded not only by them but also by fellow Christians. In 1351 the expedition of Paganino Doria resulted in the capture of Marmaraeğlisi (Heraclea), on the Sea of Marmara between Silivri and Tekirdağ, and the enslavement of 766 Greeks who were subsequently sold in the slave market at Pera.<sup>17</sup> Ibn Battuta described Umur Aydınoğlu, the hero of the *Düsturname*, in which Enveri, writing in the second half of the fifteenth century, praised his many exploits against the Latins, as constantly fighting the infidel, making incursions in the area of Constantinople with his warships and taking slaves.<sup>18</sup> The slave markets of Karası were kept well supplied with a constant stream of prisoners taken in war.<sup>19</sup>

The numbers captured by the Turks were considerable, and Turkish raiding was a major problem for the Latins. Marino Sanudo Torsello, the Venetian author of the *Liber Secretorum Fidelium Crucis* who lived between c. 1270 and c. 1343, recorded 25,000 people taken prisoner by Turks during the period 1331–2.<sup>20</sup> A major battle could result in a large crop of captives. In this respect the Ottomans did well out of the battle of Nikopolis in 1396 which, according to Aşıkpaşazade, left no one in either Anatolia or Rumeli without a slave.<sup>21</sup> An unnamed Turk was able to send the Mamluk sultan, Barquq, a present of 200 Christians from among the captives he had taken.<sup>22</sup>

It was not only in major battles that Christians fell into Turkish hands. There were, of course, many more small-scale encounters. In the 1331 treaty

<sup>14</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 828, n. 100, referring to the period 1410–11.

<sup>15</sup> Pegolotti, *Pratica*, pp. 14–15, 62; Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 50, l. 9, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 54, ll. 15–16.

<sup>16</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, pp. 113, 114, 115; Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, pp. 125, 126, 127; Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>17</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 303–4. Towards the end of the century it became less acceptable to enslave Orthodox Christians and was forbidden: *ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Ibn Battuta, *Voyages*, p. 311.

<sup>19</sup> Al-'Umarī, 'Voyages', p. 367.

<sup>20</sup> 1332.iv.4 = Sanudo in Fr. Kuntsmann, *Studien über Marino Sanudo den Aelteren, Abhandlungen der historischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1855), vol. VII, no. 5, p. 797 (letter from Sanudo to the king of France).

<sup>21</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 61, l. 7, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 66, ll. 17–18.

<sup>22</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 109–10. Piloti met some of them. All were young, beautiful and hand-picked, ('tous estoient josnes, beaulx et tous eslus').

between Menteşe and Marino Morosini, the duca di Candia, Orhan, the ruler of Menteşe, agreed to release all those taken from Crete and who were then in his hands or those of his subjects.<sup>23</sup> In a later treaty between the duca di Candia and Menteşe there is a clause dealing with the problem of slaves from Crete in the lands of Menteşe. This time the emir Musa agreed to hand over to the duca's ambassador, Pietro Badoer, a number of slaves from among twenty-four who had been abducted from Setia (in eastern Crete) by Turks of Menteşe.<sup>24</sup> In a later period, Ambrogio Bernichono di Arenzano opened a court case over a slave of his whom the Ottomans had captured while fighting in the gulf of Büyükçekmece (the Gulf of Atira) just south of Istanbul between Küçükçekmece (Rhegion) and Silivri (Selembría).<sup>25</sup> Life for those who had escaped from Turkish captivity was apparently not always easy, and some at least received hand-outs. Money was given, 'per amor de Dio', in Constantinople in 1439 to a 'poveromo' who had been rescued from the hands of the Turks.<sup>26</sup>

Enslavement through capture was not just a one-way process, for the Latins too captured Turks and other Muslims whom they then sold into captivity. In the early fifteenth century the king of Cyprus seized in successive raids 1,500 subjects of the Mamluk sultan to boost his labour force in the sugar plantations on Cyprus.<sup>27</sup> In the same period a corsair, Petro de Laranda, seized a Mamluk ship at Antalya (Setalia) which he sold together with the 150 Saracens on board to the duke of Naxos, Jacopo de Crispo.<sup>28</sup> One of the accusations levelled against the former *podestà* of Pera, Lodisio Banoso, in 1402 was that he had accepted money from Leondario Grecho, factor of the Byzantine emperor, for certain Turks, captured by Leondario outside the walls of Pera 'in the place where the Jews are buried'.<sup>29</sup>

Greek slaves were common in the courts of the various beyliks at the beginning of the century. Mehmed, the emir of Aydın, had Greek pages in his palace at Birgi in the 1330s. Among the parting gifts he gave to the traveller ibn Battuta was a Greek slave called Mîhail. Mehmed's son, Umur, also presented ibn Battuta with a slave when ibn Battuta visited him at İzmir. The slave was a young Christian called Nicola.<sup>30</sup>

The Turks were active traders, selling Greek slaves to Latin merchants who had no scruples over buying and selling Orthodox Christians. There are various extant slave sales recorded in Candia in the early 1300s in which

<sup>23</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1331M, clause 2, p. 187.

<sup>24</sup> 1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1358/1359M, clause 4, pp. 217–18.

<sup>25</sup> 1403.xi.23 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 21v. See also 1403.xii.7 = *ibid.*, fo. 23r.

<sup>26</sup> 1439.iii.22 = Badoer, *Libro*, col. 327, p. 656, col. 258, p. 519.

<sup>27</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 78–9.

<sup>28</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 95–6.

<sup>29</sup> 1402.v.30 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1306, fo. 72v.

<sup>30</sup> Ibn Battuta, *Voyages*, p. 309.

Greek slaves bought from the Turks were sold in Crete.<sup>31</sup> Later, as the Ottomans advanced, the importance of captives from the Balkans in the slave markets increased. In the early 1380s many Bulgars were bought from the Ottomans by Latin merchants and subsequently sold in Candia.<sup>32</sup> Export taxes on slaves were imposed by both Menteşe and Aydın in treaties with the duca di Candia.<sup>33</sup> From the 1353 treaty it is clear that the Turks of Aydın were trading in slaves with the Genoese as well as with the Venetians, and one may presume that the Turks of Menteşe did likewise.

The Ottomans too were involved in the slave trade including the trade of slaves to Egypt. Muslim slave merchants were active at the court of the Ottoman ruler, in Edirne and Gelibolu, where they bought young slaves, sometimes as many as 100 or 200, whom they transported to Cairo where they were sold to the Mamluk sultan. These slaves were shipped from Gelibolu on Muslim vessels, or sometimes on those of Christians 'malvais et mal disposés'.<sup>34</sup> As relations between the Ottomans and the Genoese were generally good these erring Christians may well have been Genoese.

It is possible that the Ottomans pursued a more active trade policy than that followed by the emirs of Menteşe and Aydın. One of Bayezid's demands in his peace proposal presented to the Hospitallers in 1393 was that he should be able to sell slaves in Rhodes without any restrictions.<sup>35</sup> This implies that the Ottomans, in contrast to the Turks of Menteşe and Aydın, sold slaves to Latins not merely in their own markets in Turchia, but actively went out to the markets on the Aegean islands to sell. As the Muslim merchants buying slaves in the markets in Turchia for the Mamluk sultanate travelled with their merchandise to Cairo,<sup>36</sup> and as some of these

<sup>31</sup> 1304.xi.9 in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', 86–7 (a Greek female bought from the Turks); 1305.v.27 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 613 (sale of Maria de Romania de loco qui dicitur Ania, quam emi in Nasso de turchis); 1305.vi.2 in *ibid.*, p. 613 (Greek bought from Turks); 1305.vii.1 in *ibid.*, p. 614 (Costa of Chios, bought from the Turks, sold in Candia); 1305.xi.20 in *ibid.*, p. 615 and Verlinden, 'Recrutement', 88 (Eudoxia of Samos, bought originally from the Turks, bought by an inhabitant of Coron in Crete); 1306.iii.2 in *ibid.*, and Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 615 (female Greek, Erini, de loco Theologo, bought from the Turks). Other slaves, probably Greek judging by their names, were sold by the Turks: 1301.iv.8 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 1, p. 5 (Georgius); 1301.v.1 = *ibid.*, no. 68, p. 29 (Maria); 1301.vii.9 = *ibid.*, no. 222, p. 82 (Herinim); 1301.viii.1 = *ibid.*, no. 256, p. 95 (Maria). One merchant, Hemanuel Vergici, seems to have been particularly active, selling in April 1301 five slaves whom he had bought from the Turks and one in May, 1301.iv.8 = *ibid.*, no. 4, p. 6 (Anna); 1301.iv.9 = *ibid.*, no. 10, p. 8 (Maria bought from the Turks); 1301.iv.9 = *ibid.*, no. 11, p. 8 (from the Turks); 1301.iv.19 = *ibid.*, no. 46, p. 21 (Herinim from the Turks); 1301.v.15 = *ibid.*, no. 120, pp. 46–7 (Cally from the Turks).

<sup>32</sup> ASV, Notario Manoli Bresciano in Verlinden, 'Recrutement', 165.

<sup>33</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1331M, clause 3, p. 187; 1353.iv.7 = *ibid.*, doc. 1353A, clause 19, p. 214.

<sup>34</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 14–15. Piloti describes the merchants as 'payens' which I take to mean here Muslim.

<sup>35</sup> Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', pp. 96–7, citing a document from the Malta archives.

<sup>36</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, p. 15.

merchants may well have been Ottomans, it is possible that this too indicates a more adventurous trade policy than that of the beyliks.

Apart from selling, the Turks were apparently buyers of slaves, although presumably they were not as active in this field as they were as slave sellers since their territorial expansion ensured them of a constant source of slaves as booty. A Genoese document of 1413, enacted in Chios, makes it clear that the Genoese traded in slaves with the Ottomans in Turchia. Simon de Serra appointed Giovanni di Babaino as procurator to retrieve two of his slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia. If Giovanni was unable to recover these slaves, he was to get the price for them that those holding the slaves, subjects of the lords of Turchia, were accustomed to pay for slaves acquired thus or transported there by the Genoese.<sup>37</sup> Genoese transporting of slaves into Turchia is also attested in the Massaria of Caffa for 1410 to 1411 which give various references to slaves being taken from the Crimea to Sinop, Samsun and Bursa where presumably they were bought by the Ottomans. In the same period 1,080 slaves were taken from Caffa to the southern shores of the Black Sea.<sup>38</sup> In a Genoese document of 1431 Batista Macio acknowledged having taken twenty men from Lo Vati near Sevastopolis to Liminia in Turchia.<sup>39</sup> Batista had contravened a decree, issued in Caffa a year earlier, forbidding the taking of men from there to Turchia and was petitioning for this to be excused on the grounds that he did not know of the decree at the time of his transgression.<sup>40</sup>

Turks were themselves also commodities. They were bought and sold often by Genoese merchants, particularly in the slave markets of Chios and Genoa,<sup>41</sup> where 2.4 per cent of the slaves known to have been sold in the Genoese slave market between 1300 and 1408 were Turks,<sup>42</sup> as well as in

<sup>37</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filza 1 doc. 17. 'precium et preciam quod et que detentores eorum in locis Turchie et subditi dominis Turchie soliti sunt solvere ilis ad quorum vertutem sclavi ad partes illas fugiunt seu converti sunt con Januensibus'.

<sup>38</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 828, n. 100.

<sup>39</sup> Panaretos, the fifteenth-century chronicler of Trabzon, mentions the emirs of Limnia: Panaretos, *Eustathii Metropolitae Thessalonicensis Opuscula accedunt Trapezuntinae Historiae Scriptores Panaretus et Evgenicus*, ed. T.F. Tafel (Frankfurt am Main, 1832), p. 369, l. 89. They were probably the Tacüddinoğulları, who were active in the area of Terme (Themiskyra) and Çarşamba, just east of Samsun: Donald Edgar Pitcher, *An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire* (Leiden, 1972), p. 31.

<sup>40</sup> C. 1431 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 39, busta 88, doc. 440.

<sup>41</sup> eg. 1360.x.20 = ASG, Notai Ignoti XVIII.10, Raffaele di Casanova, fourth page, *recto*, enactment of the sale of a fifteen-year-old male Turkish slave, called Nicola, for 47 florins, enacted in Chios; 1404.v.15 = ASG, Notaio, Gregorio Panissario, Sc. 37, filza 1, doc. 82, Jane Crossecheri [? Crossorheri, or Crossoiheri] de Folia Vetera, sold to Nicolao de Mareo, a twenty-five-year-old male Turkish slave called Mithare for 21 gold *ducats*, enacted in Chios; 1423.v. = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Labaino, Sc. 40, filza 1, doc. 383, 1423.v.c.9 = *ibid.*, doc. 381, 1423.v.11 = *ibid.*, doc. 382, <1423>.v.14 = *ibid.*, doc. (no number). Other sales were enacted in Genoa, e.g. 1370.ii.14 = ASG, Notaio, Donato de Clavaro, Sc. 39, filza 1, doc. 374, sale of female Turkish slave of about twenty-five years, for 45 Genoese pounds.

<sup>42</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 800.

Crete,<sup>43</sup> Famagusta<sup>44</sup> and Constantinople.<sup>45</sup> The presence of Turkish slaves in Crete in the early fourteenth century is further attested by the order of the duca di Candia, Jacopo Barozzi, in 1301 that anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from the island would be fined 50 *hyperpyra* per slave.<sup>46</sup>

Turks continued to be sold as slaves in the markets of Crete throughout the fourteenth century.<sup>47</sup> Turkish slaves also appear in Venice in the fifteenth century.<sup>48</sup> In 1400 nine Turkish heads were listed among goods received from the ship of Giovanni Obizio of Venice, whose ship sailed from Venice to Ibiza. The Turks were forwarded to Valencia for sale, with a letter describing one of the slaves as a woman who could 'sew and do everything ... Your money will be well placed in her.'<sup>49</sup> Turkish slaves appear too in Pera.<sup>50</sup>

The numbers of Turkish slaves on the Aegean islands were sometimes considered a security risk. The Hospitallers on Rhodes controlled the movements of their Turkish slaves within the town.<sup>51</sup> In 1357 a decree was issued in Rhodes forbidding the keeping of Turkish slaves within the

<sup>43</sup> 1300.v.30 = Pietro Pizolo, *Notaio in Candia*, vol. I, no. 539, pp. 246–7, sale of three Turkish slaves 'nomine unus Ysilami quem vis clamare Vaxili et alius Feramardo quem vis clamare Georgium et alius Isa quem vis clamare Michali'; 1301.vi.10 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 174, pp. 65–6, the sale of a Turkish slave called Mamut, who was sold to Magister Marco, the plague doctor (*Medico plagarum*); 1301.viii.5 = *ibid.*, no. 263, p. 97, the sale of a female Turk called Berta. There is reference to a Turkish slave in Crete in 1271, Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 594; 1303.v.10 in *ibid.*, p. 609, a Genoese merchant, Nicolao de Sauro, sold his male Turkish slave in Candia; 1303.vii.20, 1303.ix.12, 1303.xii.17, 1304.v.11, 1304.ix.5 (though Verlinden suggests that from the name this slave, although described as Turkish, was in fact Greek) in *ibid.*, p. 609; 1305.vi.8, 1305.vi.10 in *ibid.*, p. 613. There is also a manumission of a Turkish slave in Candia, 1312.x.23 in *ibid.*, p. 619.

<sup>44</sup> 1301.iii.1 = Lamberto di Sambuceto in C. Desimoni, 'Actes passés à Famagouste de 1299 à 1301 par devant le notaire génois Lamberto di Sambuceto' in *Archives de l'Orient Latin* (Brussels, 1964), vol. II, no. 255, pp. 302–3; 1301.iii.1 = *ibid.*, no. 256, pp. 303–4; 1301.iii.8 = *ibid.*, no. 270, pp. 321–3; 1301.iii.28 = *ibid.*, no. 293, pp. 351–3; 1301.v.22 = *ibid.*, no. 380, pp. 456–7; 1301.iv.1 = *ibid.*, no. 331, pp. 396–7; 1301.iv.11 = *ibid.*, no. 340, pp. 404–5; 1301.vii.27 = Lamberto di Sambuceto in Romeo Pavoni, *Notai Genovesi in Oltremare. Atti Rogati a Cipro da Lamberto di Sambuceto (Gennaio–Agosto 1302)*, CSFS (Genoa, 1957), no. 20, pp. 26–7 refers to a slave from Cassaria (?Kayseri); 1301.vii.27 = *ibid.*, no. 21, pp. 27–8; 1301.ix.2 = *ibid.*, no. 78, pp. 105–6; 1301.ix.28 = *ibid.*, no. 168, pp. 206–7; 1302.iii.14 = *ibid.*, no. 122, pp. 151–2; 1302.viii.8 = *ibid.*, no. 281, pp. 336–9.

<sup>45</sup> 1305.vi.8 and 1305.vi.10 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 613, two Turks who had been sold in Constantinople were sold again in Crete.

<sup>46</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 605.

<sup>47</sup> 1329.vi.29 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 626, sale of a Turk bought in Caffa; 1331.x.1 in *ibid.*, p. 627; 1332.iii.24 in *ibid.*, p. 627; 1381.xi.9 in *ibid.*, p. 635, sale of three Turks from Alto Loco; 1382.iv.30 in *ibid.*, p. 638; 1382.v.23 in *ibid.*, p. 640.

<sup>48</sup> Verlinden, 'Recrutement', pp. 84, 171. Verlinden, *ibid.*, 171–2, gives examples of Turkish slave sales in Venice in 1410, 1418, 1428, 1434, 1444 and 1456.

<sup>49</sup> 1400.ix.1 = Iris Origo, *The Merchant of Prato, Francesco di Marco Datini* (London, 1957), p. 99 and note 41, citing Archivio Datini.

<sup>50</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r, a court case over Turkish slaves. 1403.xii.3 = *ibid.*, fos. 58v–59r, a case concerning a Turkish slave who had fled from Pera.

<sup>51</sup> Luttrell, 'Hospitallers', p. 87.

fortified town or sending them with the Brethren's horses to collect grass or hay. One Turkish slave was however permitted to each hostel.<sup>52</sup> In Crete there was a series of instructions from the senate concerning Turkish slaves on the island. Before 1313 there was a ban imposed on importing slaves except Turks and Tatars. This was perhaps a defensive measure occasioned by fear of a Greek revolt and directed against Greek slaves.<sup>53</sup> Later, however, fear of the Turks resulted in various controls. In 1341 the Venetian authorities ordered that only those Turks captured in attacks could be brought into Crete and that these captives had to be taken out of the island after six months. Various penalties were imposed on those bringing in any Turks who had not been captured and on anyone buying such a Turk.<sup>54</sup> Towards the end of the century the senate gave instructions that all captured Turks were to be sent to Crete where they were to work only for the commune. If any official used these Turks for his own purposes he was to be fined 5 *hyperpyra* per slave.<sup>55</sup> In 1363 the Venetian senate doubled the penalty for contravention of the law on Turks being sold as slaves in Crete, as the numbers of Turkish slaves were considered too great.<sup>56</sup> Even when in pressing need of slaves, the Cretan authorities, while encouraging the importation of slaves into the island, prohibited the import of Turks.<sup>57</sup> A few years later, however, the Venetian senate ordered the authorities in Negroponte to send twenty-five Turks to work in Crete.<sup>58</sup> In the early fifteenth century shortage of labour was also a problem on Cyprus.<sup>59</sup>

That the number of Turkish slaves was also high in Pera seems possibly indicated by a court case of 1403 over the imprisonment of a female Saracen who was in prison together with many other Turkish slaves.<sup>60</sup>

Clearly the slave trade was a profitable enterprise both for the Turks and for the Latin merchants. It is however extremely difficult to establish a clear

<sup>52</sup> A. Luttrell, 'Slavery at Rhodes: 1306–1440', *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* fasc. 46–7 (1976–7), 86–7.

<sup>53</sup> This ban was revoked in 1313. 1313.x.1 = Paola Ratti Vidulich, *Duca di Candia Bandi (1313–1329)* (Venice, 1965), no. 1, p. 5.

<sup>54</sup> 1341.iii.6 = S. Theotokes, *Ἱστορικὰ Κρητικά Ἐγγραφα ἠκδοῦμενα ἡς τοῦ Ἀρχείου τῆς Βενετίας Μνημεῖα τῆς, Ἑλληνικῆς, Ἱστορίας* Academy of Athens, (Athens, 1933–1937), vols I/2, II.1–2 vol. III/1, no. 25, pp. 205–6. See also 1357.vi.26 = *ibid.*, II/2, no. 5, pp. 51–2.

<sup>55</sup> 1393.iii.11 = H. Noiret, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire de la domination vénitienne en Crète de 1380 à 1485* (Paris, 1892), p. 55.

<sup>56</sup> 1363.vi.8 : Thiriet, *Régestes*, vol. I, no. 410, pp. 106–7; 1363.vi.8 = Theotokes, *Ἱστορικὰ Κρητικά* vol. II/2, no. 12, p. 110.

<sup>57</sup> 1393.iii.11 = Noiret, *Documents*, pp. 54–5.

<sup>58</sup> 1405.xii.15 = Noiret, *Documents*, p. 163.

<sup>59</sup> The king of Cyprus, in reply to the ambassadors of the Mamluk sultan who were endeavouring to arrange for the ransom of a large number of the sultan's subjects, seized in successive raiding by the king, said that he needed those he had seized to work the land: 'le roy respondist que lez .M. et .v.C. Sarasins qu'il avoit prins estoit pou au grant besoing que l'isole de Chipre en avoit: car elle avoit grant besoing de laboreus qui laborassent lez terres pour faire sucre' (Piloti, *L'Egypte*, p. 79).

<sup>60</sup> 1403.xi.13 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 57v. But see Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. I, p. 306.



picture of slave prices in Turchia and the other markets of the eastern Mediterranean. Various factors affected the price of slaves in general, such as age, looks and health. The condition of a slave at purchase was very important and accusations of imperfections could lead to court action. In 1423 a case was tried in Genoa over the sale of a female slave, described as a Bulgar from Turchia. The case arose because the slave had suffered from 'falling sickness' ('morbus caducus'), presumably epilepsy, since she had received a blow on the head when captured. She had been in Turchia, sold in Chios and transported from there by ship to Genoa. The case was an attempt to have the sale declared invalid because of the contention that the slave had already been ill at the time of purchase.<sup>61</sup>

Among the various specific factors influencing the price rate in Anatolia in this period were political developments in the area which affected not only the local markets but those further away. Prices in Genoa, for example, rose at the beginning of the fourteenth century to between 15 and 16 *libri*<sup>62</sup> as a result of the Venetian–Genoese war of Curzola (1294–9) which cut easy communications between Italy and the markets of the eastern Mediterranean. The later war between Genoa and Venice, the war of Chioggia, as well as troubles in Caffa with the Tatars of Solgat caused a price increase between 1375 and 1385 to 62 *libri* for female slaves and 54 for male. Some years later Ottoman success and that of Timur again interrupted the trade and caused another price rise.<sup>63</sup>

Natural disasters too disturbed the slave trade. A letter sent to the merchant Francesco Datini from Genoa in 1393 informed him that there would be only a few slaves from Romania because of the outbreak of plague there.<sup>64</sup> Another factor that affected the price of Turkish slaves in Genoa was that Turkish and Saracen slaves were apparently less valued on the Genoese market, particularly at the beginning of the fourteenth century, than Bulgars, Russians, Circassians and Tatars.<sup>65</sup>

One of the factors accounting for fluctuating prices through the fourteenth and first half of the fifteenth centuries was the quantity of slaves on the market. At the end of the thirteenth century the price of a Turkish slave

<sup>61</sup> 1423.v. = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Labaino, Sc. 40, filza 1, doc. 383, 1423.v.c.9 = *ibid.*, doc. 381, 1423.v.11 = *ibid.*, doc. 382, <1423>.v.14 = *ibid.*, doc. (no number).

<sup>62</sup> Around 1300 11 Genoese *soldi* were equal to 1 *hyperpyron*: Spufford, *Handbook*, p. 288; Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 653.

<sup>63</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, pp. 814–15.

<sup>64</sup> I. Origo, 'The domestic enemy: Eastern slaves in Tuscany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries', *Speculum* 30 (1955), 331, referring to a letter of 1393.ii.17 from Datini to his wife Margherita in which he said that he had heard from Genoa that there would be few slaves arriving from Romania 'for they say that in that country there are many dead and dying from the plague, and those who do come die on board'.

<sup>65</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 811. Slave prices also varied in the Mamluk sultanate according to the origin of the slave. Tatars were the most expensive (130–40 *ducats*), followed by Circassians (110–20 *ducats*), Greeks (90 *ducats*), Albanians, Dalmatians and Serbs (70–80 *ducats*) (Piloti, *L'Egypte*, p. 15).

fell below that of a sheep as a result of the military successes of the Byzantine general Philanthropenos.<sup>66</sup> In 842/1438–9, conquests, this time those of the Ottomans, again caused the price of slaves to fall so that beautiful young females sold, in lots of three, for only 100 *akçes* (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*).<sup>67</sup> The Ottoman success of 841/1437–8 in Hungary resulted in so much booty that a four-year-old boy was sold at Üsküp for 20 *akçes* (c.1.9 *hyperpyra*).<sup>68</sup> In the same year the Ottoman chronicler Aşıkpaşazade himself captured five slaves whom he sold in Üsküp for 900 *akçes* (c.85.7 *hyperpyra*)<sup>69</sup> while, in the following year, he sold captives in Edirne for 100 *akçes* for two, and 100 *akçes* for three slaves (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*).<sup>70</sup> The Belgrade market seems to have been less affected by the numbers of captives for Aşıkpaşazade bought a six- to seven-year-old boy there for 100 *akçes* (c.9.5 *hyperpyra*), while female slaves fetched 150 *akçes* (c.14.3 *hyperpyra*).<sup>71</sup> These figures, particularly that of 100 *akçes* for three females, are extremely low. Even if one does not accept their accuracy at face value but allows for some exaggeration, they still show to what an extent a glut on the market could push prices down.

Slaves were clearly an important source of income in Turchia, and both Menteşe and Aydın imposed export duties on them. Slaves exported from Menteşe were taxed in 1331 at the rate of 10 *aspers* per slave,<sup>72</sup> the same rate applying in 1407,<sup>73</sup> while those from Aydın too were taxed under the 1353 treaty between the emir Hızır and the duca di Candia although no specific rate is given, the treaty only specifying that the Venetians were to pay on slaves at the same rates as the Rhodians and the Genoese.<sup>74</sup>

It has been argued on the basis of the treaties between Menteşe, Aydın and Venice that slaves were sold in Menteşe for an average of 24 *hyperpyra* (12 *ducats*),<sup>75</sup> as this was the fine imposed on anyone abducting a slave and payable to the slave's master, while that in Aydın was perhaps around 30

<sup>66</sup> Planoudes, *Mamimi monachi Planudis epistolae*, ed. M. Treu (Breslau, 1890), letter 78, p. 99.

<sup>67</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 117, 5–6, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 128, ll. 15–16. The Istanbul edition says slave girls sold for this figure, while the Giese edition specifies that they were sold in threes for 100 *akçes*.

<sup>68</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 114, l. 16, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 126, l. 18.

<sup>69</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 115, ll. 8–9, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 127, ll. 9–10.

<sup>70</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 113, ll. 20–21, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 125, ll. 21–22.

<sup>71</sup> Aşıkpaşazade, *Altosmanische Chronik*, p. 113, ll. 12–13, Aşıkpaşazade, *Tevarih-i al-i 'Osman*, p. 125, ll. 15. The Istanbul edition does not give the age of the slave, nor the price for females.

<sup>72</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1331M, clause 3, p. 187.

<sup>73</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1407M, clause 20, p. 236.

<sup>74</sup> 1353.iv.7 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1353A, clause 19, p. 214.

<sup>75</sup> I give throughout the actual figure as it appears in the original source and convert it, where necessary, into *hyperpyra* and *ducats* for ease of comparison. During most of the fourteenth century the ratio of *ducat* to *hyperperon* was approximately 1:2, and for the end of the century and the beginning of the next was 1:3.

*hyperpyra* (15 *ducats*), the amount of the fine imposed in the 1348 treaty with Hızır.<sup>76</sup> However, a young Greek female was sold at Theologos in the early 1330s for 40 gold *dinars* (92 *hyperpyra*, 46 *ducats*).<sup>77</sup> Presumably she was particularly attractive, but even so the discrepancy between the proposed average for Aydın in 1348 and ibn Battuta's purchase price is considerable. The same discrepancy appears for slaves sold in Menteşe. Two Greeks were sold in Balat (Palatia) in 1355 for 92 *hyperpyra* (46 *ducats*), again in sharp contrast to the suggested average price based on the fines imposed in the treaty.<sup>78</sup> Fines in general do not seem a reliable guide for slave prices, particularly in view of the fine of 50 *hyperpyra* per slave imposed by the duca di Candia, Jacopo Barozzi, in 1301 on anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from the island.<sup>79</sup> In comparison the average price for slaves on the Cretan market in the early fourteenth century was 8 *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*) for males and 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*) for females.<sup>80</sup> Clearly the fine here bears very little relation to the average sale price.

One might be able to suggest some sort of price guide by looking at what was paid for slaves, originally bought from the Turks and subsequently sold in Crete. (See tables 4.1 and 4.2.)

The Latin merchants who had bought the slaves from the Turks expected to make a profit by selling them in Crete. The prices therefore should reflect both the cost of transporting the slaves and the profit margin set by the merchants. The average price of slaves originally bought in Turchia and sold in Crete was approximately 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*) per slave. This average is probably applicable only to females as all but one of the slaves in the list of those from Turchia sold in Crete are women, the resulting average figure tallying with that of the average female price on the Cretan market. Therefore the price in Turchia for, presumably, females must have been less than 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*). The average price of a male slave on the Cretan market in the early fourteenth century was 8 *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*).<sup>81</sup> Presumably, therefore, the average price of male slaves in Turchia was less than this figure.

By the 1330s slave prices in Turchia had presumably risen, for it is likely that the increased strength of the beyliks would have been reflected in their ability to insist on higher prices for the goods they sold. At the same time Menteşe imposed an export tax on slaves taken from its territories under its treaty with Venetian Crete. Orhan imposed a tax of 10 *aspers* (0.88 of a

<sup>76</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 162; 1337.pre iv.= *ibid.*, doc. 1337M, clause 18, pp. 197–8; 1348.viii.18 = *ibid.*, doc. 1348A, clause 23, p. 210; 1375.iv.22 = *ibid.*, doc. 1375M, clause 18, p. 221; 1403.vii.24 = *ibid.*, doc. 1403M and doc. 1403M DVL, clause 18, p. 230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid.*, doc. 1407M, clause 18, p. 236.

<sup>77</sup> Ibn Battuta, *Voyages*, p. 309.

<sup>78</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 163, n. 680. <sup>79</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 605.

<sup>80</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 161. <sup>81</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 161.

Table 4.1. *Prices of Turkish slaves sold in Crete, 1301*

Date	Description	Price	Source
1301.vi.10	1 male	27 hyperpyra 2 grossi	Benvenuto de Brixano, <i>Notaio in Candia</i> , no. 174, pp. 65–6
1301.viii.5	1 female	22 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 263, p. 97

Table 4.2. *Prices of slaves bought originally from Turks and sold in Crete, 1301 and 1304*

Date	Description	Price	Source
1301.iv.8	1 male	14 hyperpyra	Benvenuto de Brixano, <i>Notaio in Candia</i> , no. 1, p. 5
1301.iv.8	1 female	18 hyperpyra, 1 grosso	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 4, p. 6
1301.iv.9	1 female	25 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 10, p. 8
1301.iv.9	1 female	28 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 11, p. 8
1301.iv.9	1 female	27 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 46, p. 21
1301.iv.27	1 female	20 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 63, p. 27
1301.v.1	1 female	14 gold hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 68, p. 29
1301.v.15	1 female	18 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 119, p. 46
1301.v.15	1 female	18 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 120, pp. 46–7
1301.vi.6	1 female	6 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 172, p. 65
1301.vii.9	1 female	15 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 222, p. 82
1301.viii.1	1 female	17 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , no. 256, p. 95
1304.x.7	1 female, Greek	9 hyperpyra	Verlinden, ‘Recrutement’, 86
1304.xi.8	1 female, Greek	15 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , 86
1304.xii.12	1 female, Greek	11 hyperpyra	<i>ibid.</i> , 87

*hyperpyron*, 0.44 of a *ducat*) per slave taken out of the beylik while that for horses was 3 *aspers* (0.26 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.13 of a *ducat*) per animal and for cattle 2 *aspers* (0.16 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.08 of a *ducat*).<sup>82</sup> If, as would seem reasonable to assume, a similar tax was imposed by the emir of Menteşe on other western merchants, this tax would presumably be reflected in the prices of slaves bought in Turchia and sold elsewhere by western merchants. Therefore one may assume that by the 1330s the prices paid for slaves in Turchia was higher than that paid at the beginning of the century.

The proposition that there was a rise in prices is supported by the rise in slave rates in Crete where, in the 1330s, the average price for women was between 31 and 55 *hyperpyra* (15.5 and 27.5 *ducats*) and for men between 25 and 36 *hyperpyra* (12.5 and 18 *ducats*).<sup>83</sup> Thus the prices in Crete had increased in the thirty years from the beginning of the century by approximately 100–300 per cent for female slaves and by 300–450 per cent for men. Such a price rise in Crete over such a short period is striking. It is in part explained by the increase in demand for slaves on the island and by the greater organisation of the Cretan market,<sup>84</sup> but this does not seem perhaps sufficient to account for such an increase. It may also be partly explained by the political development in Turchia at that time. The Turkish beyliks were becoming more powerful political units, more stable and more able to hold their own in the international market, while at the same time Turchia continued to be an important slave market, constantly replenished with slaves brought in from the incessant Turkish raids and conquests. Perhaps the high price in Crete for slaves in the 1330s is a reflection of this increased Turkish muscle.

Prices in Crete do not appear to have risen during the middle years of the century and in the 1360s the average price of a female slave was 35 *hyperpyra* (17.5 *ducats*).<sup>85</sup> This is surprising when one considers how eager the Venetian senate was to import slaves to work the land, Crete suffering from an acknowledged lack of manpower, and in view of the effect of the Black Death on slave markets in general.<sup>86</sup> While it is true that the Black Death wiped out slave owners as well as slaves, thus reducing the number of potential buyers, the plague must have carried off a higher proportion of the weaker and undernourished members of the society, including slaves, than of those in a fitter condition and with the ability to escape the approaching plague by moving elsewhere. After the outbreak of the Black

<sup>82</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1331M, clause 3, p. 187. One should however note that the same rate was levied in the 1407 treaty between Crete and Menteşe, 1407.vi.2 = *ibid.*, doc. 1407M, clause 20, p. 236, thus possibly undermining the significance of the rate as a guide to slave prices.

<sup>83</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 161.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.* <sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> After the scarcity caused by the Black Death, the council of the *Rogati* offered rewards for those who found slaves who had fled: Paola Ratti Vidulich, *Duca di Candia, Quatenus (1340–1350)* (Venice, 1976), pp. 129–30.

Death prices in Genoa increased steeply to an average between 1350 and 1360 of 55 *libri* for women, 35 *libri* for men. Perhaps this apparent stability in the slave price on Crete is again connected with political developments in Turchia, or rather within the Ottoman state, for by the 1360s the state was expanding rapidly and possibly creating a glut of slaves on the markets in the eastern Mediterranean. After around 1360 the prices did fall in Genoa due to the large number of slaves on the market and settled at between 37 and 40 *libri*.

At the same time however the strength of the new Ottoman state should have ensured that it was able to charge more than the less powerful beyliks. Certainly by the 1380s the average price in Crete of female slaves had risen considerably to 96 *hyperpyra* (48 *ducats*),<sup>87</sup> representing a 275 per cent increase on the average price in the 1360s, with men fetching an average of 64 *hyperpyra* (32 *ducats*).

With these apparently huge percentage increases in prices through the fourteenth century one must bear in mind that they may not have been real increases but rather, in part at least, the result of currency devaluation. The Genoese pound, for example, lost 50 per cent of its value against silver and 33 per cent against gold during the fourteenth century.<sup>88</sup> Similarly the ratio of *ducat* to *hyperpyra* was approximately 1:2 for most of the fourteenth century, but 1:3 for the end of the century and the beginning of the next.<sup>89</sup>

The price of slaves sold in Crete may form some sort of guideline to slave prices in Turchia. If one turns to the average prices in the slave market on Chios, however, the picture seems surprisingly different. Between 1359 and 1412 the average price, which did not fluctuate greatly nor vary between the sexes, was 60 to 70 *hyperpyra* (20 to 35 *ducats*) for the first part of the period, 90 to 105 *hyperpyra* (30 to 35 *ducats*) for the end of the century and the beginning of the next.<sup>90</sup> Chios is in this respect different from the markets in Crete and Genoa. It seems odd, considering the various political upheavals affecting prices in markets in the same area, that prices did not rise too in Chios, particularly in view of the island's proximity to Turchia and the strength of its trade links with Turkish territory. Fluctuations on the Turkish market should therefore appear also on Chios. That there was no increase in Turkish slave prices does not seem credible, but it is hard to explain why such increases were not represented in Chian prices. Perhaps this is a reflection of the randomness of extant sources rather than a genuine reflection of the position at that time. The Chian slave market also differed from the markets of Genoa and Crete in that there was no apparent distinction made between male and female prices. In Genoa female slaves

<sup>87</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 162.

<sup>88</sup> Balard, *Romanie génoise*, vol. II, p. 814.

<sup>89</sup> Bertelé, 'Iperpero byzantino', 84.

<sup>90</sup> Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. I, pp. 309–10.

were always more expensive than male.<sup>91</sup> This is also true of slaves in Crete.<sup>92</sup>

Another important market in the region was Constantinople. Prices charged there may be taken as some sort of guide to Turkish slave prices, for the Constantinople market would presumably not have been so divergent from Turkish markets, and its prices thus not extremely different from those charged in Turchia. The average slave price in Constantinople in the 1430s seems to have been in the region of 97 *hyperpyra* for all slaves, female slaves again fetching more than males, on average 108 *hyperpyra* to 101 *hyperpyra*.<sup>93</sup> These figures are in line roughly with those for Chios at the end of the fourteenth century of 90–105 *hyperpyra* and with the price on Crete in the same period for female slaves of around 96 *hyperpyra*, though considerably more than the male slave price there of 64 *hyperpyra*. These figures seem to indicate a certain stability in the slave market, with no great fluctuations in price between the end of the fourteenth century and the 1430s, or, even if there was a sharp price increase or decrease at some time during this period, it was temporary.

In order to gain some comprehension of the real value of slaves it is perhaps useful to compare their prices with those of other commodities on the market. Professor Balard has calculated that in comparison with grain, slaves in Genoa were an expensive commodity.<sup>94</sup> Slaves were certainly of greater value than livestock exported from the beylik of Menteşe as the export tax imposed on them in 1331 was 10 *aspers* per slave while that for horses was 3 *aspers* (0.26 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.13 of a *ducat*) per animal, and for cattle 2 *aspers* (0.16 of a *hyperpyron*, 0.08 of a *ducat*).<sup>95</sup> However, the tax rate may not be an altogether reliable guide as over seventy years later the same rate was again imposed on exported slaves.<sup>96</sup>

Apart from straightforward buying and selling, slaves represented another form of income generation: ransom. This was used not only between Christians and Muslims but also between Christians and fellow Christians. In 1301 Notara Sevasto, the son of Paulus Notaropulus, was sold by Filippo Bicontolo, Nicolao de La Fasina, Marcelino de Ancona and Andrea Çerbino who had captured him rebelling against the doge and commune of Venice. When his ransom arrived 6,050 *hyperpyra* were to be handed over for him.<sup>97</sup> The ransom clearly represented a profit, as in August of the same year Michaelē, the son of Giovanni Maselo, sold to

<sup>91</sup> Balard, *Romanie g noise*, vol. II, p. 812.

<sup>92</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, pp. 161–2.

<sup>93</sup> See appendix 2 below.

<sup>94</sup> Balard, *Romanie g noise*, vol. II, p. 815.

<sup>95</sup> 1331.iv.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1331M, clause 3, p. 187.

<sup>96</sup> 1407.vi.2 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1407M, clause 20, p. 236.

<sup>97</sup> 1301.vii.5 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, nos. 215, 216, 217, p. 79. See also 1301.viii.6 = *ibid.*, no. 281, pp. 103–4; 1301.viii.6 = *ibid.*, no. 282, p. 104; 1301.viii.21 = *ibid.*, no. 305, p. 112. In documents 281 and 305 the captured man is called Michael  Notara and in 282 Michael  Notara Sevasto, most probably the title Σεβαστ ς.

Giovanni Bicontolo the whole of his part of the profit which was to accrue from the ransom of Notara Sevasto.<sup>98</sup> In the same year, 1301, Phylipachis de Caristo sold two slaves, with the proviso that should they wish to ransom themselves through their relatives, they should be allowed to do so.<sup>99</sup> A similar clause was included in the deed of sale enacted again by Phylipachis in the same month when selling a Greek whom he had captured in Samos. If the slave's father or any of his relations should wish to ransom him, then this was to be agreed to.<sup>100</sup> The same condition was imposed on the sale of a female Greek slave from Samos, sold in Candia in 1300.<sup>101</sup>

Ransoming also took place between Turks and Latins, with Latins arranging ransoms from those held by the Turks and vice versa. In 1369 a ransom of 130 *ducats* was paid to Turks for three Venetians,<sup>102</sup> while, several years later, Nicolao Maximo was ransomed for 150 *ducats*, a large sum indicating his importance.<sup>103</sup> Expenses incurred by Petro de Groto in ransoming one of his slaves of Caffa from the Turks appears in the account books of the commune of Genoa for 1392.<sup>104</sup> In 1408 a Greek woman was in Genoa making arrangements about the money she owed for being ransomed from the Turks.<sup>105</sup> Sometimes those ransomed merely ending up swapping masters. In 1304 two Greeks of Leros, enslaved by the Turks, agreed to be the slaves of the inhabitant of Candia who had ransomed them,<sup>106</sup> and in the same year another Greek acknowledged himself to be the slave of Filippo de Milano who too had arranged his ransom.<sup>107</sup>

It seems that this system of ransoming was also used by the Turks to ransom back from the Christians. In 1403 Giovanni Centuriono made a complaint against Giuliano de Levanto, accusing him of taking from his house without his knowledge or permission his two Turkish slaves, whom he had bought from Guilliemo de Turino, and first imprisoning them and then selling one of them and sending the other to Genoa. Giovanni called for Giuliano to be made to pay the ransom of 2,000 *aspers* for each of these slaves and the 1,000 *aspers* which he had paid to Leonardo Constantio for a slave of his whom they had sent to Turchia to get the ransom for the slaves.<sup>108</sup> From this it appears that Giovanni was intending to ransom his Turkish slaves and in order to do so had sent another of his slaves,

<sup>98</sup> 1301.viii.6 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 282, p. 104.

<sup>99</sup> 1301.vii.16 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 236, p. 87.

<sup>100</sup> 1301.vii.9 = Benvenuto de Brixano, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 220, p. 81.

<sup>101</sup> 1300.iii.7 = Pietro Pizolo, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 173, p. 85.

<sup>102</sup> 1369.ix.6 : Elisabeth Santschi, *Regestes des arrêts civils et des Mémoires (1363–1399) des Archives du Duc de Crète*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut Hellénique d'Etudes Byzantines et Post-byzantines de Venise 9 (Venice, 1976), no. 170, p. 39.

<sup>103</sup> 1394.iv.6 : Santschi, *Regestes*, no. 354, p. 90.

<sup>104</sup> 1392.iv.19 = ASG, Antico Comune 22, fos. 76, 194.

<sup>105</sup> 1408.v.19 = ASG, Notario, Johannis de Alegro, C.472, fo. 273r–v.

<sup>106</sup> 1304.v.8 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 611.

<sup>107</sup> 1304.vii.6 in Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 612.

<sup>108</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 58r.



presumably either Turkish or Turkish speaking, to Turchia to organise payment. Possibly Giuliano paid the 1,000 *aspers* to Leonardo Constantio for the slave's passage.

In the same year Giuliano di Palma made a complaint against the *podestà* Janoto Lomellino. According to Giuliano, he had nine Turkish slaves whom he and his partners (*socii*) had captured and whom Giuliano had bought from his partners. Of these, two were in his own house, the other seven having escaped from prison. Giuliano accused Janoto of sending his officials to take the two slaves from his house against his will. Giuliano was therefore claiming the 3,000 Turkish silver *aspers* he was expecting as ransom from the slaves' relations.<sup>109</sup> From a further document on the case it appears that Giuliano had had nine Turkish slaves in prison but that they had escaped. Giuliano managed to recapture three, of whom one had broken his leg falling from the walls of Pera in his attempt to flee and died in Giuliano's house. Giuliano kept the remaining two slaves in his house expecting the ransom of 1,500 *aspers* each from their relations. These two were removed from Giuliano's house on orders of the then *podestà* and put into prison.<sup>110</sup>

In reply to these charges Janoto Lomellino, claiming that Bartolomeo Rubeo was in fact *podestà* at the time, said it was known that Giuliano had committed many acts of piracy against the Turks and had disregarded the orders of the *podestà*. Giuliano had, according to Janoto, received under promise the said Turks and their ransom which they gave to him. Not content with this ransom, he had kept the slaves to sell them. Peace had then been arranged with the Turks<sup>111</sup> under which it was agreed that all Turks and especially those who were detained by Giuliano were to be released. Janoto and the *podestà* Bartolomeo took the slaves held by Giuliano and handed them over to the ambassadors of the Turks who had come to complete the peace.<sup>112</sup> In evidence Giuliano de Levanto confirmed that the slaves were handed over to a certain Turk who came to ask for them. Giuliano explained that he had not actually seen the handover himself but had been told about it by his partner (*socius*) Giovanni de Monte, who had freed the slaves on the orders of Janoto.<sup>113</sup>

While it is thus clear that ransoming between the Turks and the Latins, as a two-way process, did take place, the mechanism by which it was organised is very obscure. It seems possible that in the case of Latins ransoming from the Turks, people, either going to Turchia or sent there specially, were charged with paying the ransom and, possibly, collecting the person

<sup>109</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r.

<sup>110</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 45r.

<sup>111</sup> This is presumably in connection with the interregnum following Bayezid's defeat at the battle of Ankara in 1402.

<sup>112</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r–v.

<sup>113</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 45v.

ransomed. In 1327 Andreas de Raynaldo, who was about to set out for Turchia, received from a Greek in Crete 55 *hyperpyra* for the ransom of his daughter, a slave in Turchia of a Turkish paşa called Murad.<sup>114</sup> As for Turks ransoming from the Latins it seems possible that the ambassadors were used as intermediaries. This was certainly the case when the Mamluk sultan Barsbay (1422–37) dispatched an ambassador to endeavour to ransom 1,500 of his subjects seized by the king of Cyprus.<sup>115</sup> The Turkish slaves held in Pera in 1403 were, on the conclusion of peace, handed over to the Turkish ambassadors,<sup>116</sup> while the Turkish ambassador, Petro Longo, was to receive from the *podestà* Dexterino de Podio payment for a Turkish or Bulgar slave who had fled from Turchia to Chios and was then in the possession of Michael Neamonitus.<sup>117</sup>

Apart from these official channels it appears that people may have acted on their own. Giovanni Centuriono sent a slave to Turchia to organise the ransoming of the Turkish slaves he held.<sup>118</sup> In 1413 Simon de Serra appointed a procurator to recover his two slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia. The procurator, Giovanni de Babaino, was to track down whoever was holding them, to sell them and to send the money back to Simon.<sup>119</sup> Although this is not a case of ransoming, presumably the same procedure would have been used in locating those missing. The ransom could also be arranged through the slave concerned who then presumably furnished the information necessary to contact his or her relations. In 1403 Giuliano di Palma sued Janoto Lomellino for the 3,000 *aspers* he had agreed as ransom with his two Turkish slaves and their relatives.<sup>120</sup>

It seems also that Turks who had money, or goods, with them could pay their own ransom. In the case against Janoto Lomellino brought by Giuliano di Palma in 1403, Janoto alleged that the Turks whom Giuliano held had paid their own ransom to him, but that, finding this ransom insufficient, Giuliano had detained them for sale.<sup>121</sup> This seems to have applied not only to Turks. In 1300 a Greek female slave from Samos was sold in Crete with the proviso that should she wish to ransom herself so that she could return to Samos, then the buyer was to accept this.<sup>122</sup> It may be that the sum required from the slave as a ransom was high, for in Majorca,

<sup>114</sup> 1327.viii.16, Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 625.

<sup>115</sup> Piloti, *L'Egypte*, pp. 79, 95–103.

<sup>116</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r–v.

<sup>117</sup> 1403.x.3 = ASG, Notaio, Gregorio Panissario, Sc. 37, filza 1, doc. 21.

<sup>118</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 58r.

<sup>119</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filza 1, doc. 17. Giovanni de Babaino was not apparently successful for in 1414.vi.13 = *ibid.*, doc. 293, Simon appointed another procurator to find his missing slaves.

<sup>120</sup> 1403.xii.1 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r.

<sup>121</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 44r–v.

<sup>122</sup> 1300.iii.7 = Pizolo, *Notaio in Candia*, no. 173, p. 85.

for example, at the beginning of the fourteenth century slaves wishing to ransom themselves had to pay very highly indeed.<sup>123</sup>

Ransoming was therefore an alternative way of earning money from slaves, as opposed to selling them. Presumably, ransoming could be more lucrative on occasion for, while there were many slaves on the market, the relatives concerned wanted only one particular person back. Therefore the ransom demanded could be much higher than the price of the slave as a commodity. This certainly seems to have been the case with Maghribians captured by Catalans or vice versa at the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries.<sup>124</sup> It seems that the Genoese, and presumably other Latins, carried out raids in which they took captives whom they then imprisoned while contacting their relations and organising a satisfactory ransoming. Turkish slaves were certainly present in the prison in Pera at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Guilielmo de Turino was accused of imprisoning the slaves of Giuliano de Levanto before selling one and sending the other to Genoa.<sup>125</sup> Giuliano di Palma kept in prison nine Turkish slaves whom he and his partners (*socii*) had captured.<sup>126</sup> Another document of the same period refers to many Turkish slaves in the prison in Pera.<sup>127</sup> If the slaves were not kept there for this purpose it is difficult to think up any other explanation.

Even without imprisonment slaves seem to have had a somewhat miserable existence which presumably accounts for the great prevalence of runaway slaves, a constant theme in the relations between the Turks and the Genoese and Venetians in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The Arab traveller ibn Battuta also suffered from the problem of escaping slaves while travelling in Anatolia in the 1330s. When staying at Manisa, in the beylik of Saruhan, one of his slaves fled in the direction of Phokaea, together with another slave and ibn Battuta's horses. They were, however, all recaptured and returned to ibn Battuta the following day.<sup>128</sup>

The problem of slaves running away either from Turks to Latins or vice versa appears at the very beginning of the fourteenth century. In 1301 Jacopo Barozzi, the duca di Candia, imposed a fine of 50 *hyperpyra* per slave on anyone helping Turkish, Greek or Saracen slaves to escape from Crete.<sup>129</sup> As the average price for slaves on the Cretan market in the same period was 8 *hyperpyra* (4 *ducats*) for males and 17 *hyperpyra* (8.5 *ducats*)

<sup>123</sup> C. E. Dufourcq, 'Prix et niveau de vie dans les pays catalans et maghribins à la fin du XIIIe et au début du XIVe siècles', *Le Moyen Age*, 4th series, 20 (1965), 502–3. Among the examples Dufourcq gives is that of a woman bought for 460 *sous* who had to pay a ransom of 920 *sous*.

<sup>124</sup> Dufourcq, 'Prix et niveau', 501–4. On occasion the ransom was incomparably higher than the slave price by as much, according to Dufourcq, as ten times.

<sup>125</sup> 1403.xii.4 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 58r.

<sup>126</sup> 1403.xii.12 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, f.45r.

<sup>127</sup> 1430.xi.13 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 57v.

<sup>128</sup> Ibn Battuta, *Voyages*, pp. 313–14. <sup>129</sup> Verlinden, 'Crète', p. 605.

for females<sup>130</sup> the scale of the problem for the Cretan authorities is obvious. This problem recurs in Venetian treaties throughout the fourteenth century. A clause of the 1337 treaty between the duca di Candia and İbrahim, emir of Menteşe, stated that if a slave fled taking goods with him, the goods were to be restored though the slave remained free; and if a master or pilot of a ship knowingly took a slave on board, he was to pay 12 *florins* to the slave's master.<sup>131</sup> This clause is repeated in the 1375 treaty between Ahmed, emir of Menteşe, and the duca di Candia<sup>132</sup> with similar clauses appearing in the 1403 and 1407 treaties between İlyas, emir of Menteşe and the duca di Candia.<sup>133</sup> Musa, emir of Menteşe, made a treaty in 1358 with the duca di Candia in which he promised to hand over to the duca's ambassador certain slaves whom he had in his lands, to search diligently for the rest of these slaves, still missing, and to hand them back should they be found.<sup>134</sup> A clause dealing with runaway slaves also appears in the 1348 treaty between the Sancta Unio and Hızır of Aydın which specified the payment of 15 *florins* by the party that received a runaway slave to the party from whom the slave had fled. Any goods the slave had taken from his master were to be handed back.<sup>135</sup>

The problem of runaway slaves also forms a clause in the 1387 treaty between the Ottoman sultan Murad and the Genoese commune. The significance of the problem is apparent from the fact that this is one of the few detailed and most extensive clauses in the treaty. The Genoese agreed that if any slave fled from Murad to Pera, that slave was to be handed over to the *podestà* who was to pay the price of the slave to the master plus 100 *hyperpyra*. Murad, for his part, undertook to return all slaves who fled from their Genoese masters into Turchia or Grecia, that is areas which had come under Ottoman domination, unless the slave was recognised to be a Muslim, in which case Murad was to pay a fair price for the slave concerned.<sup>136</sup> An entry in the deliberations of the Venetian senate in the same year as the treaty shows that the Venetians were anxious that the issue of runaway slaves from Ottoman lands should not be a cause of friction between Venice and the sultan, although Venice, while professing innocence, was undoubtedly profiting from the situation. The Venetian envoy was instructed that should Murad complain of Venetian ships accepting his

<sup>130</sup> Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, p. 161.

<sup>131</sup> 1337.pre iv = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1337M, clause 18, pp. 197–8.

<sup>132</sup> 1375.iv.22 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1375M, clause 18, p. 221.

<sup>133</sup> 1403.vii.12 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1403M and doc. 1403M DVL, clause 18, p. 230; 1407.vi.2 = *ibid.*, doc. 1407M, clause 18, p. 236.

<sup>134</sup> 1358.x.13 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1358/1359M, clause 4, pp. 217–18.

<sup>135</sup> 1348.viii.18 = Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade*, doc. 1348A, clause 23, p. 210.

<sup>136</sup> 1387.vi.8 = ASG, Archivio Segreto, Materie Politiche 2729, doc. 26; Kate Fleet, 'Treaty', clause 7, p. 15. See also the 1380 treaty between Genoa and the Han of Solgat in which a clause deals with the capture and return of each side's runaway slaves, C. Desimoni, 'Trattato dei genovesi col Khan dei Tatari nel 1380–1381, scritto in lingua volgare', *Archivio Storico Italiano* 20 (1887), 164.

slaves on board and transporting them elsewhere against his wishes, he was to assure Murad that Venetian ships and citizens were forbidden from loading his slaves and that it was in no way the intention of Venice to act in such a manner.<sup>137</sup>

The problem continued into the reign of Bayezid and beyond. In 1390 there was a dispute over payment for alum occasioned by the flight of certain slaves from Turchia to Phokaea,<sup>138</sup> and in 1403 the *podestà* of Chios, Dexerino de Podio, agreed to pay 25 *florins* to Petro Longo, ‘ambassador of the Turks’, for a Turkish or Bulgar slave who had recently fled from Turchia.<sup>139</sup> In the same year Batista Spinolla, procurator of Ricardo de Vindobonis, sued Giuliano de Levanto over a Turkish slave whom Ricardo had left in Giuliano’s care and who had fled.<sup>140</sup> In 1413 Simon de Serra appointed a procurator to retrieve his two slaves who had fled from Chios to Turchia.<sup>141</sup>

Not all slaves tried to escape from their owners. There is one particularly tragic case of a runaway slave who actually tried to run back to his master. In 1401 Ambrogio Bernichono de Arenzano was obliged by the *Capitanei* Ettore de Flisco and Ottobono Giustiniano to sail with his ship from Pera against the Turks in the gulf of Büyükçekmece (the Gulf of Atira in Grecia), south of Istanbul between Küçükçekmece (Rhegion) and Silivri (Selembría). While he was there one of his slaves, a twenty-five-year-old Tatar called Asperto, was captured by the Turks. After about a year the slave managed to escape from the Turkish commander Şerefedin (Sarafadinus) and reached Pera on board a ship from Gallacia, that is from the Iberian peninsula. Unfortunately the Gallacians then wished to sell him. Asperto appealed to three friends of Ambrogio who interceded with the *podestà* on his behalf, pointing out that he could not be sold as he had not been captured by the Gallacians and was in fact the slave of Ambrogio. The *podestà*, however, paid no attention and had Asperto imprisoned. Despite further remonstrances from Ambrosio’s friends, the *podestà* handed Asperto over to the Gallacians to do with him what they wanted. Ambrogio in turn sued the *podestà* for the 200 *hyperpyra* at which Asperto was valued.<sup>142</sup> In evidence, Enrico Baldinelo, appearing for Ambrogio, said that he had gone to a castle

<sup>137</sup> 1387.x.3 = J. Chrysostomides (ed.), *Monumenta Peloponnesiaca. Documents for the History of the Peloponnese in the 14th and 15th Centuries* (Camberley, 1995), no. 35, p. 83.

<sup>138</sup> 1394.ii.18 = ASG, Notaio, Donato de Clavaro, Sc. 39, filza 1, doc. 97/240.

<sup>139</sup> 1403.x.3, ASG, Notaio, Gregorio Panissario, Sc. 37 filza 1, doc. 21; = Toniolo, *Notai Genovesi*, doc. 22, pp. 74–5. This is presumably the same person as Pietro Longo Candiottio who appears in Gerardo Sagredo’s account of the battle of Ankara of 1402 and who, with the army of Bayezid, fled after the battle to Constantinople, was ambassador of Süleyman in 1409, proclaimed peace in Albania, and in the following year was consul in Theologos: see M. M. Alexandrescu-Dersca, *La campagne de Timur en Anatolie (1402)* (Variorum Reprints, London, 1977), p. 129 and n. 2.

<sup>140</sup> 1430.xii.3 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fos. 58v–59r.

<sup>141</sup> 1413.vii.5 = ASG, Notaio, Giovanni Balbi, Sc. 46, filza 1, doc. 17.

<sup>142</sup> 1403.xi.23 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 21r.

which the Turks then called Cotoło on business for the commune of Pera in connection with the current war between Pera and the Turks.<sup>143</sup> Ambrogio, then in Pera, had asked Enrico to find out if there was there a Tatar slave, captured by the Turks. When Enrico arrived, he had made enquiries and had, in the presence of some Turks, seen a Tatar slave who said he belonged to Ambrogio. He had asked the slave why he did not escape, to which the slave had replied that he would willingly do so if possible and return to Pera, search for Ambrogio and stay with him.<sup>144</sup>

The concern over recovering escaped slaves indicates their value in the economy of the late medieval Mediterranean world and highlights their considerable importance as a commodity in the trade between the Turks and the Genoese, a trade in which the Turks took part both as traders and as trade items.

<sup>143</sup> This presumably refers to the period of confusion following the defeat of Bayezid by Timur in 1402, before the treaty of early 1403 made between Süleyman and various Christian powers including Genoa.

<sup>144</sup> 1403.xii.7 = ASG, San Giorgio, Sala 34 590/1307, fo. 23r.